CANADA

HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

FIRST SESSION—TWENTY SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

16 ELIZABETH II

VOLUME XIV, 1967

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE THIRD DAY OF APRIL, 1967
TO THE EIGHTH DAY OF MAY, 1967, INCLUSIVE.

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

ROGER DUHAMEL, F.R.S.C.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1967

23033—911½

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, April 3, 1967

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

DRUGS—SECOND REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. H. C. Harley (Halton): I have the honour to present the second and final report of the special committee on drug costs and prices.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—SIXTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew North): On behalf of the chairman, the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, I have the honour to present the sixth report of the standing committee on national defence.

[*Note: Text of foregoing reports appears in today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

C.B.C. EMPLOYEES NOT COVERED BY PART IV OF LABOUR CODE

Question No. 2,329—**Mr. Howard:**

Are there any persons in the employ of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation who the said corporation feels are not covered by the provisions of Part IV, General Holidays, of the Canada Labour (Standards) Code and, if so (a) how many persons are employed in each classification not so covered (b) what reasons does the corporation have therefor?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the C.B.C. that all employees on the regular establishment of the corporation are covered by the provisions of part IV of the labour code, with the following exceptions: (a) Those in management and professional categories, numbering approximately 1,500, who along with other regular employees do, however, enjoy 10 statutory holidays annually. Section 3(3) of the code exempts this group. (b) Those employed on a casual, temporary or part time basis and those retained by the corporation under letter of agreement who are considered by the C.B.C. as independent contractors. This is a relatively small number which fluctuates widely according to operating requirements.

SHIPMENTS UNDER FOOD AID PROGRAMS

Question No. 2,553—**Mr. Andras:**

What amounts of wheat and flour were shipped, and to what countries, under Canada's food aid programs in each fiscal year since 1961?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs):

BILATERAL FOOD AID SHIPMENTS

	Wheat		Flour	
	Quantity	$	Quantity	$
	(long tons)		(long tons)	
1961-62				
India	94,858.7	7,000,000.00	—	—
Pakistan	56,214.0	3,649,999.85	—	—
Ceylon	—	—	11,301.2	1,000,000.00
Burma	5,283.0	399,343.57	—	—
Indonesia	—	—	3,294.0	348,164.62
Rep. of Vietnam	—	—	879.0	99,998.51
1962-63				
India	18,846.7	1,499,999.95	—	—
Pakistan	9,687.5	749,999.89	—	—
Ceylon	—	—	9,708.3	999,947.43
Burma	2,114.0	162,500.00	1,483.0	162,488.59
Indonesia	—	—	2,966.3	323,346.36
Rep. of Vietnam	—	—	818.0	99,951.47

Questions

BILATERAL FOOD AID SHIPMENTS—concluded

	Wheat		Flour	
	Quantity	$	Quantity	$
	(long tons)		(long tons)	
1963-64				
India	19,322.5	1,500,000.00	—	—
Pakistan	9,508.5	750,000.00	—	—
Ceylon	—	—	8,853.0	999,974.85
Burma	3,087.0	324,950.31	—	—
Indonesia	—	—	2,774.0	323,317.10
Rep. of Vietnam	—	—	825.5	84,627.13
1964-65				
India	186,157.0	13,999,999.89	—	—
Pakistan	49,244.0	3,682,560.12	—	—
Ceylon	—	—	8,500.0	884,093.48
Burma	4,592.0	349,999.87	—	—
Rep. of Vietnam	—	—	1,463.0	149.972.13
1965-66				
India	228,784.4	17,359.112.07	—	—
Pakistan	49,691.4	3,649,999.95	—	—
Ceylon	—	—	19,424.0	1,999,835.64
Burma	—	—	3,136.0	349,998.32
*1966-67**				
India	895,488.0	68,593,877.80	33,301.0	3,685,479.62
Pakistan	75,909.9	5,899,999.04	—	—
Ceylon	—	—	17,150.0	1,999,941.00
Ghana	—	—	15,868.0	1,981,488.76
Algeria	—	—	8,242.0	999,904.65

*1966–67 figures indicate quantities shipped by February 28, 1967.

ADDITIONAL STAFF FOR OLD AGE SUPPLEMENT, QUEBEC CITY

Question No. 2,689—**Mr. Ricard:**

1. As of the date on which it was decided to grant a supplement to persons eligible for the old age pension who fulfilled certain requirements, how many employees were added to the staff of the responsible section in the office of the Department of National Health and Welfare in the city of Quebec?

2. What will be the total amount paid in salaries each year to these additional employees?

[*Translation*]

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. The Quebec Regional Office is at present employing casual staff to deal with the initial phase of implementation of the Guaranteed Income Supplement Program. Recruitment began in January and the numbers of staff (casuals), employed has increased gradually to the present total of 194. It is anticipated that the initial phase of this program will be completed by the end of April with a consequent reduction in the number of casual employees.

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

2. At this time, it is impossible to estimate accurately the number and level of employees that will be required for the ongoing aspects of this program hence the total amount that will be paid in salaries each year. This information will be available only after enough applications have been processed to permit an accurate measure to be made of the amount and type of work to be performed.

[*English*]

HEALTH AND WELFARE ADVERTISING ON U.S. TELEVISION STATIONS

Question No. 2,695—**Mr. Prittie:**

1. Has the Department of National Health and Welfare, or any agency acting for the department, placed advertising with television station KVOS, located at Bellingham, Washington, U.S.A., in 1966 and 1967?

2. Has the department placed advertising with any other United States radio and television stations in 1966 and 1967?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. Yes. Television spot announcements for the guaranteed income

supplement program during the weeks commencing February 20 and 27, 1967.

2. Yes. KCND-TV, Pembina, North Dakota and WQDY (radio), Calais, Maine for the same periods as in 1 above.

ORIGIN OF COLOUR T.V. SETS DISTRIBUTED BY C.B.C.

Question No. 2,701—**Mr. McIntosh:**

1. How many of the colour T.V. sets purchased for distribution by the C.B.C. to selected persons, were made in Canada?

2. How many were purchased in the United States?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): 1. All of the colour receivers were purchased from manufacturers in Canada and to the best of the corporation's knowledge all were made in Canada.

2. No sets were purchased in the United States.

HEALTH AND WELFARE TELEVISION ADVERTISING OVER NORTH DAKOTA STATION

Question No. 2,705—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Has the Department of National Health and Welfare, or any government agency, placed advertising with T.V. station KCND North Dakota, U.S.A., in 1967?

2. If so, what was the cost to the department or agency of such advertising?

3. What was the purpose of this expenditure?

4. Does the department consider that T.V. stations in Winnipeg and Brandon cannot get the desired information to Canadian citizens?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. Yes.

2. $900.

3. To disseminate information on the guaranteed income supplement program.

4. Television station KCND commands a significant portion of the southern Manitoba television market and was therefore used to complement the coverage provided by Canadian stations in Winnipeg and Brandon.

FARM MACHINERY IMPORTS

Question No. 2,711—**Mr. Watson (Assiniboia):**

What percentage of the farm machinery sold in Canada is imported from other countries by the following machine companies: (a) John Deere Company (b) International Harvester (c) Massey Ferguson (d) Cockshutt (e) J. I. Case (f) C.C.I.L.?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce): The Dominion Bureau of Statistics does not compile lists of companies or manufacturers importing commodities of any type.

SALES TAX ON MARGARINE IN NEWFOUNDLAND

Question No. 2,712—**Mr. Laprise:**

Is federal sales tax applied to sales of margarine in the province of Newfoundland and, if not, since when and for what reason?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue and President of the Treasury Board): To fulfil an undertaking of the government to the Newfoundland delegation during the negotiations leading to confederation, sales of margarine in the province of Newfoundland were not subjected to federal sales tax from the date of confederation. During the period April 1, 1949, to March 30, 1966, annual remission orders gave effect to this undertaking; however, effective March 30, 1966, the exemption was established under an act to amend the Excise Tax Act (Bill C198 which received royal assent July 11, 1966).

MILK TRUCKING, NIAGARA FALLS-TORONTO

Question No. 2,729—**Mr. Nesbitt:**

1. Has the Department of Agriculture made any inquiries during the last two months from any trucking company in Ontario concerning the cost of trucking milk from Niagara Falls to Toronto?

2. If so, what is the purpose of this inquiry?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): 1. No.

2. N/A.

FEDERAL GRANTS TO "CITÉ ÉTUDIANTE DE HULL"

Question No. 2,736—**Mr. Isabelle:**

1. What grants have been paid by the federal government for the construction of the "Cité étudiante de Hull", situated in the municipality of Lucerne, in the county of Gatineau?

2. What grants will be required in order to complete the said project?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Department of Manpower and Immigration as follows: 1. To date the following contributions have been approved or made toward the Cité étudiante de Hull:

Apprenticeship centre	
Total cost	$1,653,702
Federal share	1,127,776
École secondaire polyvalente	
Total cost	$7,450,000
Federal share	5,303,505

The apprenticeship centre is complete. The secondary school is now under construction.

2. The federal government has not yet had proposals for participation in other buildings and cannot estimate possible total contribution.

OPENING AND CLOSING OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT OFFICES

Question No. 2,738—**Mr. Schreyer:**

1. In each of the last three years (a) how many unemployment insurance offices have been closed and at what places (b) how many new offices have been opened and at what places?

2. In each of the last three years (a) how many national employment service or manpower offices have been closed and at what places (b) how many new offices have been opened and at what places?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Unemployment Insurance Commission and the Department of Manpower and Immigration as follows: 1. (a) 1964, none; 1965, 18; 1966, 47.

The offices closed in 1965 were at the following locations: Asbestos, P.Q.; Blairmore, Alta.; Cowansville, P.Q.; Drumheller, Alta.; Edson, Alta.; Estevan, Sask.; Farnham, P.Q.; Flin Flon, Man.; Forestville, P.Q.; Gananoque, Ont.; Lachute, P.Q.; Liverpool, N.S.; Lloydminster, Sask.; Minto, N.B.; Mission City, B.C.; Picton, Ont.; Ste. Anne de Bellevue, P.Q.; Weyburn, Sask.

The offices closed in 1966 were at the following locations: Abbotsford, B.C.; Arnprior, Ont.; Beauharnois, P.Q.; Brockville, Ont.; Buckingham, P.Q.; Carleton Place, Ont.; Cobourg, Ont.; Courtenay, B.C.; Dauphin, Man.; Dolbeau, P.Q.; Duncan, B.C.; Fort Erie, Ont.; Napanee, Ont.; Nelson, B.C.; New Liskeard, Ont.; North Battleford, Sask.; Parry Sound, Ont.; Perth, Ont.; Portage-La-Prairie, Man.; Port Alberni, B.C.; Port Alfred, P.Q.; Port Arthur, Ont.; Port Colborne, Ont.; Fort Frances, Ont.; Gaspé, P.Q.; Goderich, Ont.; Grande Prairie, Alta.; Inverness, N.S.; La Tuque, P.Q.; Lindsay, Ont.; Listowel, Ont.; Louiseville, P.Q.; Magog, P.Q.; Maniwaki, P.Q.; Midland, Ont.; Quesnel, B.C.; Renfrew, Ont.; Springhill, N.S.; Sturgeon Falls, Ont.; Sussex, N.B.; Swift Current, Sask.; Sydney, Mines, N.S.; The Pas, Man.; Tillsonburg, Ont.; Trail, B.C.; Wallaceburg, Ont.

(b) One new office was opened in 1966 at Castlegar, B.C.

2. (a) None. (b) Manpower centre was opened in Williams Lake, B.C. in the year 1966.

[Miss LaMarsh.]

LOCATION OF NEW OFFICE BUILDING, OTTAWA

Question No. 2,747—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

1. In what location will the office building in the city of Ottawa, for which $500,000 is provided in the estimates for 1967-68, be erected?

2. For use of what departments of government will the building be allocated?

3. When is it anticipated that this building will be (a) commenced (b) completed?

4. What is the estimated total cost of the building?

5. How many square feet of space will be provided in the building?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): 1. Tunney's Pasture.

2. The space will be used to meet the overall forecast needs of several departments. No allocation of space to specific departments has been made.

3. (a) Late autumn, 1967. (b) Early in 1969.

4. It is not customary to reveal the estimated cost before tenders have been called.

5. 200,000 net square feet.

SAVING IN ESTIMATE FOR ACCOMMODATION SERVICES, OTTAWA

Question No. 2,752—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

Referring to page 434 of the estimates for 1967-68, how is the item of $5,710,000 not required for 1967-68 for accommodation services in Ottawa made up?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works):

Vote 15	
Ottawa—Administration building for Department of Agriculture—to complete	$ 900,000
Ottawa—Central experimental farm —improvements to central heating plant—to complete	75,000
Ottawa—Confederation Heights—site development and improvements	315,000
Ottawa—Dominion Bureau of Statistics Building—alterations	120,000
Ottawa—Experimental station for fresh water resources branch of Department of Mines and Technical Surveys	100,000
Ottawa—Jackson Building—improvements to elevators—to complete	100,000
Ottawa—National Library—to complete	3,200,000

Ottawa—Norlite building—alterations and improvements—to complete	200,000
Ottawa—Parliament Buildings centre block—improvements	100,000
Ottawa—Purchase of, and alterations to property at 7 Rideau Gate	200,000
Ottawa—R.C.M.P. headquarters buildings—improvements—to complete	160,000
Ottawa—Tunney's Pasture—improvements to electrical distribution system	140,000
Ottawa—Virus laboratory—addition and alterations—to complete	100,000
	$5,710,000

GOVERNMENT WHARF, SAMBRO, N.S.

Question No. 2,759—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. When was the government wharf at Sambro, Halifax county, Nova Scotia, built?

2. What is its shape, and its length and breadth?

3. At the time it was built, how many fishing vessels used the same, and what was their approximate average length and tonnage?

4. At the time it was built, what limit if any was imposed on the weight of vehicles using same?

5. What moneys have been spent on the wharf since it was built?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): 1. The government wharf at Sambro was built in 1911, rebuilt in 1935 and in 1951, and extended in 1957.

2. It is "ell" shaped, having a stem 289 feet long by 20 feet wide and an ell 49 feet long by 20.8 feet wide.

3. We have no records of the number and size of vessels using the wharf during the year it was constructed.

4. The first recorded load limit was in 1935 when it was 150 pounds per square foot and concentrated load of 5 tons.

5. An amount of $66,391 has been spent on this wharf since it was built.

FEDERAL BUILDING, PARRSBORO, N.S.

Question No. 2,768—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What progress has been made toward the construction of a new federal building at Parrsboro, Nova Scotia?

2. Has a site been secured and, if so, from whom and at what cost?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): 1. The proposed accommodation areas required have been approved.

2. Not yet.

DREDGING OF HARBOUR, PUGWASH, N.S.

Question No. 2,770—**Mr. Coates:**

Will a dredging program be carried out at Pugwash harbour in 1967 and, if so, of what will the program consist and what is the estimated cost of same?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Yes. The work will consist of the restoration of the outer leg of the channel to original lines and depths and some spot dredging in the inner harbour. It is not customary to reveal the estimated cost before tenders are called.

BREAKWATER REPAIRS, WEST ADVOCATE, N.S.

Question No. 2,773—**Mr. Coates:**

Will breakwater repairs be effected at the breakwater at West Advocate, Nova Scotia, and are any other improvements planned?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): No, unless an inspection in the spring reveals that repairs are necessary.

HARBOUR DREDGING, PORT GREVILLE, N.S.

Question No. 2,774—**Mr. Coates:**

Will dredging be carried out at Port Greville harbour in 1967?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): No, not unless maintenance dredging is found to be necessary.

APPLICATIONS FOR OLD AGE SECURITY SUPPLEMENTS

Question No. 2,790—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

1. Under the guaranteed income program, how many persons currently in receipt of old age security payments have applied for an additional $40 per month?

2. How many of the applications have been processed to date?

3. How many have been approved for payment of an additional $30?

4. How many have been approved for lesser additional amounts?

5. How many applications have been rejected?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): As at the close of business March 17, 1967: 1. 708,121 persons have

applied for a supplement under the guaranteed income supplement program.

2. 570,705 applications have been processed.

3. 355,516 have been approved for payment of an additional $30.

4. 196,032 have been approved for lesser additional amounts.

5. 19,157 applications have been rejected because of income in excess of the limit.

EGG IMPORTS

Question No. 2,798—**Mr. Nasserden:**

1. How many dozens of eggs were imported into Canada during the year 1966?

2. How many dozens were imported in each of the months of January and February, 1967?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. Imports of eggs in the shell totalled 10,601,821 dozen for the year 1966.

2. No statistics are available as yet on imports for the months of January and February, 1967.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

EXPORTS OF POWDERED SKIM MILK

Question No. 2,713—**Mr. Laprise:**

1. For each year, since 1958, what quantities of (a) powdered whole milk (b) powdered skim milk, have been exported and to what countries?

2. For each year, since 1958, what quantities of (a) powdered whole milk (b) powdered skim milk, have been stocked?

Return tabled.

• (2:40 p.m.)

CANADA LABOUR (STANDARDS) CODE

AMENDMENT RESPECTING NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES DISCHARGED OR LAID OFF

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-284, to amend the Canada Labour (Standards) Code (notice and payment to employees in case of discharge or lay-off).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Knowles: The purpose of this bill is to amend the Canada Labour (Standards) Code to require that employees covered by the code who have been employed for three months or more shall not be discharged or laid off except with two weeks' notice or two weeks' pay in lieu thereof.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

AMENDMENT INCREASING NUMBER OF GENERAL HOLIDAYS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-285, to amend the Canada Labour (Standards) Code (provision for ninth general holiday with pay).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend the Canada Labour (Standards) Code with respect to the general holidays provided in that code. At the present time there are eight general holidays with pay each year. This bill would add a ninth, namely the first Monday in the month of August.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REPORTED SPEECHES BY CHIEF OF DEFENCE STAFF AND MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Did the minister give clearance, and thus approval, to the speech made by the chief of the defence staff to the International Relations Club at Bréboeuf College, in which improper motives were imputed to members of this house and particularly to privy councillors?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I did not know of the speech but I have complete confidence in the chief of the defence staff and he is at complete liberty to express himself publicly as he sees fit.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Harkness: Then, Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege it seems to me that this is a matter in which the minister, in fact the Prime Minister and the government generally, must take some action. A report has been made as follows:

General Jean Allard, commander in chief of the Canadian armed forces, says opposition to unification mostly is a result of political ambition.

Members of the opposition in the House of Commons hope to strengthen their chances of being re-elected by opposing Defence Minister Hellyer's plan, he told a meeting of the International Relations Club at Bréboeuf College.

"I would like to ask former cabinet ministers why they are clinging to the name of the navy, army and air force..."

I think, Mr. Speaker, this is an unprecedented event so far as Canadian history is concerned, that a member of the defence forces of this country, and particularly the chief of the defence staff, would impute to members of this house and members of the defence committee improper motives in regard to the stands and positions they have taken with respect to a measure which is now before the house.

I think there is absolutely no excuse for conduct of this kind. It has never been permitted for members of the defence forces or members of the civil service in this or any other country which has the British parliamentary system of government, and I think it is incumbent not only on the Minister of National Defence but on the Prime Minister to take disciplinary action in this case in order to ensure that there be no repetition of instances of this kind.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Paul Martin (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has raised this matter as a question of privilege. I do not rise to comment on the substance; I have not seen the statement. I do wish, however, to point out to Your Honour rule 41-A which deals with questions of privilege. It is not open to the hon. gentleman to raise the question in the absence of the notice provided for in this new rule which governs our procedure.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have no doubt that hon. members will accept the correctness of the procedural point raised by the Acting Prime Minister. I felt it was my duty to hear the statement to be made by the hon. member for Calgary North, but the rule is clear that an hour's notice is to be given on a question of privilege. This is a rule which has been adopted by parliament and which parliament would expect to be followed.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): It arose out of the minister's answer.

Mr. Speaker: The suggestion is made that the question of privilege arises out of the minister's answer. I would not agree with that suggestion. If the hon. member for Calgary North felt he had a valid question of privilege he should have raised it according to the rules. I suggest to him that it would have been very easy to give the prescribed notice, as all hon. members invariably do when a question of privilege is raised in the house.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, I did think my question of privilege arose out of the minister's reply, which was so contrary to what has been the practice in the past in this house. I thought I had a valid question of privilege which arose at that time, but naturally I defer to your judgment on the matter.

I should like to ask the Acting Prime Minister a supplementary question. As Acting Prime Minister will he take action to ensure that instances of this kind do not recur and that disciplinary action is taken in this case?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated I have not seen the statement. I will be glad to look at it. I will do so in the light of what my honourable and respected friend has suggested.

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I have a related question. In view of the statement by the Minister of National Defence over last week end, I should like to ask whether he was enunciating official government policy when he told the Young Liberals Association that the press of Canada was guilty of irresponsible reporting and had done a great disservice to Canada in the manner in which the news was reported.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I do not know that it is open to an hon. member to ask anyone in the house whether he agrees with the views of a colleague or another member of this house. However, since my hon. friend has put that question I should like to say in answer to my hon. friend that the Minister of National Defence has the right to state his views, just as my hon. friend has that right. I recall one occasion, when my hon. friend was questioning a matter which I raised about his particular administration, when he made an observation which I do not think reflected too kindly on the press of this country.

Mr. Starr: What was it?

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence whether in his years in office he has familiarized himself with Q. R. & O. If so, does he not realize that his answer is entirely wrong?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Inquiries of the Ministry

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—REQUEST BY UN SECRETARY GENERAL FOR CEASE FIRE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Acting Prime Minister regarding the appeal by Secretary General U Thant for a unilateral cease fire by the United States, under which there would be a truce under which United States forces in Viet Nam would fire only if fired upon. In view of the fact that the Secretary General has indicated that he himself or a group of governments, who are members of the United Nations, might make an appeal to the United States for such a declaration by a fixed date, will the Canadian government indicate to the Secretary General of the United Nations Canada's support of such a declaration?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have not yet seen the official text of the appeal of the Secretary General addressed to the government of the United States, but I expect to receive it later this afternoon. In general terms, however, so there can be no misunderstanding, the position of the Canadian government remains as set out in this house on a number of occasions. We should like to see the bombings stopped; we should like to see the infiltration stopped, and we should like to see this conflict transferred from the battlefield to the negotiating table as soon as possible. Any proposal or appeal which carries us closer to that objective will be supported by the Canadian government.

I should like to remind my hon. friend, and I am sure he will recall this, that in answer to a question from his seatmate I said that the government publicly endorsed the three point proposal put forward by the Secretary-General on March 14. That proposal seemed at that time, as it still does, to offer some hope for early restoration of peace in Viet Nam.

Mr. Douglas: I have a supplementary question. Is the Canadian government prepared to support an appeal by the United Nations to the government of the United States to set a fixed date for a cease fire to be carried out on a unilateral basis?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I can say unequivocally that the Canadian government will support an appeal to all sides for a cease fire. That was the tenor of the first proposal made by the Secretary General on March 14.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Does the Secretary of State for External Affairs accept the proposition of the Secretary General of the United Nations that the first initiative in stopping the conflict should rest, for the major part, with the United States?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I think I have dealt with this question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question is argumentative.

NATO—REPORTED INVOLVEMENT OF OFFICERS IN SPY ACTIVITIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of Canada's deep involvement in NATO does the minister have anything to report to this house in respect of the alarming reports regarding spy activities within the NATO organization?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, a communiqué was issued by the Secretary General of NATO on March 23 in which it was stated that NATO has been informed that the news carried by the press in respect of the alleged involvement of 300 NATO officers in the ring discovered in Italy lacked any foundation. As a result of conversations I had with the Secretary General in England on Friday I would say there is no reason for changing that reply.

HOUSING

INQUIRY AS TO FORMATION OF NEW DEPARTMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, in view of the continuing decline in housing starts as reported last Friday by C.M.H.C., and in view of the speech of the right hon. Prime Minister last week concerning urban and housing affairs and techniques of handling related problems, I should like to ask the Acting Prime Minister whether the government is considering a new agency or perhaps a department of housing and urban affairs.

Hon. Paul Martin (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's statement

speaks for itself. When the government feels that an announcement of its policy now under consideration should be made, it will be made. I am sure it will please my hon. friend.

GRAIN

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In view of the self imposed deadline of March 31 having been reached with no announcement from Geneva concerning the future price of wheat under the international wheat agreement, is the minister in a position to indicate whether negotiations have bogged down or is the government still optimistic about a 32 cent increase in the price of wheat?

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I have no comment to make regarding the 32 cents, which is a figure unknown to me. I think the suggestion regarding the March 31 deadline may be somewhat in error. The agreed terminating date for the current cereals negotiations at Geneva is April 30.

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, I did not suggest that it was the terminating date. All reports in the press indicated that the negotiators had set this particular, termination date for the negotiations on wheat, and that the future—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is a difference of opinion between the minister and the hon. member which we should not attempt to resolve just now.

SPORTS

NANCY GREENE—SUGGESTED RECOGNITION FOR WINNING WOMEN SKIERS' WORLD CUP

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I rise with great national and parochial pride to bring to the attention of this house a matter of national significance. In view of the great achievement of Miss Nancy Greene, of Rossland in Kootenay West, in having won the first world cup for women skiers, to the delight of all Canadians, has consideration been given by the government to proclaiming her the centennial athletes' queen for Canada, or to some other recognition such as Canada's centennial champion athlete?

Hon. Paul Martin (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask my colleague the Minister of National Health and Welfare to reply to this question. Before doing so may I say on behalf of all of us in the house that I am glad to see the hon. member for Grey North still in his seat, and I should like to extend to his seatmate, the hon. member for Humboldt-Melville-Tisdale, our warmest congratulations—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): —on being selected whip of a rapidly reducing group on the other side of the chamber.

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege to make a brief correction. My constituency is Grey-Bruce, not Grey North.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, may I thank the hon. member for bringing to the attention of the house the remarkable achievement of Miss Nancy Greene in winning the world cup and thus establishing herself as the top woman skier in the world. She has generated the admiration of Canadians from coast to coast, and this feat certainly will be regarded as one of the most outstanding performances by an individual in the long history of amateur sport in Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacEachen: In paying tribute to Miss Greene I wish also to express my congratulations to all members of our national ski team. Canada's level of performance in world skiing is on the ascent, and this year's team has made a notable contribution.

With respect to the specific and important point raised by the hon. member concerning a suitable award for Miss Greene, I should like to mention that some time ago the national advisory council on fitness and amateur sport undertook to consider the question of suitable awards for outstanding amateur athletes in Canada. That proposal has been approved in principle and within a very short time a special committee of the council will be meeting to determine the final details of such an award. Naturally Miss Greene would rank high on any list of possible candidates for such an award.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The Acting Prime Minister said my constituency was Humboldt-Melville-Tisdale, instead of Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale. Nevertheless I very much appreciate the Acting Prime Minister's congratulations and thank him for the nice remarks he made on my appointment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

FREIGHT RATES

NOTICE OF INCREASE FILED BY RAILWAY ASSOCIATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Transport. Is he aware that the Railway Association of Canada, representing some 15 railroads in this country, have filed notice that they intend to increase some class and commodity rates? If the minister is aware of this, I wonder if he could advise the house whether the new railway commission has been set up with all the regulations and administration powers necessary to administer the new transportation policy in Canada, or is this an attempt by the Railway Association to raise these rates under the old act?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the application; like the hon. gentleman, I received it in the mail. Part V of the Transportation Act, which contains the amendments to the Railway Act, was proclaimed on March 23 and is now part of the law of Canada.

Mr. Olson: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I know the act was proclaimed and is part of the law. What I asked the minister was whether the new transportation commission, along with the necessary regulations, has been set up to deal with this kind of thing in the event that any of these rates exceed the maximum allowable under the new act.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, all amendments to the Railway Act—here I speak subject to correction in detail—were proclaimed on March 23. Among the other provisions in the act is a provision that until the new transport commission is set up the board of transport commissioners will act in its place. That is the law as passed by parliament and given royal assent at this session.

Mr. Olson: A further supplementary question. Can the minister tell the house whether the new transport commission is now set up?

Mr. Pickersgill: The answer, sir, is no.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

TRANSPORTATION

INQUIRY AS TO REPORT ON MARITIME STUDY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. In light of the drastic loss of winter traffic to Halifax, I wonder if the minister can now advise the maritimes, including his own province, whether the special maritime transportation study is now receiving consideration by the department.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is referring to the report of the consultants who were engaged jointly by the Atlantic Development Board and my department, their report is rapidly approaching completion and I hope will be in my hands shortly.

Mr. Forrestall: A supplementary question. Could the minister now advise us whether this is a matter which will come before the house prior to our summer adjournment?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I would hate to predict the course of this parliament for even one day.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the transportation aspect of the secret plans to keep open the St. Lawrence up to Montreal, will the minister stop all activity by engineers of his department until we have had the chance to examine this whole question in a committee of the house, as promised before the Easter recess?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I would reassure the hon. gentleman that there are no secret plans whatever; therefore there is no need to suppress the secret plans.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Will the minister give every assurance that no engineers in his department or any other branch of the government are working on any plans to keep open the St. Lawrence in the winter to Montreal?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I think in the very careful and calculated language of the hon. gentleman I could give that assurance. But I would not want to mislead the house, sir; therefore I might be permitted to add this word. As is well known—there is no secret about this—consideration is being given to improving the ship channel in the St. Lawrence for normal summer navigation.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Could the Minister of Transport tell us whether officials of his department, in line with modern progress, intend to set up such a committee to ascertain the possibility of keeping the St. Lawrence open all year round to Montreal? Could he also tell us why his department, under which this matter comes, does not see to it that the St. Lawrence seaway is kept open all year round?

[*English*]

Mr. Pickersgill: I fear that a reply to that question would start a debate, sir.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, may I take this matter up at ten o'clock?

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REPORTED CHANGE IN ROLE OF CF-5 AIRCRAFT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of National Defence. Could the minister advise whether the role or purpose of the CF-5 aircraft is being changed from that of a close support tactical aircraft to that of merely reconnaissance and surveillance, as attributed to General Allard, who says that the aircraft has been found peculiarly vulnerable to ground to air missiles?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is very difficult for me to determine whether there is urgency to the question asked by the hon. member.

Mr. Lambert: Well, Mr. Speaker, on the question of urgency, I understand there is a debate coming up on defence, so perhaps we might have the information.

Mr. Speaker: The question might be asked then.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO PAYMENT OF KINDERGARTEN TEACHERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. May I ask the hon. gentleman whether it is the intention of his department to pay salaries to teachers of kindergarten classes for native Indian children?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that the question should be placed on the order paper.

HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS

LOUISBOURG FORTRESS—RETURN TO WORK OF MEN LAID OFF

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. May I ask the minister whether the government has altered its plans with respect to the development of Fortress Louisbourg?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): A supplementary question. Since the minister does not have any knowledge, would he assure the 40-odd men who were paid off on Friday that they will have their jobs back tomorrow or the following day? If the minister is not in a position to answer now I will raise the matter at ten o'clock.

INQUIRY AS TO APPOINTMENT OF MANITOBA REPRESENTATIVE ON BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In view of the importance of history in Canada's centennial year, and the fact that the position of Manitoba's representative on the historic sites and monuments board has been vacant for several months, can the minister indicate when this appointment might be made?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This question should be placed on the order paper.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

INQUIRY AS TO PERSONNEL OF FEED GRAIN BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Forestry and Rural Development.

In view of the fact that this matter is of great interest to all the farmers in eastern

Canada, is the minister in a position to give the names of the members of the Canadian Livestock Feed Board?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry and Rural Development): Mr. Speaker, the names will be announced this week.

Mr. Ricard: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know if the minister will be able to announce those names definitely, since he has promised to do it three times in the last ten days.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member will agree that the minister has already answered the question.

[*English*]

AIR TRANSPORT

MONTREAL—INCREASED AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SERVICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de Grâce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Would the minister tell the house whether his department has taken any steps to increase air traffic control services in the Montreal flight information region to handle the increased air traffic for Expo and the centennial, announced by the minister on March 27?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes.

Mr. R. R. Southam (Moose Mountain): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of these stepped up air services for centennial year, will the minister make sure that Saskatchewan is not left lagging in the provision of services? There has been considerable complaint in the province that air transport service there is inadequate at the present time.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I think every effort will be made within the capacities of the air lines serving Canada to provide service to every part of Canada to the best of their ability.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): A supplementary question. Has the minister any intention of bringing Canadian Pacific Airlines service to the maritimes, that part of Canada that was forgotten in this announcement?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Pickersgill: The answer to that question is no.

[Mr. Ricard.]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—CANADIAN PARTICIPATION IN POLICING OF CEASE FIRE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for either the Acting Prime Minister or the Minister of National Defence. As it arises out of some remarks attributed to the latter before a meeting of the Toronto Young Liberals Association, I will address my question to him. Has Canada officially offered or will Canada officially offer to make peace keeping forces available to help police a cease fire in Viet Nam?

Hon. Paul Martin (Acting Prime Minister): Would my hon. friend restate the first part of his question?

Mr. Brewin: Has Canada made or will Canada make any official offer to make forces available to help police a cease fire in Viet Nam?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I have read what my colleague the Minister of National Defence has said concerning the situation that would arise in the event that at some point an invitation were extended to Canada to take part in a peace keeping operation, either in an expanded I.C.C. form or in some other form, perhaps under the UN charter. But I cannot see that the question my hon. friend has put is in any way related to what the Minister of National Defence is reported to have said. I do not see how the use of force, in the sense mentioned by my hon. friend, would be very helpful.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO INTERIM ADJUSTMENTS IN PENSION RATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. In reply to a question asked on March 13 the minister stated that if the report of the committee studying veterans pension rates did not become available in the near future, further interim adjustments might be necessary. Could I ask the minister whether he has yet received the report, and if not has any decision been made with respect to further adjustments?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I think the clearest answer I can

give to the hon. member is no to both questions.

CAMP HILL, N.S.—REPORTED LACK OF HOSPITAL ACCOMMODATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): My question is for the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Is the hon. gentleman aware of the charges and accusations that have been made that legitimate, pensionable veterans have been refused bed space in the Camp Hill hospital while merchant seamen from Canada and other countries are occupying beds? Will he investigate this matter?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I have certainly not heard of this. I will look into it but I very much doubt the accuracy of that report.

[*Translation*]

EXPO '67

STATEMENTS IN "LA PRESSE" RESPECTING LOGEXPO

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce as the minister responsible for Expo '67.

Can he tell us whether he intends to take action against the Montreal paper *La Presse* because of the considerable damage caused by the irresponsible reports published in that paper with regard to Logexpo?

[*English*]

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I have not been contemplating any such action. Since the initial statement made by *La Presse* they have given very full coverage to the corrective action that has been taken and to the good progress now being made by Logexpo in bringing together people seeking accommodation and those who have it to offer.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Could the minister, with the help of his department and the Department of Justice, make inquiries in order to ascertain whether it is true that members of the Montreal underworld have approached an editorial writer from *La Presse* in an attempt to divert the attention of the Montreal police during Expo '67?

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION RESPECTING NEW UNIFORM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. I am wondering what would be the implications to the Canadian defence readiness posture if information about the colour and cut of the walking out uniform of the armed forces were to be finally disclosed to an anxious and breathless public.

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to know how to cope with such a comprehensive question as that raised by my hon. friend. However, if he is referring to the picture which appeared in some newspapers last week end, it might interest him to know that the gentleman in that picture was Captain Ken McLeod of the Queen's Own Rifles. He is a member of the directorate of ceremonials at headquarters in Ottawa. All the battle ribbons he was wearing were his own; and it is a great tribute to him that after so many years of distinguished service he is as useful —youthful as the picture portrays him to be.

Mr. MacEwan: Useful to the minister.

Mr. Hellyer: This very effective officer, who was having his picture taken—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

CO-OPERATIVES

INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): May I direct a question to the Registrar General. On the day we recessed, March 22, he took as notice a question I asked with respect to a co-operatives act which the government has indicated from time to time was under consideration. I want to ask the minister at what stage the preparation is and whether we can expect this legislation to be produced in the near future.

Hon. Guy Favreau (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I must say that this legislation is still being considered in the light of the eventual amendment of other related acts, and no final decision has been taken at the moment.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Douglas: May I ask a supplementary question. May I ask the minister if the co-operative organizations will have any opportunity to make representations to those who are preparing this legislation prior to it being introduced into parliament?

Mr. Favreau: Of course they will have the opportunity. Especially now that the question has been asked, I assume the hon. gentleman is aware of some who want to make representations, so I will see to it that a proper occasion is afforded.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REPORTED LACK OF REFRIGERATOR CARS FOR POTATOES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Transport. Can he assure the house that adequate refrigerator cars for the transportation of potatoes is now available in eastern Canada? If not, would he be kind enough to look into this problem with a view to making transport available for the disposal of surplus potatoes?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I regret very much, sir, that it is not within my power to give such an assurance, as I am sure the hon. gentleman realizes. However, I will be happy to make the most urgent representations to the Canadian National Railways.

CANADIAN CENTENNIAL

CASTLEGAR, B.C.—REQUEST FOR PRESENTATION OF AIR FORCE PERFORMANCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): I dislike very much intruding twice during one question period, but this is a matter of urgency. In view of the request by the municipalities in Kootenay West, representing the wishes of the people, that the R.C.A.F. Golden Centennials put on a full show while in Castlegar on July 14, and in view of the fact that the Castlegar squadron of the Royal Canadian Air Cadets, Kootenay West, has been chosen as the top squadron in Canada, will favourable consideration be given to the request of the municipalities and the 25,000 spectators expected to attend—

Mr. Speaker: Order. This question should be placed on the order paper.

[Mr. Favreau.]

[*Translation*]

EDUCATION

REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE FOR CLASSICAL COLLEGE AT SUDBURY, ONT.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Acting Prime Minister.

Could the minister tell us whether, after the repeated refusal of the Ontario government to give assistance to Ontario's French speaking classical colleges in order to allow them to survive, especially the college of Sudbury, it is the intention of the federal government to use the ancillary powers vested upon it by section 93 of the constitution to contribute to the survival of the classical college of Sudbury?

Mr. Speaker: Order. That question should be put on the order paper.

[*English*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

INQUIRY AS TO REGULATIONS UNDER NEW LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the President of the Treasury Board. Have all the necessary regulations under the Public Service Staff Relations Act and under the Public Service Act been promulgated? If so, when will they be available?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue and President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I know the work on the regulations has been going on urgently. I should like to take the question as notice to determine whether or not all of them have been completed.

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

BRITISH COLUMBIA—PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF HARBOUR COMMISSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Just before you call orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Minister of Transport whether he can inform the house about any recent developments regarding the recent proposal by the province of British Columbia to establish a harbours board.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I am not in the confidence of the government of British Columbia.

Mr. Howard: I rather expected that answer, from the statements made by the Prime Minister over the week end in Vancouver. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he knows whether the act has been passed and what action the government intends to take, that is the federal government?

Mr. Pickersgill: I do not think any action is called for except the action required under the British North America Act, to look at any legislation within one year of its passage. I presume that the Minister of Justice or his officials will do that at the appropriate time.

Mr. Howard: In other words—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Orders of the day.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

OUTER MONGOLIA—INQUIRY AS TO EXCHANGE OF DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATIVES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Acting Prime Minister in his capacity as Secretary of State for External Affairs. I wish to ask him if action is now in the process of being taken with respect to implementing an exchange of diplomatic representatives with Outer Mongolia.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): I recognize that the minister said three weeks ago that there was no intention of making changes immediately. Nevertheless, considering the changing situation in that part of Asia, coupled with our lack of knowledge of the situation actually existing between Red China and the U.S.S.R., is consideration being given to this matter?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have a lack of knowledge about Outer Mongolia, but I rather suspect the question could well be placed on the order paper.

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

AMALGAMATION OF NAVY, ARMY AND AIR FORCE

On the order:

March 22, 1967—House in committee of the whole on Bill C-243, an act to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof (as amended).—The Minister of National Defence.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order on the calling of this item. I do so knowing the seriousness of the situation at hand in that the house is being asked, or will be asked, to consider in committee a complex bill of many clauses on which the defence committee held many hearings the transcripts of which have not yet reached members of the house. Some, the later ones, reached hon. members at twelve o'clock today, that is, hon. members who went down to the distribution office and themselves obtained the copies. The last copy of evidence has not yet reached me. It may be in my office now, since 20 minutes to 3, but I do not know that it is there.

As has been the practice with other bills—and I cite the bill with respect to the Bank of Canada amendments where such transcripts were not ready—I submit that the government should defer the calling of this particular item until the complete transcript of evidence given before the standing committee is available for distribution to this committee. I think it would be doing a great disservice to the house to proceed with this matter without the evidence being in the hands of hon. members. I see no justification for the government going ahead at the present time.

Second, and this point is even more important than the first point, if Your Honour refers to *Votes and Proceedings* of Wednesday, March 22, at page 1591, as part of the fifth report of the standing committee on national defence Your Honour will see the following paragraph:

A further report, setting forth the above mentioned amendments to Bill C-243, is being prepared and will be presented.

Well, Your Honour, this afternoon on motions an hon. member of that committee in the absence of the chairman tabled the report. Those amendments are not printed in *Votes and Proceedings*. They are not available to hon. members as the committee report and they will not be available, other than as photocopies which can be made in a hurry or as some other sort of substitute.

I put it to Your Honour that these amendments and this report do not become official until they are printed in *Votes and Proceedings*, notwithstanding that in its fifth report the committee did say that it had ordered the reprinting of the bill, and that there is in the midst of our bills a copy of the reprinted bill. Hon. members, from the minister down, cannot take the original bill and the amended bill and show what changes were made by the committee. That would be a laborious process.

National Defence Act Amendment

I am as anxious as anyone else to proceed to an intelligent discussion of this matter. I have not passed observations on the unintelligent press reporting of the unification evidence, or the evidence on unification that the minister has. I shall refer to that later. I do say, however—and I spoke to the government house leader about this briefly early today—that to proceed with this item the evidence must be available to us. I say that hon. members of this house are entitled to that evidence. It is not a case of saying "Oh, well, it will be presented." We need that evidence to work on this legislation.

I suggest that Beauchesne makes certain references which imply that all the evidence shall be before the house when the matter is being discussed. In any event the evidence must be before hon. members, and it should not be presented merely at 2.30. To do that is contemptuous and frankly contemptible. Second, I put it to Your Honour that it is mandatory that the committee report embodying the amendments be printed in *Votes and Proceedings* before we can proceed to study the bill as amended.

If Your Honour will look at citation 318 on page 248 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, the paragraph dealing with the report by the chairman or member of a committee, Your Honour will find these words:

> If it is long, the house generally dispenses with the reading, as all reports are printed in the *Votes and Proceedings* for the information of members as soon as they are laid before the house.

I am concerned not only with members of the defence committee—and the acquantance of some hon. members on the other side with that committee was short enough—I am concerned with all members in the house. They must have the contents of the report before proceeding on it. That report was tabled at approximately 2.45 p.m. this afternoon, and I put it to Your Honour that that is not complying with the rules and practice of this house. The house having received the report, it may read it in *Votes and Proceedings* for today, and at the appropriate time proceed with the discussion of the bill.

I have raised these points because more and more with the evolution of the committee system in dealing with legislation, it will be absolutely mandatory that this house have the committee evidence before it, that it may properly consider the bill clause by clause. I therefore seek the co-operation of the leader of the house on the government side to turn to other business that we may complete these administrative details and allow hon. members to be properly prepared for this debate.

[Mr. Lambert.]

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I am always desirous of co-operating with hon. members, particularly when that will expedite the business of the house. I followed citation 318 (1) closely when the hon. member read it. It is interesting to note that it does not provide any requirement for the printing of the report in *Votes and Proceedings*. It does make reference to the information being available to hon. members.

Mr. Lambert: That is nonsense at this stage.

Mr. McIlraith: Information is made available to hon. members in the report of the committee and the evidence. The evidence has been printed in both English and French and has been distributed, and the sixth report containing the amendments made by the standing committee is to be found on page 2387 of minutes of proceedings No. 37 of the standing committee. That has been distributed.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Lambert: Will the minister say when that was distributed?

Mr. McIlraith: If I might just finish my remarks—

Mr. Lambert: When was it distributed?

Mr. McIlraith: I think the hon. gentleman should have learned by now that in this house members other than himself are entitled to speak and that a little courtesy such as is extended to him when he speaks should be extended in return. I said when he asked his question that I would be glad to deal with that point. As I was about to say before I was interrupted, the bill itself, as reprinted by order of the standing committee of which the hon. member was a member, is in the binder of bills. So not only do hon. members have the bill as originally submitted to the House of Commons but they have the reprint of the bill as ordered to be reprinted by the standing committee which dealt with it. In the sixth report of the committee they also have the amendments in isolation. So it is very easy for hon. members to know precisely what clauses have been amended and what the amendments are.

The hon. member asked me when the evidence was delivered. He was kind enough to call me this morning about noon to say it had

not been printed, whereupon I expressed surprise and said I would immediately look into the matter. This I did, and I was assured that it had been printed. I was also assured that at the very moment of that conversation the reprinted bill was being placed in the binders beneath hon. members' desks in the House of Commons. I do not know when they were delivered to hon. members' offices or to their mail boxes but I am assured it was done earlier today both as to the evidence and as to the reprinted bills.

Mr. Lambert: May I ask the minister whether he is satisfied that report No. 37 of the minutes of proceedings and evidence was distributed? He will clearly remember my telling him that No. 37 had been printed but was not available for distribution, though Nos. 34 to 36 were perhaps available to members if they went down to the distribution office and got them themselves. That was at a quarter to one this afternoon. At that time No. 37 was not available for distribution. It may have been printed but it was not available for distribution.

Mr. McIlraith: I checked on this immediately the conversation had taken place. I do not know the precise time; it was somewhere between twelve thirty and one o'clock. I was assured that it was printed, available, and distributed.

Mr. Ricard: I have just received my copy.

Mr. McIlraith: I have no way of knowing, beyond that.

An hon. Member: In English and French?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, in both English and French.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order which has been raised, this is too serious a matter to be glossed over so carelessly by the leader of the house. Yes, we have in our possession, placed in the binders today, Bill No. C-243 reprinted as amended and reported by the committee on national defence. Consequently we need some other document to which to refer in order to check with regard to the amended clauses. The old bill has been removed from our binders. I was looking for mine in order to begin making the comparison. Obviously we need something else in addition. It has been normal to use *Votes and Proceedings* with the amendments printed therein.

When the committee reported on March 22 it stated, as my hon. friend from Edmonton West has pointed out, that a further report setting out the amendments to the bill had been prepared and would be presented. This was presented today, but of course it cannot appear in *Votes and Proceedings* until tomorrow. The leader of the house tells us we have available the final report of the committee on national defence. That is not true. It is not available to me. I have not got it here, unless it is being delivered at this very moment.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: This, I say, is making a mockery of the House of Commons. Here we have the senior page delivering copies of the final report of the minutes of proceedings and evidence—No. 37. I would want to be assured that every single member of the House of Commons has that report in his possession before we proceed with this debate this afternoon. It is all very well to come here with a dozen copies and pass them out to people who may be on their feet speaking or who have said something about this matter. Each of the 265 members of this house is entitled to this report. Even so, I say that the normal procedure is to have the amendments printed in *Votes and Proceedings* which is available at our desks, having been filed each day by the pages. We wish to refer to this background information right now and this is where it should appear. Unless every single member of this house can give you the assurance, Mr. Speaker, that he has report No. 37 in his possession it is not fair to ask this institution to proceed with the bill at this stage.

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, aside altogether from what one might call the legal requirements to which the Minister of Public Works attached a great deal of emphasis, I think it is unfair and unreasonable to expect members of this house to proceed with a bill of this nature when the relevant committee reports and the bill as amended were not in their hands until a few moments ago. I did not receive Nos. 33, 35 and 36 of the committee reports until twelve thirty or one o'clock today. The first time I saw No. 37, which outlines the amendments made in the committee, was two or three minutes ago after it had been distributed in the house. I did not receive an amended copy of Bill No. C-243. The first printing of the bill was on my file when I came into the house.

I have taken a fairly active part in the affairs of the committee and perhaps I could get on reasonably well without referring to these documents. But most hon. members of the house were not members of the committee and I submit they are at a complete disadvantage in not having these documents at their disposal in such a situation as this.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention the fact that on the inside of the first page of Bill No. C-243, which is in our folders, the following words appear:

> The amendments made in the committee on national defence are indicated by underlining and vertical lines.

Therefore the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre can simply look through the bill and find out where the committee made amendments, because there will be either vertical lines or the words will be underlined. I do not know whether he has the original bill with him in order to make comparisons but I am sure that like myself and other members he has a copy in his office. Even though the copy of the original bill may have been removed from his file here, surely another copy is available to him. It is customary to show the wording that was in the previous bill and the new wording and identify the amendments with vertical lines or by underlining. I do not see any great difficulty in sending someone to my office for a copy of the old bill if I want to make comparisons.

• (3:40 p.m.)

However, I am in some measure of agreement with the hon. member for Calgary North when he suggests that the minutes of proceedings and evidence taken during the latter stages of the committee hearings have just now been made available to hon. members and there should be an opportunity for them to review some of the evidence in order to familiarize themselves with it. If the normal course in committee of the whole is followed I suggest that there will be fairly long introductory speeches made by some members on both sides of the house reviewing the general principle of the bill and that by the time we get down to clause by clause discussion of the bill each member will have had an opportunity to review that portion of the evidence that he wishes to review. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in view of the many months we have spent in this session I suggest that we go ahead and finish the balance of the business on the order paper.

[Mr. Harkness.]

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I subscribe to the views of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness). I am not a member of the defence committee. From time to time within the scope of my other duties I have attempted to study the transcripts of the proceedings of that committee. An important issue is involved here. I do not necessarily take the same viewpoint as some of my colleagues on that committee. I may or may not, but I think there is some very important evidence to be considered. I suggest that Your Honour can take judicial notice of the fact that the Prime Minister made a statement in which he said he had an opportunity some days ago to read the evidence of Air Chief Marshal Miller, that it was evidence which impressed him and that it should be considered in depth. That evidence only became available to me a few minutes ago. On an issue of this kind, Mr. Speaker, I think the whole value of the committee system is at stake. We have now obtained over 2,400 pages of evidence given by a number of witnesses, of which more than 250 pages was distributed today. There was a very excellent series of examinations and cross-examinations of these witnesses. We should have an opportunity to read all the evidence.

I do not go along with the hon. member for Medicine Hat who suggested that we can prognosticate that a certain length of time is going to be taken up with preliminary speeches. This is not necessarily the case. I am looking at the first two or three clauses of the bill, and hon. members who were not on the defence committee will be called upon to take certain positions with respect to those clauses, make important decisions and decide how they are going to vote.

At this stage I suggest it is utterly impossible for hon. members to analyse the evidence of very important witnesses contained in the last two or three transcripts, relate their evidence to what was said previously and come to an independent decision. If we are going to make proper use of the committee system I suggest it is incumbent upon the government to ensure that transcripts of proceedings are in the hands of members of the house in sufficient time for members to read them, examine them and make a decision on them. It is utterly impossible at the beginning of the debate today for myself and other members to examine the very important evidence given by the latter witnesses who appeared before the committee and say. "This is the view I am going to take."

I would say that this point is as much a matter of privilege as it is one of order. If our committee system is going to work then inevitably the government will have to do better than this if it is going to ask members to make use of the proceedings of committees. The committees are emanations of this house set up by the house to examine witnesses, something which we are incapable of doing in committee of the whole house. The defence committee has done an excellent job but we want an opportunity, particularly in the light of these recent transcripts, to examine the evidence and come to a decision. Without that opportunity I do not think we can do justice to this bill and to the work that the committee did.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: There are two points raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West. The first one deals with the question of the report—

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member is suggesting that further comments be heard from the government benches. If so I will hear them.

Mr. Lambert: I hesitate to raise one point again, Mr. Speaker, and I do so only because, unfortunately, the hon. member for Medicine Hat inadvertently misled the house when he referred to the reprinted version of Bill C-243 and said it contained a note at the top of the first right hand page that the amendments are indicated by underlining or by vertical lines. That is only as between the revised bill and the original C-243. If he will look at the original Bill C-243 he will see that the underlinings and vertical lines indicating amendments to the act are entirely different and there is absolutely no relationship among the three at all. Therefore what he had to say in this regard was quite misleading, albeit perhaps innocently.

Mr. Speaker: If I may resume the suggestion I was going to make to hon. members on the first point raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West, which deals with the report, the hon. member with support from other hon. members referred to citation 318 (1) of Beauchesne's fourth edition. I must say, with respect, that I tend to agree with the proposition advanced by the government house leader that the only requirement in that citation is that information be available for hon. members. That suggestion did not appear to gain much support from hon. members on the opposition side when it was made, but on reflection I believe this is the purpose of this citation. As hon. members know, the amendments are now before the house in two forms, in the form of the report which was tabled and which is now officially before the house and in the form of the amended bill which has been distributed. Of course I fully recognize that distribution might be a bit late, but the report could not be distributed until it was tabled in the house. This causes difficulty but it is not really a point of order; it is really a question of convenience.

I note that the hon. member for Edmonton West during his presentation appeared to appeal to the government house leader rather than to the Chair, assuming, I would think, that this is something the government should agree to rather than for the Chair to rule that it was a valid point of order.

On the other point, the suggestion is based on the desirability of letting the order proposed for consideration this afternoon stand long enough for hon. members to familiarize themselves with the evidence. I point out to hon. members it is not for the Chair to decide whether one hour, one day, or one week is sufficient time for members to familiarize themselves with the evidence, and because of this I do not think I can interefere to ask the house not to proceed with the order of business called this afternoon by the government.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a second point of order to raise with regard to the copies of the bills which are in front of us. I have in my hand a copy of the bill which was given first reading on November 4 and I also have a copy of the bill which was given to us today, reprinted as amended and reported by the committee on national defence. I ask you, sir, which copy are we to refer to in the course of our committee study?

It says in the explanatory notes in the reprinted bill:

> The amendments made in the committee on national defence are indicated by underlining and vertical lines.

Clause 2 of the bill that was given first reading on November 4 was amended in the committee on national defence. There is no vertical line to indicate the change that was made in that committee and even had there been I submit, sir, that the normal practice is

Division

for the reprinted bill to show the changes from the original act.

In the reprinted bill, new section 15 in clause 2 reads:

> The Canadian Forces are the armed forces of Her Majesty raised by Canada and consist of one service called the Canadian Armed Forces.

• (3:50 p.m.)

There is no indication given of the change made from the bill given first reading on November 4. There is not a single indication given of the change from the present act which is still in force and which, in section 15, reads as follows:

> The Canadian Forces are the naval, army and air forces of Her Majesty raised by Canada and consist of three services, namely, the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force.

My point of order is this: What is the committee of the whole to do? Is it to deal with the bill which was given to us and read for the first time on November 4? Is it to use the reprinted bill which was given to us today? If it is, how is any member of the committee to know from the reprinted bill what changes have been made in the act now in the statutes? By a very careful reading of the act now in the statutes and the reprinted bill now in our hands we can, of course, pick out the changes, but this is not the normal practice at all.

In respect of all previous bills the government has taken the house into its confidence and has always underlined and indicated the changes which were being brought about. Normally on the explanatory note pages the section of the statute being repealed or amended is printed. I submit that this has not been done in this amended bill which is now placed before us for consideration.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, this is a very interesting point. I cannot see much difference between the procedure proposed now and the procedure usually followed when bills and amended bills are being considered by the house. The only suggestion I can offer for the hon. member and for the benefit of all hon. members which perhaps is not a very useful one is that members could have both bills before them and compare one bill with the other. If hon. members can show me a standing order requiring that we should follow for the convenience of hon. members the suggestion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre then of course I would certainly rule in his favour.

[Mr. Churchill.]

What the hon. member is saying now is that it is not very convenient to proceed in the way in which the house is being asked to proceed. He may be quite right. I am not disagreeing with him. I have no right to express an opinion one way or another on this point. On the strict point of order, however, there is nothing in the standing orders of the house to support the contention of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. I am afraid I can only suggest to him as I did in the first instance that both bills be used by hon. members in the course of the discussion.

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence) moved that the house go into committee to consider Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof.

Mr. Churchill: Call the yeas and nays.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour please say yea?

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed please say nay?

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Hellyer) which was agreed to on the following division:

• (4:00 p.m.)

YEAS

Messrs:

Allmand	Émard
Andras	Ethier
Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe)	Favreau
Badanai	Forest
Batten	Gauthier
Béchard	Godin
Benson	Goyer
Berger	Gray
Blouin	Guay
Boulanger	Habel
Brewin	Haidasz
Brown	Hellyer
Cadieux (Terrebonne)	Herridge
Cantin	Honey
Chatwood	Hopkins
Chrétien	Howard
Clermont	Howe (Hamilton South)
Côté (Nicolet-Yamaska)	Isabelle
Cowan	Jamieson
Douglas	Knowles
Dubé	Lachance
	Laing

Lamontagne	Reid
Langlois (Chicoutimi)	Richard
Laniel	Rideout (Mrs.)
Lefebvre	Rinfret
Legault	Rochon
Lessard	Rock
Lind	Saltsman
Macaluso	Schreyer
Macdonald (Rosedale)	Sharp
MacEachen	Simard
McIlraith	Stafford
McNulty	Stanbury
McWilliam	Stewart
Marchand	Tardif
Mather	Teillet
Matheson	Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Matte	Tolmie
Nixon	Tremblay
O'Keefe	Turner
Olson	Wahn
Patterson	Walker
Pepin	Whelan
Peters	Winters—91.
Pickersgill	
Pilon	

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken	MacRae
Baldwin	McCleave
Bell (Saint John-Albert)	McIntosh
Chatterton	McKinley
Churchill	Madill
Clancy	Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Code	Muir (Lisgar)
Dinsdale	Nasserden
Fane	Noble
Forrestall	Nowlan
Grafftey	Ormiston
Grégoire	Pascoe
Gundlock	Rapp
Hales	Régimbal
Harkness	Ricard
Howe (Wellington-Huron)	Sherman
Korchinski	Southam
Lambert	Starr
Loney	Thomas (Middlesex West)
MacEwan	Webb
MacInnis (Cape Breton South)	Winkler—43.
MacLean (Queens)	

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Macquarrie). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. Groos: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Skoreyko). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. McLean). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mrs. Wadds: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Miss LaMarsh). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted in the negative.

Mr. Orange: Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted in the affirmative.

The house went into committee, Mr. Batten in the chair.

The Chairman: Order. House in committee of the whole on Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof. The amendments made by the standing committee on national defence are included in the reprint of the bill, which I understand has been distributed.

On clause 2—*Canadian forces, Canadian armed forces.*

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Churchill: Is this going to be a leadership speech?

Mr. Hellyer: —during the last few months the subject matter of the bill now before us has been extensively examined and debated in this chamber, in the standing committee on national defence and throughout the news media. Every opportunity has been afforded those who are opposed to this concept to make their views known. Unfortunately, in any debate of such magnitude it is difficult to deal with each of the various issues raised as precisely as I am sure we would all like. Nevertheless, this kind of open, free discussion is very beneficial, I think, to the understanding of the reasons for the proposal that is now before us.

I thought it might be helpful, Mr. Chairman, if today I went back and reviewed some of the background information which led the associate minister and myself to the position that we have taken in recommending this bill to the consideration of the House of Commons. If I may, therefore, I should like to go back four years approximately to the time that the then associate minister and I were given responsibility for the Department of National Defence and to relate to the committee the series and chain of events which we think justified the legislation now being requested.

At the time that responsibility was accepted there were three things that we decided had to be undertaken. We had, first of all, to bring the past up to the present, and by that we

meant to acquire for Canada the nuclear warheads required for the weapons systems that had been purchased for our armed forces to enable them to carry out the commitments that had been undertaken on behalf of our country. The second was to review the equipment programs then outstanding. The third was to determine a long range defence policy for Canada.

• (4:30 p.m.)

In so far as the first of these is concerned, hon. members will recall that a bilateral treaty was signed with the United States of America under which it would be possible to stockpile nuclear warheads for those weapons systems which had been supplied to our troops and for which they were being trained. Technical agreements were signed between the forces of our two countries. A certain amount of construction was undertaken, and ultimately all of these weapons systems became fully operational.

The review of the existing equipment program involved a study of the requirements from a military standpoint, budgetary considerations and, third and probably most important of all their possible effect on future defence policy. In some cases programs were cancelled because they did not fit into our plans for the future, because there were weaknesses technically and, in some cases, the effectiveness did not justify the expenditure being made. In other cases we decided to continue the programs that had been undertaken and which were current at the time of the change in government.

All the while that these two matters were being attended to, preparations were in hand for the writing of a long range defence plan for Canada. Study groups were set up which included representatives of the navy, army, air force, the deputy minister's staff and the Defence Research Board. These studies covered a wide range of activities such as the military history of this country, the changes that had taken place in weapons technology over a period of ten years, an appraisal of the likely changes in technology in the coming ten years from that time, a look at the political situation in the world and a guess as to what might develop amongst the nations of the world in the decades to come. Finally, there was an appreciation of the strategic situation as it then existed in the world.

It is difficult to make political forecasts because no one has a crystal ball which is infallible. At the same time one has to make

[Mr. Hellyer.]

assumptions in order to base plans on them. These assumptions were ultimately stated in the white paper as it was published in 1964.

Cardinal to the plan as set out in the white paper was the strategic situation as it existed at that time. On this question there was no difference of opinion whatsoever. The unanimous decision by the chiefs of staff and all the staff members who considered it was that in the world today the least likely kind of was is an all out thermonuclear war. At the other end of the spectrum, the most likely kind of war is a continuation of small wars, riots, insurrections, the overthrow of civil government, namely, the kind of conflict that has been going on almost continuously throughout history and certainly continuously during the 20 years since world war II.

Each side in the cold war, the United States and the U.S.S.R., has sufficient thermonuclear striking power that even after one side had commenced a sneak attack the other would be able to retaliate, from hardened and dispersed bases, with sufficient power to wipe out the agressor's industrialized areas. Therefore this kind of attack would be irrational. There is no conceivable political goal which would justify a conflagration on that scale, a conflagration which would result in casualties ranging from 150 million to 300 million people in the first 24 hours, depending on the circumstances prevailing at the time.

From a rational standpoint, therefore, this kind of conflagration is the least likely during the ten year period. That is not to say it could not happen as a result of madness or miscalculation, but it is not likely to happen and certainly not from a rational standpoint. Steps have been taken to reduce the chance of miscalculation. A hot wire has been established between Washington and Moscow in order to check out at the highest decision making level the intentions of one toward the other in the event an incident happens over which there is some uncertainty as to what the intention of the other party really is.

The only other caveat which I think should be registered in respect of this strategic appraisal is that it is only true as long as the strategic balance remains, as long as the thermonuclear stalemate continues. This implies, of course, that we retain on the western side an effective deterrent which would make it inadvisable for the Soviet union ever to undertake an adventure of this sort.

The other end of the scale, however, is the almost certainty that there may be times

when some political objective might be considered somewhere in the world as of sufficient importance to use force of arms. This is clearly what is going on in the world today. Our problem in Canada was to devise and develop a defence policy sufficiently broad and with sufficient flexibility that our forces could contribute to the deterrence of a major war at one end of the scale and through to these peace keeping activities at the other end of the scale or assist in putting out a small conflagration before it escalated into all-out thermonuclear war.

This is not easy because it requires a wide range of equipment and a wide range of training. At the same time, it is possible and we are achieving it. We are achieving it with considerable success and intend to continue to achieve it in the years ahead. Our troops in Europe are committed at the high end of the scale. They are there as a contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and as a part of the integrated force in peacetime. Militarily, they are very effective. Politically, they are very important. It is an indication on the part of our country that we stand with our allies to deter aggression on the part of any possible enemy.

At the same time there have been demands on our forces to contribute to peace keeping and other activities. There is a real possibility that this will continue in the years ahead. It is difficult to determine in advance precisely what the requirement will be. We have participated in every United Nations operations so far, but there have been no two that have been the same. Each one has been different. The problem then was to devise a policy and to design a forces structure sufficiently flexible to enable us to continue to do what we have been doing, make our contribution to the NATO forces in Europe and on the high seas and increase the capability of our forces to participate in any action anywhere in the world which might be in the interests of Canada in so far as putting out, containing or controlling incidents which under other circumstances might escalate into something more serious.

• (4:40 p.m.)

This was the basis, then, of the policy as laid out in the white paper. There were two significant changes, I think, that really should be mentioned. They are associated with the two words, flexibility and mobility. First of all we reversed the policy of 1959, that the Canadian army in so far as new equipment was concerned would only be equipped to training scale for the three quarters of the army in Canada and to full equipment for the brigade group overseas. I know that my hon. friend from Calgary North has questioned this, but I have the policy before me. It was established in 1959. The formal decision was taken and it applied to over-all equipment purchases. Therefore the policy then in effect, which meant that only one quarter of the Canadian army would be equipped and available to fight overseas, was reversed.

The second most significant change was the decision to increase strategic mobility, in other words, to provide more aeroplanes and ships to transport our troops more quickly to meet any commitment either in Europe or any other part of the world. These were the two fundamentals from the policy side.

If I may, I should like to discuss now the organization side, the means by which this increased capability could be achieved. At the time I was given the responsibility as Minister of National Defence two impressions were made on my mind during the early months. One of them was that the six methods of direct reporting to the minister were too many and that there was insufficient co-ordination of plans. The three chiefs of staff, the chairman of the chiefs of staff, the chairman of the Defence Research Board and the deputy minister all had direct access. Programs could be brought to the minister directly by any of the chiefs of staff, and they often were. In a number of cases there was not the kind of co-ordination that is necessary in my opinion to get the most cohesive military force and the best balance between the forces of our country.

There was no over-all strategic plan applied to the three services. Each service was planning independently of the other services. There was no over-all co-ordination of the equipment programs in the sense that priorities were established on a hard basis to fulfil national objectives. Often programs were put forward by a single service directly to the minister, and often these were approved. These required such a proportion of the total funds available that subsequent programs needed to fit a higher policy could not be brought into the over-all financial picture.

It seemed necessary, therefore, that two changes had to be accomplished. One was an over-all strategic unity in planning, a unity of purpose with the services working together for clearly understood goals. Second, once having decided what these plans were and

what the goals should be, there was then to be a military appreciation of the various priorities for equipment programs.

At that time, if hon. members will recall, the department operated on the committee system. The senior of these committees, apart from the defence council, was the chiefs of staff committee. It could co-ordinate and it brought about much co-ordination. At the same time it was not necessary for the service chiefs to have all their programs approved by the chiefs of staff from the standpoint of priorities vis-à-vis other programs. Also there was, I think, a tendency for the chiefs of staff to support each other's programs as a sort of *quid pro quo* for support, particularly when there was no real pinch on funds. We had the situation, therefore, where often the programs approved were not in my opinion the ones which were most important for Canada to give us the best balance of military capabilities to carry out the assigned tasks of our armed forces.

Below the chiefs of staff committee there were 200 or 300 other committees with members from the three services and from the civil side and also from the Defence Resarch Board. They considered a wide variety of subject matters but they had no executive responsibilities. Often it took them weeks or months to reach a decision. Often their decisions were delayed or influenced by single service needs. Once a decision was reached there was no guarantee that it would be put into effect by the three services because each service had the power of veto. The organization, therefore, seemed to leave something to be desired.

The Glassco commission came to the same conclusion. It reported that the amount of money being spent on overhead was too great, that the number of personnel in the headquarters establishments vis-à-vis the fighting machine was too great, that there was a great deal of duplication and triplication among the services and that a better organization was possible.

In considering the situation as we found it, as well as the Glassco commission report, we looked at the alternatives available to us. The one recommended by the Glassco commission was what we call the fourth force theory. It was in effect that those elements which are common to two or more of the services would be transferred to the authority of the chairman of the chiefs of staff. This was an appealing suggestion because it had been talked about and tried, I think, in other areas by other military forces. It has some drawbacks, however, which we thought were conclusive.

First, if you gave the chairman of the chiefs of staff executive authority to impose decisions in respect of the support services for the three fighting services you would reduce the chiefs of the three fighting services to mere rubberstamps. If, on the other hand, you did not give this executive authority you would have a continuation of the committee system with all its frustrations, delays and inefficiencies, with perhaps the addition of one extra person to each committee and the consequent increase in cost and inefficiency which would undoubtedly result from that.

Our conclusion, was that based on the experience in the United States, the initial efforts at integration which had taken place here in so far as the doctors and the padres were concerned, and from all information that we could gather from other military forces, the fourth force theory was not the right choice. It was inefficient, cumbersome and probably very expensive.

To meet the cardinal criticism that there was and has been a great deal of duplication and triplication we had to look for another solution. The solution we recommended to the House of Commons and the Canadian people at that time is one which was fundamental. It was the creation of a single military force as an alternative to three or four separate military forces.

We proposed that this would be accomplished in three steps: First, the integration of our headquarters staff in Ottawa on a functional basis; second, a re-evaluation of our field command structure and, third, the formation of a single force. Legislation was introduced in the House of Commons authorizing the first two of these steps. It authorized the integration of the headquarters organization and the reconfiguration of the field command structure.

• (4:50 p.m.)

We began on August 1, 1964 to reorganize the headquarters when the three chiefs of staff and the chairman, chiefs of staff committee, were replaced by a single chief of defence staff. The balance of the headquarters was organized on strictly functional lines, to wit, a vice-chief of defence staff, as is now the case, with executive authority under the chief of the defence staff for all the operations, naval, air and land, for planning of operations, for the operational requirements of all these

forces and for the intelligence necessary as a basis for these plans or operations; a chief of personnel, responsible for the men and women of the navy, the army and the air force, responsible for individual training in all these forces including trade training and pilot training to wing standard; a chief of technical services responsible for the procurement of the hardware required by our armed forces, for the depots in which equipment is stockpiled, for the distribution of that equipment to the users, and for its maintenance in an acceptable state of repair and, finally, a comptroller general responsible for the accounting of the navy, the army and the air force and for the allocation of manpower to all of the requirements.

In the process of designing the headquarters organization the staff soon found they could not complete the design until they knew what the field formations would look like and what the command structure would be. The second stage was therefore accelerated. I should like to underline this. The second stage was accelerated because in practice we found there was such a close relationship between the first and the second stages that we had to know what the second would look like before we could complete the first. Therefore, several months before the date originally scheduled stage two was designed by the military staffs, presented to the defence council for concurrence, approved, and subsequently implemented many months earlier than we had thought at the beginning of the reorganization.

A year ago April 1 the bases were integrated as part of the over-all command structure reorganization. One of the primary purposes of the integration-unification cycle—as I have indicated earlier, these purposes cannot really be separated when we go as far as we are going and intend to go—was an increase in the effectiveness of money being spent. I should like to give five or six examples in specific areas which can be isolated to show that savings are and have been possible.

Previously we had five intelligence organizations in this country. We were interested in the experience in the United States where they had brought together their sources of strategic intelligence but left tactical intelligence to the services. Their reorganization did not result in any economy of manpower. Our reorganization has meant the formation of one intelligence agency to replace five. It has involved a reduction in personnel of 30 per cent and the result has been better service than we have ever had from our intelligence organization in recent years This is not just my opinion; it is the opinion of the director general of intelligence as well.

Second, let us consider the field of construction engineering. These are the men who build the runways for our air force the drydocks for our ships, the hangars for our airplanes, the buildings which house the men and women of the armed forces. There are, of course, specialities within this field but there is also a great deal of common knowledge which cuts right across previous service lines. Here a new organization was set up and it was possible to reduce the number of personnel required at headquarters by 44 per cent and the number of personnel involved in the national organization by 30 per cent. The latest report I have received is that the service being provided is excellent. In a number of individual cases I have been told that the service exceeds that provided previously. In theory this can be expected in some areas because there is a greater pool of engineering knowledge available to be applied to specific tasks which arise.

My third example concerns recruiting. When I first came to the House of Commons almost 18 years ago I can remember discussion about the possibility of integrating the recruiting system in Canada. The idea was talked about repeatedly down through the years but never implemented. Last year it was implemented with a reduction in personnel of 33 per cent. For the first time recruiting centres were not just co-located, as some had been previously, but integrated and given authority to enroll men and officers in the navy, the army and the air force. Notwithstanding the problems which inevitably arise in the first year, and a reduction of 33 per cent in personnel, we were able to recruit more people in 1966 than in the previous year.

Mr. Churchill: How many did you lose?

Mr. Hellyer: The next example I should like to give is that of the information services. This is one which was singled out by the Glassco commission, if I recall correctly. This was one of the most dramatic cases and the reduction in personnel amounted to 60 per cent with a consequential saving to the Canadian taxpayers of more than a million dollars in this limited area alone.

North NORAD region and Air Defence Command are being amalgamated and here again the expected reduction in personnel—it

has not yet been fully achieved but it is forecast for achievement some time next year—is 30 per cent. The Canadian defence liaison staff in Washington was fully integrated with a reduction of 34 per cent in personnel. The Canadian defence liaison staff in London was integrated with a reduction of 44 per cent in personnel.

My next example relates to our communications system.

The Chairman: I must advise the minister that the time allotted to him has expired.

Some hon. Members: Go on.

Mr. Churchill: Before giving consent I should like to ask the minister a question. Does he intend to deal with the question of unification and the establishment of a single service? Everything he has said so far has dealt with integration; it has nothing whatever to do with unification. This is another instance of misleading the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hellyer: I appreciate the indulgence of the committee and if the hon. gentleman does give me permission to continue I will undertake to deal with that matter as soon as I have finished my introductory remarks.

The Chairman: Does the committee agree to allow the minister extra time in which to complete his statement?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lambert: I assume we will be granted suitable time in which to reply.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Hellyer: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and I also thank members of the committee. It had long been suggested that a single long-line communications system for our armed forces would be more efficient and would save some money. That was undertaken in the 1950's and it fell flat on its face. It failed, and the reason it failed was that the three services could not agree even after agreeing that they should agree. Each service thought that its system was best. They were not willing to make the necessary compromises and to seek out the best system or a better one, and they were not willing to fund in a manner which would make the development of a new system possible. The experiment, therefore, did not succeed.

We have developed a new long-line communications system for the Canadian Armed Forces which will result in savings of 18 per cent. This new system is already working very satisfactorily. But more important than either the savings which have taken and are taking place, or the modest improvement in efficiency which I think we can claim, is the fact that it is enabling us to have studies made by the Canadian National-Canadian Pacific telecommunications system which will allow us to take a quantum jump in communications once the report has been made and has been acted upon. Our experts are convinced that very great inprovements are possible in this area. As a result of the single system which has been put into effect those improvements are now almost certain and require only the funding necessary for the new capital equipment once the plan has been presented and approved.

With respect to our cataloguing system I do not think it is any secret to members of the committee that the services have had separate cataloguing systems in the past. Air Marshal Annis, who appeared before the committee, used to say to me, "You know, we stored washers and shims under five different categories, five part numbers for the same thing." There were many cases where one service declared equipment surplus at the same time that another service was acquiring the same kind of equipment through the Department of Defence Production for use by that service. One of the first things to be undertaken was a new combined cataloguing system. The peak load which resulted from this combination was considerably greater than the previous load on the people involved, but the ultimate saving in personnel once the new system is complete will be 26 per cent.

These are just examples, Mr. Chairman, to show that where duplication and triplication can be eliminated savings are made, to show that the basic conclusion of the Glassco commission was a valid one, and to show also that acting upon that conclusion will be of considerable benefit to the Canadian people and to the armed forces who will get greater value for the money being spent.

One of the stated intentions of the savings that could be made was to use those savings for new equipment for the armed forces. No one regrets more than I do that last year we were not able to increase the amount of money being spent. This was partly due to technical considerations. We did not spend all of the money that was voted for equipment.

There was a certain amount of program slippage. I think this is inevitable, but at the same time we want to use the money which is made available to us by parliament for the acquisition of equipment so that the armed forces can carry out their tasks in the manner in which we would like to see them carried out, and so that they will have the equipment they need to do the job. I hope there will be a very substantial improvement in the coming fiscal year, 1967-68, but I must say, Mr. Chairman, that no improvement would have been possible with anything like the present defence expenditure without the savings that have been made by the elimination of duplication and triplication, particularly in headquarters and in those areas that I have set out this afternoon.

Mr. Churchill: And of 23,000 personnel.

Mr. Hellyer: I think my hon. friend will appreciate that a reduction in personnel had to be made in order to make a diversion of funds for the acquisition of equipment, and that, of course, was one of the objects of the exercise.

Mr. Churchill: Unmanned ships and understrength battalions.

Mr. Hellyer: This money is being spent for a wide variety of equipment which will give our forces balance and make them all more effective in the jobs they have been assigned. This program is well known and I will just skip over it briefly now by mentioning once again some of the more significant items.

The new support ships being acquired for the navy are really based on the model of The *Provider* which was undertaken by my hon. friend, the hon. member for Calgary North, when he was minister. Certain technical improvements are possible as a result of that experience but I think the significant thing is the increase in effectiveness of our naval force as the result of the acquisition of these three ships, and I include the one that was started then.

I have used this example a number of times and I would like to repeat it. In a study the navy did they showed that without any support ships it was only possible to maintain three destroyer escorts on station a thousand miles off Halifax on a continuous basis. With one support ship it was possible to maintain ten ships on station continuously and with two support ships it was possible to maintain the whole fleet on station continuously, or certainly for an elongated period in the event of crisis. This is a very effective use of funds. It is an excellent example of cost effectiveness as applied to military procurement.

Four new destroyer escorts are planned and the lead items have already been contracted for. This will probably be the most effective anti-submarine system anywhere in the world, certainly that this country has ever developed, using all of the expertise and all of the knowledge which is available to us on the basis of our past experience.

One of the most significant improvements of these weapons systems over previous destroyer escorts is the introduction of the use of helicopters with a range and speed which make it possible for them to go out and survey the ocean territory by the use of listening devices which are dropped into the water, thus increasing many times over the amount of ocean area which can be surveyed for submarines.

The weapons system of a ship with an improved sonar, a variable depth sonar, which as hon. gentlemen know is a Canadian development, and the use of one or two helicopters flown from the deck, which add very greatly to the over-all effectiveness of the weapons system, has a very great capability both in surveying the ocean territory and, if necessary, in destroying submarines once they have been isolated.

Earlier this afternoon before this committee began its discussions a question was raised about the tactical airplanes that are being acquired. These tactical airplanes are for close support for our ground forces but they will do in that role all of the tasks which one would expect of them, in other words, surveillance, interdiction and close ground support. It is gratifying that the Dutch government and Dutch air force have chosen the same airplane for the Royal Dutch Air Force. It is gratifying also that these airplanes will be built in Canada based on the Canadian configuration which is a very marked improvement over the earlier configuration of this airplane.

• (5:10 p.m.)

We have placed orders for self-propelled howitzers. This, I think, is the last remaining significant equipment necessary to bring our brigade group in Europe up to full operational potential. Sufficient of these howitzers are being acquired to equip the second heavy brigade which will be stationed at Camp Gagetown and which is being used as a rotational back-up for the one in Europe. The

M-113 armed personnel carrier is being acquired in quantity both for the brigade group overseas and in Canada. This is one of the most significant improvements in our over-all range of equipment and one which has provided to our infantry the armoured protection they have badly needed for so long.

The process of integration and unification is well on its way in bringing together first at headquarters on a functional basis members of the navy, army and air force to administer the total force in unity. In a sense then our headquarters is unified. It is unified in the sense of being a single management of the navy, army and air force. This is where the problem of semantics between these words crops in. It is unified but with members of three separate legal entities, the navy, army and air force.

Our command structure is integrated or unified. Again one could use either word. These commands include, in the units assigned to them, elements of more than one service. In their directional staffs are included members of more than one service all working together toward a common goal. Maritime command is perhaps the best example. Maritime command has assigned to it ships of the Royal Canadian Navy, airplanes of the Royal Canadian Navy, helicopters and of course the long range airplanes of the Royal Canadian Air Force, all under a single integrated, unified command and all with the same missions—anti-submarine, search and rescue, as well as a secondary transport requirement. It is interesting to note that each one of these missions involves more than one of the traditional elements. Anti-submarine operations are sea operations; helicopters are flown from ships. Then there are submarines, land-based airplanes and airplanes flown from the carriers all in the same role. Search and rescue is sea and air. Transport is sea and air. In almost every instance there is a combination of elements. The old clear division between land, sea and air no longer applies.

This kind of organization, which in my opinion is very effective and will increase in effectiveness throughout the next four year period at a steady pace, leads inevitably to a single service. Air Chief Marshal Miller in his testimony before the committee underlined this. He rejected the idea of separate heads of service. As soon as one rejects the concept of separate heads of service one is talking about a single service. Regardless of what you call it you are talking about unified management.

[Mr. Hellyer.]

The plan for a single unified management was developed and approved by many of the officers who gave testimony before the committee.

Mr. Churchill: Would the minister permit a question at this point?

Mr. Hellyer: Would the hon. member mind waiting until I have concluded these remarks?

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I should like to raise a point of order. If the minister is going to give us his impression of what a witness said in the defence committee, I do not think the house should accept that. Let us have the exact page reference for the statement made by the witness. I suggest that the minister is not doing this now with regard to Air Chief Marshal Miller when he creates the impression that Air Chief Marshal Miller has said something or other. We should have the exact page reference now that we have the information before us in the evidence of the committee. That is my point of order.

Mr. Harkness: The minister is completely misrepresenting the evidence given by Air Chief Marshal Miller.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, the evidence given by Air Chief Marshal Miller is in the record. I do not think I am doing any injustice to it in my statement. The organization at headquarters and commands is effectively unified. In other words, all commanders report through the same chain of command to the same head of service. I think, therefore, that logic would lead one to the inevitable conclusion that the end objective is exactly as stated in the white paper at the time the cycle was begun, that is, that integration of the headquarters was the first step toward a single unified defence force for Canada.

The advantages which would result from the passage of this bill have been stated. Perhaps, however, I should go over them again today. The first is identification. All these people working together in the headquarters and in the unified commands will be identified with the force as a whole. There are some very serious disadvantages in doing it the other way. If people are in unified staff organizations as representatives of different services, the service representation becomes the significant factor in the choice of personnel. It becomes a matter of the ratio of personnel between one service and another, the balance of people by colour. From my

own experience I believe the continuation of this system would be detrimental to the force and to the people in it.

I should like to commend to members of the committee the evidence given by the Judge Advocate General who has operated an integrated branch longer than anyone else in this country. In his evidence he pointed out the difficulties which arise in operating an integrated branch with representatives of three separate services.

Mr. Churchill: That is the legal branch only.

Mr. Hellyer: That is the legal branch. May I say that from my own experience the same problem arises in every other integrated branch. Even in respect of recent senior promotions the problem of service representation was one which had to be taken into consideration. Certainly there are some jobs which must be filled by experts from a particular specialty. There are many more which should be filled by the best qualified staff officers available, and it should not be of significance from which branch they come. Until we have a single service in identity and identification we will always have tugging and pulling for additional representation from one service in competition with other services.

• (5:20 p.m.)

The other side of this coin relates, of course, to career opportunity. The more staff jobs that are opened up to qualified people from all specialties the more opportunity there will be for employment for gifted people who want to progress, who are well motivated and have the necessary qualifications. Therefore there will be broader employment opportunities and consequently greater chances for the kind of person who should be advanced and should have greater responsibility in an integrated force of this kind.

Next let me refer to adaptibility of change, and this is related to the other two. When roles and missions change, and this will be of interest to my hon. friends in the New Democratic Party, it will be much easier to meet government requirements with a single force. Let me stop at this point and assure hon. members that there is no intention to change roles and missions at this moment beyond what has been publicly stated. This can be clearly set out, but I am stating to my hon. friends in the N.D.P.—heaven forbid that they should ever form a government —that it would be much easier to change these roles and missions within a single service than it would be with three separate services. I have put some examples on the record earlier as to why this would be the case and I do not think it necessary to repeat them this afternoon. However, it certainly would be easier to change these roles if the question regarding rank structure on a single service basis was not allowed to play too important a part in the political considerations within a department when decisions are being made, and I use that word in its narrow sense.

My comments now relate to the demands of modern warfare and these are related to changes in roles and missions. It is very difficult to foresee what future requirements will be. At the moment there is no intention for Canada to develop a space force although as hon. gentlemen may or may not know, we have some people who have been acquainting themselves for some period of time with the problems involved in space travel. If any future government decided it was in Canada's interest to develop a space capability, a single service would lend itself more readily to the formation of units and organizations to carry out that particular mission than would otherwise be possible. I can assure hon. members that with three separate services there would be an interservice battle as to whose mission this was going to be. With a single service this would not make any difference because the best qualified people would be eligible to change list and participate in the development of a new role of that kind. Those are some of the considerations.

Perhaps I could briefly deal now with some of the myths that have been raised. One relates to the question of the uniform, and I believe this has been effectively answered. I think this is one of the less important areas for consideration if one looks at it in perspective over a long period of time. Of course this is one area in which there is a great deal of emotion involved. That is inevitable. At the same time it should be clearly understood that what one might refer to as an "instant uniform" is impossible. We have made preparations for user trials this year of a limited quantity of uniforms. These uniforms will be worn by a number of members of the armed forces to ascertain how they stand the wear and tear of military life and whether they are generally acceptable. If subsequently they are considered acceptable or acceptable with some modifications that will be the time to make a decision to provide them to the services. Once that has been done the whole

program will require a cycle of perhaps four or five years.

The suggestion has often been made that we have some secret arrangement to change our roles and missions in order to provide for peace keeping only. I think this myth has also been satisfactorily answered. The white paper stated that the best way to perform peace keeping roles was to extract from fully equipped and trained operational forces those elements required to meet the existing circumstances. That was the policy expressed in the white paper and it is the policy today. It has been re-examined by our staffs at least twice since the white paper was written and it has been found to be still valid. Forces designed for peace keeping only have a very narrow capability. Forces designed, equipped and trained for what one might call conventional fighting have a very wide range of capabilities from conventional war participation right down to peace keeping activities.

The suggestion that Canada cannot meet its commitments is not true. Again evidence has been provided the committee which indicates specifically that we can meet our commitments to NATO, NORAD and the United Nations and that we have been keeping our commitments and are now keeping our commitments. Whatever our commitments are in the future we will be able to continue to meet them on behalf of this country. Certainly, so far as most of our commitments are concerned, they are being carried out as effectively and in most cases more effectively than has been the case previously.

Let me now deal with the hybrid myth. The suggestion is made that the men of the new single service will be expected to do all jobs and will have to be Jacks-of-all trades. That is absolute nonsense. The men in the combat arms will still specialize in exacly the same way they have in the past. In the support services, I submit there will be wider areas of employment available to the men and women because the work they will perform will not be limited to a single environment. They will perform this work in various environments and therefore this will increase the avenues of opportunity. This will increase the opportunities for our servicemen to serve their country in a wider sphere.

The suggestion has been made that we will have to resort to compulsory service to maintain this kind of force. I think this is absolute nonsense. Many things attract people to service in the armed forces including the desire to serve their country, the desire to learn a trade, the desire to travel overseas, and to make friendships which last throughout their whole lives. There is a wide variety of motivation. We are gratified by the number of people who want to join the armed forces and we are sure that once this bill is passed and the public controversy surrounding it dies down there will be an increase in the number of young people waiting to join the armed forces. The latest statistics show that recruiting this year is appreciably higher than for last year and the year before during the same period.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I can only repeat some of the admonitions expressed to the committee by members of the serving staff. Earlier I indicated to the committee that we accelerated stage two because we found we could not complete stage one until we knew what the command structure was going to be like. We are now in precisely the same situation in so far as the future is concerned. We must know what the personnel structure will be and we have to know whether the men and women of the armed forces will be managed in three personnel streams or one. This is fundamental to future planning. There are many questions which cannot be answered or resolved by any amount of staff work until the answer to that fundamental question is known. The request of the serving staffs, the people who are charged with the responsibility of getting on with the plans of reorganization, is that parliament now indicate its intention.

• (5:30 p.m.)

The passage of this bill does not mean instant unification. The passage of this bill is a statement of the intention that the ultimate goal is a single service and all the men and women in the forces will be managed in a single personnel stream. This must be known in order that the kind of detailed staff planning required can proceed on an orderly basis. This was first stated in the white paper and reiterated before the committee. It is part of the total cycle. It is not being done in haste, not overnight, but over eight or nine years in total. The first two stages in the first three years were authorized by a previous act of parliament. It is true that much of the continuation of the integration process could be completed without this bill. It is true that many more benefits could still be obtained from the integration process minus legislation to create a single service. It is equally true, and I want to make this point as forcefully as I can, that there are some problems which

cannot be solved, there are some questions which cannot be answered, until we know the intention of parliament in respect of this bill and whether or not the ultimate goal is a single service.

We have here an over-all cycle of eight years, each stage planned by the military after authority had been given to do the planning. Headquarters were designed by the military following the passage of Bill C-90. The command structure was designed by the military and approved in accordance with our constitutional practices by the minister and his staff in conjunction with the headquarters that were required in order to complete the whole and give meaning to the whole.

Once again there is the desire now on the part of the people involved to know the intent of the parliament of Canada so that they can plan toward the ultimate goal, know what it is and get on with the job. As was stated before the committee, some preliminary planning can be done but much cannot be done until this bill is passed and the will of parliament is known. I would therefore request and urge members of this committee to give serious consideration to all the points of view that have been put forward and to all the steps that have been taken, and then consider the steps that remain to be taken.

I hope that hon. members will then come to the conclusion that authority should be given now to the military to plan for the balance of the cycle, because that is what this bill is for, that is what this bill will provide, namely, the clear indication of the final goal and the authority to prepare the Queen's Regulations and Orders and all the other things that are necessary in order to take full advantage of the miracle, as Lieutenant General Moncel described it, and the tremendous progress that has been made, to bring it to full fruition and get on with the job in the most orderly and efficient manner.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be wrong for me to begin my remarks without expressing on behalf of the members of this house a warm welcome to you after your illness.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lambert: We expect that you will be with us until the end of this parliament, at least—I will not go any further—but in any case I assure you that we are happy to welcome you back today.

[*English*]

The minister has made the best possible case to this house to buy a pig in a poke. He has asked us to give the Department of National Defence, himself, the associate minister and their officers carte blanche to organize something. They are not too sure how it is going to go over a period of years. The minister is forgetting that in coming to this house to seek permission to make this most fundamental change he must prove his case. It is not up to the opposition and those who do not like unification to prove their case. I wish the minister had spent 50 minutes speaking on unification and 10 minutes on integration rather than the reverse. The onus is not on those who do not believe in the values of unification as demonstrated, and poorly demonstrated, I may say, by the minister and those who testified before the committee with regard to unification or the single service concept, to prove their case.

I do not for one moment dispute that many of the witnesses who appeared before the committee were able to indicate the values of an integration of command and an integration of functions. That is all we have had from the minister this afternoon, namely, a repetition, a rehash of a number of things that he said in 1964 when he was advocating Bill C-90, in December when he was talking on the resolution stage of Bill C-243, and again on second reading. This was the cardinal theme and it was so apparent in the testimony of so many of the serving officers. Everything dealt with integration. It was pointed out to us that these were the advantages of integration. But when they came to the question of unification the situation was different. They said, "we believe that," "we feel that," "we think that," and anything that was demonstrable, such as declining enrolment and an obvious and regrettable decline in morale, was brushed aside. A sort of airy-fairy optimism was breathed and in so far as these questions were concerned it was said, "Well, this might be changed."

Those are preliminary remarks, Mr. Chairman. Today in my objection to the Chair to proceeding with this bill I wanted to make sure of establishing a principle. It was not that I was not ready to debate this question, nor that my colleagues were not ready to do so. It was a question of establishing the principle that the government in making its case must come before this house with the complete case. That was not done. We have seen this nonsense of a technical compliance by having

the pages run around as we started to discuss the bill and distribute No. 37 of the minutes of proceedings of the committee containing, not in one group, the amendments that were being proposed by the government to the bill they had before the house amending the National Defence Act. So we now have a bill which amends a bill which amends a bill. What a way to run an operation. This is what I complain about now; this is what I complained about the other day in respect of the hon. member for Lapointe.

[*Translation*]

But, had I spoken in French, I suppose that I would have been granted what I am asking today and that the debate would have been postponed until tomorrow. I find this an unacceptable principle. In fact, it was unacceptable the other day. And hon. members opposite supported the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) when he asked for parts of the minutes of proceedings and evidence of committees. But today, no, that is not necessary. Why? Is there any difference, whether it is the hon. member for Lapointe or a member on this side of the house who asks for all the minutes of proceedings and evidence before we come to a decision? None at all. Other items are on the order paper. The Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) is most eager to have his bills examined. But no, it is rank obstinacy to want to take this bill now because, whether it is examined tomorrow or the day after, it may not be implemented fully before nine years, according to the minister. Why be so eager then and so impatient to proceed today with the debate on this bill?

I therefore point out now that this is a question of principle. I wish to stress that point this afternoon as I will tomorrow and in the future. I hope that when they develop the committee system, hon. members will observe established principles.

• (5:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I also want to take exception to the attributing to some of my colleagues and myself of rather ulterior motives in our opposition to this bill, and attributed by a man who should know better and who should keep his mouth shut. I refer to the chief of the defence staff. There is as much right in the chief of the defence staff to say what he has about the hon. member for Calgary North, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre and perhaps myself as there is in me to say of him that he is a great advocate of unification because it helps his career. You would say, Mr. Chairman, that that statement might be unfair. It is just as unfair for the chief of the defence staff to say what he has. The sooner he keeps his mouth shut on matters of this kind, the better it will be, and I will say that to him directly if I get the opportunity.

I was rather amused by a headline which appeared in one of the morning papers to the effect that there might be more heat than light during this debate. There was a long critique about how the committee proceeded. Some people who do not attend committee meetings very frequently have a lot to say about what goes on at such meetings. They really are unaware of some of the difficulties of the mechanics of the matter. At such committees hon. members from all parties in the house have a right to ask questions and they do, and there must inevitably be some repetition. Then there is repetition, of course, by various witnesses.

However, some of these people to whom I refer have perhaps not experienced a trial which tries to establish the truth where from a great deal of evidence you try to come to a consensus, to a point where you can form a judgment. Once these people to whom I refer have made up their minds, anything to the contrary becomes in their view rather more heat than light. After all, those who hold a contrary view are not enlightened in their mind.

As I say, hon. members on all sides participated in the proceedings of the committee. Certainly government members participated and did so because, as I said before, they are putting their case for a change before parliament and the country. They must put forward their case. Let them analyse the evidence, Mr. Chairman. Let them discuss the evidence given by four branch heads out of five who say no to unification today. Some of them directly and outrightly oppose it; others said, "Do not do it now." Other senior officers whose capabilities, abilities and military knowledge far surpass ours, including those of the minister, tell us, Mr. Chairman, that we are going down the wrong route.

There is a good reason why this whole question got off on the wrong foot. It got off on the wrong foot last June when we were starting to discuss the question of integration and the progress that had been made, and

unification. Some of us on the committee also wanted to make some comments and ask some questions on the basis of the evidence that was then before the committee. But no, Mr. Chairman, back to the house came the estimates without comment. We then had that performance of last fall when, arising out of the mid-summer crisis with all the firings and resignations, there was a steadfast refusal to discuss the matter, to send it back to the committee so as to find out why it had all happened.

I have been a member of this committee since 1963 and, having sat on defence committees or defence estimates committees previously, I thought that we had a very fine committee in 1963-64. The report which was then presented was of assistance to the government. A non-partisan co-operation among members of the committee was established. People got to know about military affairs, and this state of affairs continued until last year.

The ill-considered action of June, 1966 caused this committee to adopt a partisan division. The same thing has happened on this question of unification. Having insisted upon a vote on second reading in this house when the principle was accepted, the government members might as well have gone off to the Caribbean for all they cared because they were not going to change their minds. They are committed by their vote in this house. And, may I say, so are the members of the opposition.

That is the nonsense of the situation, Mr. Chairman. The man responsible for it is the minister who insisted that this bill be accepted in principle before any witnesses were heard. It would have been so much easier and so much better for the future of the defence committee if the bill had been discussed prior to its acceptance on second reading.

May I say to the committee that the government members went through some education in military matters during the committee hearings. At times they were left a little short in numbers as the platoon went back and forth. Some members who presumably were asked to vote on the clauses of this bill had sat on the committee for less than two weeks and had not heard a fifth of the evidence. They did not have available to them the transcripts of the evidence but they voted right down the line.

Was this an intelligent vote? I cannot accept it as such, not on the basis of the evidence that was put before the committee by bona fide witnesses, men who were reluctant to come before the committee but wished to assist the house in arriving at what they felt was the right decision for our armed services. Those men have a great deal of heart and feeling for our armed services; yet they have seen the question handled in this perfunctory and preordained fashion. I think that this action that was shown was a great disservice done to our armed forces.

• (5:50 p.m.)

It was obvious this afternoon that there has been a great deal of confusion between the terms integration and unification. Sometimes they have been deliberately confused while at other times the confusion has arisen as a result of sheer ignorance. I must say I was surprised when I read the minister's comments about the press and the way they handled the unification debate and the testimony before the committee. I am not sure that the government would necessarily appreciate what he had to say about the press. Perhaps some of his colleagues will have other comments to make.

In any event, I read an article in this morning's *Globe and Mail* in which it was stated that the minister told the Young Liberals that the controversy over unification became inevitable once power groups, retired officers and service organizations, took public positions on the issue. That is the first item with which I want to deal. Is the minister the only one who is entitled to take issue on this question of unification? Why should not retired officers, who know far more about it than he does, as well as service organizations and the public, take part in the discussion of this issue? I suppose members opposite who take a view different from that of the minister will become power groups.

The article reads in part:

> He said some of these views were the result of genuine concern over the problems, while others were fostered by special interests.

Let him spell out these special interests or does he too share the opinion of the chief of staff that those of us who do not share his view in this regard have ulterior motives? Our concern about the armed services is just as sound, just as bona fide as that of the minister. He has no monopoly on this concern. These ulterior motives that are inferred at will contribute nothing to the advancement of the debate in this house.

The minister had something to say about editorial writers, and particularly an editorial that appeared in last Saturday's *Globe and*

Mail to the effect that a clause in the unification bill to delay implementation might help win parliamentary approval. This has been recommended by a lot of men including some now in the service. The chief of the general staff did say that a delay would hurt morale and so on but did not say precisely how this would come about. In any event, here is the comment about the editorial writer:

He said the editorial writer obviously had not read the full transcript of evidence before the Commons defence committee—

This would be true because it was not available.

—and listed several books that the writer had also apparently not read.

If they were the books the minister referred to in his appearance before the committee when there was some judicious picking out of certain passages, then perhaps it was just as well the man had not read them. If the minister had continued quoting from the books he would have found his face very red because the case was not supportable.

Mr. Hellyer: The way you chose your witnesses.

Mr. Lambert: The minister made a remark about choosing witnesses. If the minister's representatives on the committee had been prepared to call witnesses, we of the opposition were prepared to take all of those witnesses they wished to put forward.

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): As many as they wanted?

Mr. Lambert: As many and as often.

Mr. Laniel: So the bill would not come back to the house.

Mr. Lambert: Oh, no, nothing of the sort, because the committee had been told it would be able to hear all the witnesses that it desired to hear. However, there was a desire on the part of government members to close off everything. The hon. member started out on the committee but then went off on some other course and was not there. Perhaps he has not read all the transcript, so the remarks of the hon. member for Châteauguay—

Mr. Laniel: For Beauharnois.

Mr. Lambert: Oh, for Beauharnois; je m'excuse—indicate he had better read the transcript of the remarks of some of his colleagues.

In any event, let us go on to see what the minister said about the editorial writer. He might say the same thing about the writers in the *Globe and Mail*. He said that the editorial writer obviously had not read the full transcript of the evidence before the defence committee and then listed several books which the writer had apparently not read. Then the article continues:

"I'm not even sure he's read my second reading speech," Mr. Hellyer said.

Well, I am not sure that reading the second reading speech would help anybody. However, I question whether the minister is on strong ground when he says this:

He added that it was a mistake for the public to assume that editorials are based on a wide fund of knowledge and depth of understanding.

I do not share all the views of these editorial writers but I find they are not writers for elementary school children and their knowledge is great. In any event, I want to deal with some of the remarks the minister made this afternoon. I am not going to indulge in an exchange of views with regard to integration. I think the first 50 minutes of the minister's speech were quite irrelevant to this debate. The point is, what are the advantages? Are there demonstrable advantages, are there preponderant advantages for unification, the single force concept? Are the men better fighting men? Do we get more for our defence dollar?

We have heard a great deal in terms of man management. Unfortunately, this program is man management mad. One point has been forgotten which General Moncel was able to emphasize. He said that after all our defence forces exist to fight. This is the real *raison d'être* for a defence force, that ultimately it may have to fight. We do not want that but if they are not trained for it, if they are not geared for it, then there has been no purpose in setting up a defence force. So I am suggesting to the members of the committee that the man management concept has gone wild, that there is a peacetime philosophy that has gone abroad and that what has suffered has been the fundamental purpose of having a big proportion of our forces available and trained to fight. The operational men have special considerations.

The members of the services are not of two categories. The people in the supply and administration fields are not a different category of member of the armed services from those who are in the field units. There is an exchange to avail ourselves of the skills of those in the administration and supply fields. We can also take men who are perhaps a little

older and who have had experience. This is also a good place to train men, younger men even, and bring them forward where administration is required. In operational units horizontal promotion is as good as vertical promotion. This is what I feel is wrong; this is where my big objection to unification lies.

• (6:00 p.m.)

What is the demonstrable effect, and it must be demonstrable, excepting the integrated command, the functional command and the functional organization, of taking a sailor, an airman and a soldier and putting them in the same uniform, in the same rank structure and calling them the same thing? What particular advantage is there in that? After all, as the minister has said there are to be air, sea and land elements. Those men will be specialists, each in his own field. Of course we will not have hybrids, notwithstanding the example of stewards. One should hear the report about stewards from the army going on board ship and how good they are when they return. If that is the start, I must say it is a wonderful one. But we shall not get these hybrids; otherwise men will spend their time training for jobs and never put their training into effect.

If you have a sailor, an airman or a soldier in an integrated command why will he be better because he happens to wear the same uniform as the chap alongside him? Those who have had the privilege of serving in units in battle conditions know that there is something more than meets the eye that calls to a man. There are all sorts of little intangibles that you refer to and appeal to whether in the field of battle, in a ship at sea or in the air. It is not the man managing with computers who will bring that out in the fighting man. What matters is what you will do to the fighting man's heart and how you will get him to do just a little better under such conditions.

Why is there this change for the sake of change at this time? It is not needed for integration. Gracious me, it will take three years to get the supply services going full tilt, and that is on the best advice the forces have. We are told that the Judge Advocate General's branch is a good example. With all due apology to the gentlemen occupying the chief positions in that branch, and I know and respect them, their branch is unrepresentative of the armed services. One might call them civil lawyers in uniform. Theirs is the one section of armed services where normal retirement ages do not apply. In fact, again apologizing to the hon. gentlemen occupying those positions, that branch could easily be handled by civilians.

Mr. Churchill: Yes.

Mr. Lambert: There is no question of rank or uniform. Perhaps the branch ought to be run by civilians. But that does not establish the argument that by asking a number of personnel in the Judge Advocate General's branch to be civilians we are asking the whole of the armed services to put on civilian suits or put on one suit. Not at all. The Judge Advocate General's branch is one particular type of administrative service.

The Chairman: Order, please. I must advise the hon. member that the time allotted to him has expired.

Some hon. Members: Go on.

Mr. Lambert: I thank hon. members for this opportunity. I hope I shall not abuse it.

We heard the minister speak about broader career and employment opportunities. Why should this be? Because a man is called a major instead of a lieutenant commander or squadron leader, why will he have wider career opportunities? If his uniform is light blue or dark blue or khaki rather than a uniform approved by user trials—and I will not pick any particular type of uniform—why will he be a better man? Why will he have a broader employment opportunity? This applies, once you reach a certain rank, to staff promotions and staff learning. But there are other areas in which it does not work as well. Surely those could be ironed out. But why do you need to put a man in the same uniform as all other men and into the same rank structure?

I shall have a great deal more to say when we get to the appropriate clause about the question of command and rank structure, and some of the difficulties in some of the regulations. Let me say here that there is a great potential for trouble ahead. Does anyone in his sane moments think that if a commander of a ship has decided to take the rank of lieutenant colonel that any officer junior to him will insist on his particular naval rank? Let us to practical. It will be all or nothing.

A great deal was made by my hon. friend from Greenwood that this measure would give us a force that will be more adaptable to change and will have a quicker response. The quicker response is merely a question of integrated command. The minister said there could be a quicker change of role and so

forth. All right. I think the minister will have to agree that perhaps he is changing the role of the aircraft he is buying for the air force.

Mr. Hellyer: Not at all.

Mr. Lambert: This comes from a statement attributed to the chief of the defence staff. Somebody is wrong because there is a grave contradiction on this point, or a grave misreporting. I do not know how far this matter goes but here again we want clarification.

• (6:10 p.m.)

Why should there be in a single force, if its role is to be peace keeping, a greater adaptability to differing roles? Peace keeping, if that is to be the role of the force, is not in high odour among world councils today. Is this to be training for operations in the temperate zone? Is it to be for the jungle or for the desert? Is it to be for the Arctic? Remember, the uniform which is talked about is not the fighting uniform. Those will be diverse. The tank men will still wear dungarees; the sailors will still need dungarees at times. They will not be working in those uniforms about which we have heard. Let no one think that the only uniform the soldier will wear in the field or on peace keeping operations will be his "camouflage" clothes. Has the minister never heard of week end leave or time off from duty? Has he never heard of getting out of fighting or working clothes? I have heard a great deal of nonsense, men talking about the kind of shorts they wore in the field during the war, the unconventional clothes they wore fighting. I will tell you this, Mr. Chairman. As soon as they stopped that they went back to their regimental uniforms of which they were inordinately proud.

Ceremonial dress? How long will that last? Will sailors go walking ashore in a green uniform looking like Air Canada pilots? If that is what hon. members opposite think they can do, all right. But I wish they would consult some sailors and see what they think about it.

Surely the hon. member for Greenwood must envisage a further difficulty in his desire that our forces should work on a really co-operative basis with the forces of the rest of the world in peace keeping operations—the difference between the structure of our forces and that of the forces with which we would be working. Our Canadian organization is to be so distinguished, so different from that of others, and yet we are to work with British, French, Italians, Norwegians, Swedes. The call is for co-operation. But we intend to be the one country that is in step; everyone else will be out of step.

How is co-operation achieved? By integration. By working with equals, with people who know your type of job and who tend to think as you do. But we intend to set ourselves apart, to make ourselves really distinguished on this basis though we know that no one else is giving serious thought to unification.

Let us not confuse unification with integration. A number of countries are examining the possibilities of integration and action has been taken by some of them to a certain extent. But there they have cried halt, with none of this nonsense about one uniform, one rank, one serviceman.

We shall get an opportunity to examine the testimony of individuals whose opinions must be highly respected when we consider the question of unification. All the testimony of General Lilley for instance, has to do with integration and amounts to an explanation of an integrated supply service which is partly in blueprint form. It is still on a three-services basis. If the temperature of international relations were to increase somewhat and if we had to push the accelerator forward two or three notches we would be in trouble. The same applies to the training command. We would be in trouble.

The foundations of integration must be completed and tested, and what is found wanting must be changed. Anyone who listened to the comments of Air Chief Marshal Miller would agree they amounted simply to this: why introduce the dislocation of unification in addition to the problems already brought about by integration? What is the rush? This is apart altogether from an acceptance of the principle of unification.

I will close these remarks hoping that there will be full participation in this debate by members of the defence committee in all quarters of the house. This is too important a subject for hon. members to sit mutely by instead of analysing these proposals like intelligent men, as they are. I want to hear both sides of the question; there may be something I have missed. I also want members opposite to note those proposals to which experienced men have said no.

No country has faced such a situation as we have faced since June of last year in which so many senior officers, men appointed by the present minister under the new plan of reorganization, have chosen to fight or to place

their heads on the chopping block. There is something very wrong when this happens.

We find the chief of the defence staff saying "halt". The vice-chief said "I am leaving". The chief of personnel said "I am leaving". The comptroller general said "I am leaving". The director of technical services, who retired a couple of months earlier, came to us and said "I was sick with frustration". What does this leave the house to consider? That they were all wrong? I have not spoken about those below who left the services and in whose case the doors clanged somewhat more loudly. The minister must think long about his actions with regard to those men.

It is said of Mr. McNamara that he ignores his military advisers. It has been strongly suggested that the present minister has patterned himself after Mr. McNamara. The difficulty with the minister is that he will have few military advisers left or will have none if this continues.

• (6:20 p.m.)

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, what we in Canada need in the field of defence is a clear defence policy. In all the mass of words spoken by the minister and his aides on the subject of unification there has been a complete failure to clarify or justify our defence roles, a failure to say what the future of the armed services is to be, what purposes they are to serve, what sort of hostilities we expect to be involved in. We have continued to put the cart of organization before the horse. We are presented with a cart; we are not told what sort of horse we are to have, what direction it is to go, and what sort of load it is to carry. We are bogged down in discussing organization, and organization without a clearcut statement of the contemplated future and roles of our armed forces is a waste of time and totally illogical.

On second reading of this bill the hon. member for Vancouver East and myself made clear what we thought were the basic and, indeed, vitally important questions underlying the issue of unification and involved, in our view, with the whole future of our armed services. In our view, as we expressed it then, unification would make sense only if we made a radical review of our defence commitments and decided to concentrate on a mobile intervention force. It was our considered conviction that this course ought in fact to be taken, that we should concentrate on such a role, that it would enable us to take an effective part in peace keeping and peace enforcing, and that it would do much more than that.

The opponents of unification have tried to present the alternative of carrying on our present roles, or the alternative of doing nothing but peace keeping. This is not what we envisage would be the purposes of a unified mobile intervention force. True, it would be available for peace keeping and peace enforcing, and we put the highest possible value on that. Of all the contributions that can be made by Canada to the security of the world there is none higher in our estimation than the importance of having available peace keeping or peace enforcing units ready to act for the United Nations, but it is a total error that such a mobile intervention force as we think should be the major defence effort of Canada would be confined to that.

Such a force would be available in the unlikely event of some invasion on the soil of Canada. It would be available quickly to deal with it. Now, this is a most unlikely occurrence in any event as, Mr. Chairman, we are part of the North American continent and share this continent with the most powerful nation that the world has ever known, armed with colossal destructive power, but if there should be some invasion of Canadian soil then a mobile intervention force that could get to the scene quickly would be the most effective type to have available.

It would also enable us to contribute, if we saw fit to do so for political or other reasons, to a mobile reserve for NATO. It is not a choice, as is sometimes said, between getting out of NATO and continuing to do what we are doing at the present time. The choice is whether we will continue to make useless contributions that make no sense and are obsolete or whether we are prepared to look toward a contribution of a mobile force that is needed and would be available if we decided to continue in NATO, or indeed in any other military alliance.

We believe that the present roles carried out by the Canadian armed services are no longer useful or needed. A great many of them are militarily useless. What are we doing in NATO? As hon. members well know, we contribute an army division, part of a massive tactical nuclear means of response to a full scale Russian attack on western Europe. There is no more improbable contingency in the judgment of any informed or sensible person than that such an attack would take place. If it did take place we have been told by no less a person than U.S. Secretary of

Defence McNamara that there is a massive superiority of tactical nuclear weapons in the hands of the Americans and their allies. Our contribution to that particular form of defence is militarily completely useless.

We also believe that our air division in Europe is vulnerable and therefore useless. Worse than that, in times of tension it is positively provocative because at present our air division sits on the plains of western Germany with Russian missiles trained on them and in the event of any grave tension in Europe, although such an occurrence does not seem likely at the present time, the incentive toward early destruction of these air forces would be a possible provocation to an action that would tend to escalate rapidly into a full scale nuclear war.

We say that these particular contributions are no longer appropriate to Canada. They are not needed. I defy the minister, or any representative of the minister, to pronounce a single useful purpose that is being served by these particular forces. It is suggested that perhaps they perform a political service, and I want to deal with that a little later.

I come now to another commitment we have made, the commitment to the air defences of North America. I propose to refer to evidence in the defence committee where distinguished military men have stated that in their opinion this is an obsolete form of defence. In the age of missiles an attack by manned bombers on North America is so improbable that you have to assume complete insanity on the part of some enemy, and of course the only enemy in this field would be the U.S.S.R. There is not the slightest sign that such a threat is a real one and, Mr. Chairman, we should not be continuing a form of organization which prevents us from doing the things that are vitally essential where our major contribution can be made to the security of the world.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the defence committee considered Bill C-243 after second reading. I hope the Minister of National Defence and the government now realize the foolishness of the decision to require the examination of this highly technical subject by the committee after rather than before second reading. What happened? Positions were solidified. Every representative on that committee showed a complete inflexibility of view.

It would be less than frank for me to say what I was looking for as the evidence was given to the committee were matters that would justify the stand we have seen fit to take in the House of Commons on second reading. I would say of the government members on the committee that not a single question or intervention they made seemed to have any other purpose but wholesale support of the bill and nothing but the bill. At the same time the official opposition made their views very clear, and instead of having a calm, objective examination of the merits of the bill we had a continuation in the defence committee of a political wrangle and a strengthening of political opinions.

• (6:30 p.m.)

I hope we will not do that again. It was said that for some sort of practical reason it was inevitable that we had to have second reading first. I say it was a mistake that the sort of matters which the minister and other witnesses brought before the committee could not have been brought before the committee in a totally different atmosphere, in an atmosphere where we had not been committed to a particular stand before we had an opportunity to examine the situation in detail. Therefore, instead of having a consensus we were forced into a situation in which all members of the committee were taking sides one way or another, without being able to withdraw from the entrenched positions which had been taken on second reading.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, we did receive a very great deal of evidence. In my view we received a great deal of useful and worth while evidence. However, as I see it, that evidence has established the point I am trying to make to the committee now; it has made the point abundantly clear. None of those who were opposed to unification—including representatives of TRIO, the group which has opposed unification on behalf of many retired officers of the service—denied that unification would be an appropriate form of organization if we were to confine our role to that of a single mobile intervention force.

Yet the whole weight of the evidence established that, so long as we continue to have, for example, an army brigade isolated from other services and an air division operating solely as an air division, then the disturbance created by a new form of organization certainly is not worth while. This point was made with greater clarity by General Moncel than by any other witness who appeared before the committee. I should like to refer to some of his evidence. General Moncel I believe is well known to members of this house. He is a very distinguished officer who had a

great deal of responsibility at top level for the working out of policy in this field. I should like to deal first with what he had to say about the roles. At page 1323 I put the following question to him:

May I put it to you this way: As I understand it, it is your view that unification of the services makes no sense as long as we continue with the roles that we have at the present time.

Mr. Moncel replied: "That is right". The evidence continues:

Mr. Brewin: For example, if I may draw you out with a few examples, if you have an army brigade group in Europe as it is now integration is meaningless or, indeed, harmful, because it creates disturbance in that it does not make any useful contribution to what we are doing in our brigade group now?

Mr. Moncel: Not "integration".

Mr. Brewin: I meant to say "unification". I am sorry.

Mr. Moncel: Yes. Who are you going to unify it with?

Mr. Brewin: Precisely; and is not the same true of the air division?

Mr. Moncel: Precisely.

Mr. Brewin: I suppose one could go through some of the other roles. The anti-submarine role of the navy—how are you going to integrate that when it is basically a naval role?

Mr. Moncel: That is right. I just do not know the answer to it. This is why I fault it here.

Mr. Brewin: But I understand you also to say that if for various reasons, partly political and partly military, you decide that it is necessary to concentrate on this sort of intervention force then unification begins to make some sense?

Mr. Moncel: Yes.

Mr. Brewin: Therefore, the real choice that we have to make, as a nation, and that we are responsible for making in Parliament, in the matter of making sense out of unification, is whether we are going to continue the roles that we have or concentrate on this mobile intervention force?

Mr. Moncel: Yes.

I went on to deal with the question of his own view, that it would be a risk to switch to a single force. Then at page 1324 we find the following:

Mr. Brewin: May I go back to this question of the different roles? Would you agree, General Moncel—in fact, I think you already have—that this—

That is the choice of roles.

—is partly a political consideration.

Mr. Moncel: Entirely a political consideration.

In my view, Mr. Chairman, this reveals the essence of the matter which is facing the house today. General Moncel put his finger on precisely the real issue. However much it may be obscured by the discussion of unification, the real issue is that unification makes sense if the concentration is to be on a single mobile force which will be available for peacekeeping and other activities, but if the present roles are to be continued then it does not make sense.

We do not find fault with the government because we oppose unification; we do not oppose it. We think unification is a forward looking and wise policy. However, we believe it is a forward looking and wise policy only if the logical base for it is established, namely the roles which are appropriate to Canada's position in the mid 1960's and 1970's, and not those roles which may have been appropriate in the late 1940's or 1950's. This is precisely the point which has been ignored by the minister. In ignoring it, in my opinion, he destroys the real basis upon which he could appeal to the country and to the members of the armed services themselves and obtain their wholehearted support for unification.

General Moncel said something else which I think the minister prefers to brush aside as easily as he can. General Moncel said—and I am paraphrasing his evidence but I believe I am doing so accurately—that if we were to build up a truly mobile force an added expense would be involved. I should like to read from the evidence at page 1322:

Mr. Brewin: General Moncel, I wanted to ask you to elaborate a little on the White Paper. I think you said that it had two major defects, as you saw it, and I wonder if I understood at least one of them, correctly. The White Paper contemplated the maintenance of the existing commitments that Canada was involved in, or, the existing roles—I think that is a better word than "commitments". "Commitments" implies that you have agreed to do it indefinitely; a "role" is something that you are doing. Now, as I understand it, the White Paper proposed the maintenance of a series of existing commitments—the brigade, the air division, the anti-submarine forces, the air defence, and so on; and it proposed continuing those without any apparent change and certainly with no early, or definite change. It also proposed, as I understand it, the creation of a mobile force, this intervention force, or whatever you want to call it.

Do I correctly understand you to say that if we are going to do all of these things this would involve a budget in excess of two billion dollars a year?

Mr. Moncel: Yes, sir.

Mr. Brewin: So that if you are going to accept a ceiling on the budget of, say, what we have now, which is approximately $1.5 billion, something has to give?

Mr. Moncel: Precisely.

• (6:40 p.m.)

Mr. Brewin: You have to make a choice on whether you are going to expand your mobile role or cut out some of the other roles. Is that correct?

Mr. Moncel: Yes. This is the alternative.

I asked the minister about this and he went into all sorts of evasions about time phases. He said it depended on how many helicopters we have and he actually said that they had not computed the cost of developing a mobile defence force. He said he did not know what the cost would be, but that it would depend on various contingencies. It was my expectation that with his organizational mind and his computers, he would have worked out precisely what this new concentration would cost. The vice chairman of the defence staff, Air Marshal Sharp, made it perfectly clear that the whole new concept into which unification is supposed to fit is a concentration on this mobile role. In spite of that, we are told the cost has not been worked out.

Sometimes in this field, we have to repeat ourselves to get a point across, and although this is a repetition I should like to say to the minister that is will not be possible to build up an effective mobile force and at the same time maintain all the existing roles efficiently keeping within a budget ceiling of something like $1.5 billion. So the minister must make a choice. So far he has failed to do so, and this vitiates the whole defence policy for which he and this government stand.

I do not think when we are debating unification I should partake in an elaborate examination of each of the different roles involved or explain how and why they are inadequate, but I should like to call the attention of this committee to a statement made by General Allard, the present chief of our general staff. This is a striking statement. He was being questioned about an article written by John Gellner which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* magazine on February 4, 1967. This article is in reference to Canada's defence and Mr. Gellner, dealing first of all with the plan for a mobile intervention force, said this:

> According to plan, within three years Canada will have a fully mobile intervention force of 15,000, equipped with the best modern weapons. This represents considerable power, especially when it can be applied quickly, and in a preventive role.

I take it Mr. Gellner was not writing from a figment of the imagination when he said there was a plan for an intervention force of 15,000 which would be fully mobile. Such a force is bound to cost money. Mr. Gellner goes on to deal with our existing commitments to NATO, and he says:

> It should be realized, and undoubtedly it is realized in Ottawa, that militarily the value of the Canadian contribution is minimal. It was contracted at a time when NATO planning was based on the assumption that a war in Central Europe could be a limited nuclear war and that the enemy could thus be deterred by the weapons of limited nuclear war. This theory could never have withstood serious examination; by now nobody in a responsible position inside or outside of NATO really believes in its validity.
>
> Yet for a variety of reasons, mostly political, it still determines NATO's deployment. This means Canada now has 126, and will have 108, CF-104 Starfighters standing unprotected on huge air bases (within range of Soviet nuclear missiles no doubt zeroed-in on them) and a brigade group prepared to manoeuvre on a nuclear battlefield, supported by a battery of short-range (15 miles or so) nuclear Honest John rockets designed to act much like ordinary artillery pieces (except for their incomparably greater power).
>
> All this is of no use, as it presumes to deter a kind of war the Soviets have repeatedly declared they have no intention of fighting, and the French have said they will not allow to be fought in central Europe.

Mr. Gellner goes on in this article to deal with another aspect of this matter, that is our air defence. I will not read this all, but he does write the following:

> This has to be borne in mind when one stands rather puzzled on one of our two Bomarc surface-to-air missile bases and sees 28 of these weapons standing virtually unprotected yards apart on a single pad, ready to repel a bomber attack. If attack ever came, the whole Bomarc complex would probably be taken out in the enemy's first surprise strike.
>
> With a little foresight, the Bomarcs could have been recognized for the military absurdities they were when installed in 1961. Yet we took them, had to take them, simply because our two Bomarc bases formed a link in a chain of similar U.S. installations.

It is about time we stood on our own feet in respect of defence and thought out for ourselves what was useful for Canada, rather than getting ourselves involved in what Mr. Gellner here describes as military absurdities. The government says it is forward looking, but when it comes to action it continues the inertia so typical of it, doing exactly what was done in the 1950's, with practically no change.

On March 15 the Secretary of State for External Affairs, when discussing our commitments to NATO, said this to a committee of the other place:

> The specific form of our contribution is under continuing review and has, in fact, changed significantly over the years. One example will, I think, suffice to illustrate my point. In the middle fifties, Canada provided twelve squadrons of F-86 interceptor aircraft to NATO. These were replaced in the early sixties by eight squadrons of F-104 aircraft, six squadrons of which had a strike role and two a reconnaissance role. This year, as a result of attrition, we are reducing the number of squadrons of strike aircraft from eight to six. At some time in the 1970's, all the F-104 aircraft

will be "phased out". At the appropriate time in the future, the government will have to decide what position to take on a "follow-on" aircraft.

In other words, the Secretary of State for External Affairs says that at some time in the 1970's we will proceed to consider whether we will replace something that Mr. Gellner has indicated is in his view a military absurdity.

Perhaps what Mr. Gellner has said as a writer is not important to this country, but I should like to indicate that the view expressed in this article has been adopted by General Allard, the chief of general staff. He gave evidence to the defence committee, and I should like to refer to what he said in answer to the hon. member for Simcoe North as reported at page 1830 of the proceedings of that committee.

The hon. member for Simcoe North read the comments I have just read from Mr. Gellner's article, as to the value of Canadian contributions, and then added:

I want an opportunity to talk about it.

Mr. Allard: I could answer you right away, Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith: All right, fine.

• (6:50 p.m.)

Mr. Allard: The answer to this is that this is a political question, and the political direction that I will get will certainly serve to generate the necessary plans. As far as Mr. Gellner's article is concerned, I do not—

The Chairman: Order. I must interrupt the hon. gentleman to advise him that the time allotted to him has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

The Chairman: Does the committee give the hon. member permission to continue his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, like the hon. member for Edmonton West I shall try not to abuse the generosity of the committee. I was reading the passage from the proceedings of the committee where the hon. member for Simcoe North put Mr. Gellner's article to Mr. Allard, who said:

As far as Mr. Gellner's article is concerned, I do not disagree with it.

So we have the chief of our general staff saying that he agrees with an article, and indeed it makes admirable common sense, in which it is made abundantly clear that the military contribution we are making to Europe at the present time makes no sense militarily. I ask, what sense does it make politically? It has been said to me by some experts that we are buying some sort of influence, that by making a contribution that does not make sense we are somehow or other pleasing our allies. The sort of domino theory put forward is that if we were to withdraw this useless brick, upon which nobody depends, it would bring down the edifice. I am not running down the troops themselves, because they are first-rate and efficient, but it is suggested that if we withdraw from this useless role the whole edifice will come tumbling down. This is absolute nonsense. It is an insult to our allies, and I suggest it is an insult to our troops to say to them, "We want you to continue doing something that does not make good military sense at the present time." How can you build morale upon an argument of that sort?

My time has elapsed, Mr. Chairman, and I do not wish to trespass upon the generosity of the committee. In conclusion I would say to the minister that even at this late date it is time to use some imagination; it is time to make something in the nature of a stirring appeal to the people of Canada. Only a truly Canadian defence policy can obtain the support for which the minister asks in relation to his plans for unification. Only if it is seen that Canada is prepared to make a maximum contribution to peace and security will the minister receive the support for the policy he is putting forward. It is not good enough to carry on with this sort of inertia and repetition of our role. Politically a new phase has developed in Europe, yet we are carrying on the same immobile policies of the past.

Canada's defence policy should be directed to the future and not to the past. We are spending vast sums of money in this area. We are asking for the lives and devotion of many highly competent and dedicated men and women. They should be put behind a unified force; we accept that. But this unified force should play a modern, up to date role fitted into the needs of Canada to contribute to the security of the world in the 1960's and 1970's. As far as this party is concerned, we shall continue to urge that we do not worry just about machinery and organization, as though we were a group of organization men and nothing more, and we shall try to arouse the imagination and enthusiasm of the people of Canada for a contribution that makes sense at the present time.

Mr. Knowles: Seven o'clock.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Chairman, I think I might as well call it seven o'clock and begin my remarks later. I therefore call it seven o'clock.

[*English*]

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chairman: Order. I do not know what is the wish of the Committee, but there is no order of the house to suspend the sitting at seven o'clock.

Mr. Hellyer: Then perhaps, Mr. Chairman, you will rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again later this day, and an order of the house could be made to resume at eight o'clock, if this is agreed.

The Chairman: Shall I rise, report progress and request leave to sit again later this day?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Progress reported.

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Chambly-Rouville (Mr. Pilon):

That the sitting of the house today be suspended from 7 o'clock p.m. to 8 o'clock p.m.

Motion agreed to.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: The hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge), transport—request for restoration of service on Kettle Valley Railway; the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan), immigration—reported discrimination in admission of immigrants from Poland; the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. MacInnis), historic sites and monuments—Louisbourg fortress—return to work of men laid off.

Perhaps the house would agree, before suspending the sitting, to return to consideration in committee of the bill before it a few moments ago.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Knowles.]

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

AMALGAMATION OF NAVY, ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The house resumed consideration in committee of Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof.

The Chairman: The sitting is suspended from now until eight o'clock.

SITTING SUSPENDED

[*Translation*]

SITTING RESUMED

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

The Deputy Chairman: When the committee rose at seven o'clock, it was considering clause 2.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Chairman, before getting into the subject matter of the brief remarks I propose to make, may I be allowed to express our pleasure at your return to the house after your stay in the hospital. We earnestly hope your health will continue to improve so that you may as in the past have the patience to listen to us.

This afternoon we have heard military experts such as the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer), the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) as well as the brilliant lawyer who spoke for the New Democratic Party.

Tonight I should like to speak for the businessmen, the owners of small businesses.

Mr. Chairman, I admit at the outset that I am no expert in military matters; that is why I shall only make general remarks and give a brief summary of our military organization as seen by a civilian.

• (8:10 p.m.)

This afternoon the minister expressed his views on the military reform. He spoke as the soldier he is; he defended his position well; he spoke as a businessman would have done to protect his interests; as a labour leader would have pleaded the cause of his union. Now, I admire the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer) and I always did, because he is strong willed, and when he has made up his mind, I think he has thoroughly thought out his decision before announcing it to the house.

I feel the defence committee performed some fine work, and I congratulate its members for having earnestly looked into the Canadian military question and especially for having suggested amendments and improvements which the entire population expects from the government.

I happened to read this morning an article by Clément Brown about unification. He had this to say about our discussions which started today:

> There is first, by order of importance, the armed forces unification bill, already read a second time and recommended, in spite of the Conservative opposition, without amendment by the parliamentary committee. That bill could give rise to a long debate since the Conservatives are against unification. All the more so since Prime Minister Pearson himself implied that he wants to consider the advisability of proceeding without delay with unification, when the most distinguished witnesses to appear before the parliamentary committee have advised the government to make haste slowly.

In my opinion, the main purpose of Bill No. C-243 is above all to unify the three armed services. I feel that such unification is not only advisable but essential. I fail to see why in the military field as in all other fields, expenditures should not be reduced as much as possible.

Therefore, I am rising this evening in order to express the views of our group concerning the unification of the three armed services, because we consider primarily the savings to be made. According to military technicians, it would also be beneficial to the unity of the army itself on the economic level, which would necessarily reduce administrative costs.

I heard this afternoon the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) talk about the uniform. In my opinion, that matter is of minor importance. Whether the soldier is given a blue, green or gray uniform, it does not change anything to the effect of the bayonet or the cannon, it is simply a matter of fashion. If experts in military fashion are needed, they should be consulted. But when some hon. members talked about the new uniform or said that an effort was made to impose the same uniform to the three services, that was, in my opinion, a very weak argument and I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Edmonton West—a man whom I admire also—object to that bill on that score. It seems to me that most soldiers I talked to in my area are looking forward to a single command, to unification. I am therefore mildly surprised that the Conservatives, as a whole, should so oppose the bill.

All kinds of excuses will be given for holding up the business of the house, such as the one we heard this afternoon, namely that all the committee reports had not been tabled. Mention was made of the delay in tabling the minutes and proceedings of the committee entrusted with the study of the bank bill. I suspect the same thing is going to happen again because the last reports were distributed to us at the beginning of the sitting. I got the last reports on arriving at my office, and at that, not in the final version but merely copies of the transcript.

Well, this is a procedure which I have not ceased to deplore in the five years I have been here. I deplored it even under other governments and it should not be resorted to in order to delay a discussion by putting forward such a worthless argument, as if it were a major reason to adjourn a debate that is so important and so urgent that—

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member allow a question?

Mr. Gauthier: Certainly.

Mr. Lambert: Is it not a fact that, in the case of the Deposit Insurance Act, the reports of the proceedings were late and that the debate on the bill dealing with the Bank of Canada Act was delayed for four days because the French translation was not finished? I think that perhaps you will agree with me in this regard.

Mr. Gauthier: I agree that the reports took four days to reach us and that consideration of these documents was delayed until they were printed. But the debate began when the last report was received. That is what I mean. The same happened today: discussion was begun when the last report reached our office. In the other instance, we had to wait four days because about 12 French reports were missing. Let me speak as I did at the beginning, as a simple civilian. As civilians, we notice mainly the military budget. I said earlier that we were expecting a reduction in the expenditures, but when we look at the military budget, we notice that this year, in spite of all the minister's predictions, it is yet much higher than last year.

I do not know whether this is due to the fact that the country's expenditures are higher or whether the cost of updating our armaments have increased but everybody, the people in general find that a military budget of about $2 billion for a small country of 20

million people is just outrageous. We had hoped that the budget would be reduced by at least one third, but it is not the case and I want to point out to the minister that we are a little disappointed in that respect.

• (8:20 p.m.)

That situation may be due to the purchase of airplanes, mainly those we use for military training. I know that in my area, for instance, there is a centre where all day long they play with those small toys worth a million dollars apiece. When you replace 140 of those toys because they are a little worn out, at a cost of $140 million, we can imagine that the military budget is going to go up as the minister mentioned. I would not repeat that word, had the minister not used it but he spoke about waste in the Department of the National Defence. I think that we suspected it for a long time. In his statement, the minister said that there had been some waste, and I am confident that he will try and stop such waste so as to save in that respect.

What we really need, in brief, is an army to protect this country, not an army of which two or three battalions could fight abroad, for foreign interests. We do think and the people in general feel that we need an army in order to protect this country.

Canadian citizens are ready to pay for their own aircraft, but what they do not accept today is the fact that, after 20 or 22 years, namely since the last war, they still have to pay the costs of training and the travelling and living allowances of Canadian soldiers stationed in Europe and all other countries. In fact, they are wondering what a poor little country of 20 million people like Canada is doing there.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest it would be preferable to direct our dollars and our energy toward peace production rather than try to thrust peace upon people by force of arms. I believe that if we earmarked 50 per cent of the military budget for production, in order to give food to people in starving countries, we would be doing something useful.

Now, we cannot all be of the same opinion and, as I said a while ago, a soldier speaks like a soldier, a civilian like a civilian. That is why I admire the minister who defended his own cause in this house and defended it well. This does not prevent us from having our own opinion and from wishing that we may, some day, think more about feeding the people, for the sake of peace, instead of thrusting peace upon them, by force of arms.

I wish that day to be the nearest possible, I wish that the minister would think about organizing the army so as to provide protection for this country itself and that he would earmark the difference of millions of dollars to feed the people of this country first of all and then have them benefit other countries that are in need.

[*English*]

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, my first remarks at this stage of proceedings on Bill C-243 are to commend the standing committee on national defence for the great deal of work they did in examining in detail, with the benefit of expert witnesses, the provisions laid out in the bill. I do not pretend to be familiar with all provisions in the bill, as it is now or before it was amended, because this was a specialized study undertaken by a number of competent members in this house. While it is obvious that there is not full agreement among members, it seems to me that they have performed a useful service to parliament and to Canada by making their examination.

I rise tonight to express some opinions respecting Canada's role in international affairs politically and militarily. We in this party have long advocated that there ought to be far closer liaison between the Department of National Defence and the Department of External Affairs. I do not suggest that the ministers or supporting staffs of these departments do not co-operate. I do suggest, however, that the policies of the two departments ought to be more co-ordinated than in the past.

If we are to talk intelligently about Bill C-243, which is designed to bring about a new structure for our armed forces, we ought first to discuss what the purpose and role of those armed forces will be. In this day and age I suggest that that purpose is completely tied to our foreign policy. I suggest, as has been said before, that Canada through obligation or choice, whichever term one wishes to use, occupies a unique position in world international relations. As the minister said a few moments ago, there is so much military power in the hands of the super powers that it is not likely either one will deliberately embark on a war calling on both sides to use all the power they have. As a result I think that Canada ought to use its resources in manpower and material in some way to keep the peace of the world. I had not intended saying

this, but perhaps in the context of my argument I ought to say that I am not particularly interested in Canada's strength as a military power. I am, however, interested in Canada's capacity to assist in keeping world peace.

If we agree that Canada's major role in international politics is to have available men and equipment to be used anywhere in the world to extinguish small wars or disputes, we must examine our armed forces to see if they have the capabilities to perform those functions.

There is good reason for our role in the world today. Canada's troops are accepted by other nations for this purpose. For example in many parts of the world the troops of the U.S.S.R., the United States, France or Britain would not be accepted. I do not think United States troops would be accepted in some Asiatic or African countries. I doubt if those countries would accept Soviet Union troops. Were those troops to come in, the countries concerned would be apprehensive. They would be afraid that there would be an extension of Soviet power and influence, were the troops of that powerful country allowed to come in. Also in the middle east, the far east and other places in the world United States troops and military equipment would not be acceptable. The outstanding example of that might be Viet Nam, although I shall not discuss that now.

I suggest that the troops of the United Kingdom and France, former colonial powers, would not be accepted in countries that were colonized by Britain and France in times gone by. I have attended international meetings from time to time, some in the United Nations and some in our own parliamentary associations. If there is one thing that is obvious, it is that these new countries, these developing countries which were formerly colonies of Britain or France simply will not accept troops in their territories for any purpose. They do not want them. There is an obsession in many of these countries to rid themselves of all traces of former influence so that they can concentrate on governing themselves. There is no doubt in my mind that at this stage the forces of former occupying powers would not be allowed back if border disputes broke out between any of those nations. So I think Canada ought to accept this role. I recognize we have done so in a number of areas, even though we were perhaps not well prepared from a military point of view to fulfil this function.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Another reason for my thinking that Canada is well suited to this task is that among the smaller nations of the world—and I am thinking in terms of population—there is not one which is in a better position, because of the extent of its material resources, to support a peace keeping force.

This is an important consideration since we know that if the major powers, the major contributors to the United Nations, fail to agree on whether a peace keeping force should be sent, it is the practice for those who do not agree to withhold financial contributions in respect to such a force. This happened in the case of the Congo, to mention one example. I am thinking of circumstances where the security council has authorized a peace keeping force to begin operations, but where the assessment levied in connection with the force has been withheld. The need therefore is for a nation which is willing to provide a service of this kind, and whose material resources are sufficient to support such a force. The presence of the peace keeping force in Cyprus is an example of a service of this kind, and there are other examples. If there is wrangling in the United Nations about whether a force should be sent or not, great damage might be done while these arguments or discussions were going on, and the situation might deteriorate to the point at which no useful purpose would be served by sending in a small peace keeping force such as Canada can provide.

Having agreed that Canada ought to accept a peace keeping role and having drawn attention to Canada's unique position in being able to assume a role of this kind in international affairs, I come to the next logical step, namely how to design our armed forces in such a way as to make the greatest possible contribution to this concept. I said I do not pretend to be an expert on military matters. It might be possible using separate armed services to provide the forces and the equipment required. I am not sure. I know that these forces have been provided on several occasions in the past, though I suspect not without difficulty. It seems to me that acceptance of the concept which I and other hon. members have outlined is a quite different matter from devising the best possible means of carrying it out.

My hon. friend from Fraser Valley has pointed out, as reported on page 12423 of *Hansard* of January 30, that we in this party

have long taken the position that certain adjustments should be made within our armed forces. His words on that occasion were:

> We ought to redesign Canada's defence strategy and military forces to eliminate useless expenditures on forms of defence obsolete in the light of modern circumstances.

This is even more important. We should, he said—

> —concentrate on establishing powerful, well-equipped, highly mobile forces strategically deployed and capable of immediate airborne transport to any area of Canada.

This was contained in a policy statement we issued several years ago. Having regard to the passage of time, I think the last part of that statement should now read—"capable of immediate airborne transport to any area of the world." So this concept is not new. It is not something we have very recently discovered. The bill before us represents in some respects the culmination of this idea; we are reaching the point at which action is to be taken in a direction we advocated a long time ago. It seems to me that for the purpose of fulfilling a role as a peace keeper in the world, a unified and integrated force would be more effective than three separate forces.

Nevertheless, I believe we should move rather slowly in the field of unification and integration. Sometimes I am puzzled about the interpretation of those two words as they are defined by various hon. members. If integration has already been achieved, and if all this bill will do is provide for unification, I am afraid I do not follow the argument. However this may be, it seems there is some reason and logic in having a single service under a single command if we are to provide the kind of force I have tried to describe. In the initial stages, at least, there has to be a higher degree of co-ordination between the services than we have now. Earlier this afternoon the minister suggested there were some deficiencies in co-ordination among the three forces we have at the present time. It is understandable that this should be so, whether or not one is intimately familiar with the organization of the armed forces.

So we agree to the concept of Canada's new role in international affairs, and we can find some measure of agreement upon integration, and even unification, up to a point. But I suggest to the minister that for the sake of morale we should not lose some of the very useful parts within our forces, and that we should go a little bit slowly in trying to set up a completely new structure. There are traditions in the Canadian forces that are proud and glorious, and rightly so. We should move very slowly, to make sure that no attempt, or apparent attempt is made to destroy these traditions or take away from the proud history of Canada's armed forces.

• (8:40 p.m.)

I am not suggesting to the minister that he is deliberately setting out to destroy such traditions, but accusations have been made that he is. If we move slowly, as I have suggested, and as my colleague from Fraser Valley suggested several weeks ago, we can make sure of providing a clear concept in the minds of all the men in the armed forces as to where we are going, and our purpose can then be achieved without too much pain.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the minister and to the government house leader that public debate, and debate in the House of Commons on integration and unification of tht armed forces have gone on just about long enough. I do not believe that anything useful is going to come, from here on out. The defence committee accepted a lot of amendments to the bill. No doubt representations were made to the minister and the department about other amendments.

I know there are those in this house and in other places who are hard and fast in their opposition to the provisions of the reprinted bill, but I believe we reach a point, and I think we have reached it, where nothing further of great usefulness can come out of extending the debate. I suggest to the minister that he get together with the house leader, look at the provisions of provisional standing order 15-A, and invoke some of them if this debate evolves into what appears to be developing, namely some kind of filibuster, the wasting of time to achieve certain things.

In my opinion the provisions of standing order 15-A are not too severe. Subsection 2 states:

> During routine proceedings a minister of the crown may propose that the question of allocation of time for any item of business, unless otherwise provided for, be referred to the business committee, and upon such proposal being made that question shall stand referred to the committee.

Although I was not in Ottawa at the time, I have heard that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre supported that there ought to be some discussion at least with respect to limitation of time on this debate, if there are members of the house who are determined that it is going to become an interminable debate.

Mr. Knowles: Before we get into trouble.

Mr. Olson: Yes, before we get into too much trouble, because it would be very difficult to limit debate after the house deteriorated, if that is the right word, into an ugly mood so far as the bill is concerned.

Subsection 3 of the standing order states:

> The business committee shall report back to the house on or before the third sitting day following such reference.

The minister can decide for himself how long he wants to wait before using this standing order. Maybe he thinks the bill will pass in one or two days. I would be willing to wait about three days, but after that time I suggest that he take it upon himself to move a motion referring the matter to the business committee. The rule provides that the committee is required to report back to the house within three days. But the committee might sit for only an hour before it became completely obvious its members could not agree, or it could sit for the full three days.

Subsections 5 and 6 of the standing order provide that in the event the business committee cannot agree, the minister may move for limitation of time. Subsection 7 states however, that—

> —no motion made by a minister under sections 5 and 6 of this standing order shall provide for the allocation of a period of time less than two days for the second reading, two days for the committee stage, and one day for the third reading of any bill.

I would suggest to the minister that he be careful not to impose the absolute minimum of time specified in the standing order. Even if he finds out from whoever is on the business committee from the Conservative party that they are not going to agree to anything—and that has happened before, you know—

Mr. Lambert: You are being very sanctimonious.

Mr. Olson: —he does not have to impose the absolute minimum of time in the standing order.

There are some 48 pages in the bill and I suggest the minister should not give the Conservatives cause for the old cry that closure is being imposed by imposing the absolute minimum under standing order 15-A. What I seriously suggest to the minister is that if it becomes apparent that there is not going to be any agreement by the business committee, then we should have about three or four days for the committee stage. I think one day is enough for third reading, but we probably need more than two days in committee on something as important as this.

I hope the debate is not going to go on, and on, and on. It has gone on for a long time already and it can only get more acrimonious as the days go by. If there has not already been opportunity for all members who want to make representations with respect to the bill, then we should continue for a few more days, but I believe we have reached the stage where almost everything new that could be said about the bill has been said, and debate will be a little repetitious from now on.

I suggest we could continue for another three or perhaps four days before the minister imposes the provisions of standing order 15-A, and while the matter is before the business committee we could discuss some other item of business. But when the matter returns from the business committee I suggest another four or five days debate would be enough. Let us not have the House of Commons and the whole country bogged down because there are one or two, or half a dozen of our members unwilling to accept the majority decision of the house.

Mr. Churchill: Will the hon. member accept a question?

Mr. Olson: Yes, sir.

Mr. Churchill: If the hon. member's suggestion of closure is adopted by the government—and he often acts as a spokesman for the government—what percentage of time in that limited period would be given to his party of four and a half members? I think one member of his party is sort of leaving them now.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, I have to straighten the hon. member's thinking out again, as I have often had to do. First of all, I am never the spokesman for the government. In case the hon. member was not sure about that—

Mr. Churchill: Should I have used the word stooge?

Mr. Olson: The hon. member said I am often the spokesman for the government, and I am telling him I have never been appointed spokesman for the government. He then described as closure the procedure that I suggested. Closure does not come under standing order 15-A, which provides for allocation of time.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Mr. Churchill: Closure of debate.

Mr. Olson: The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre knows very well that, if there are a number of clauses, closure is a situation in which a minister of the crown moves every day that the question be put at the end of that sitting day. I think that is the way it works. I never was in the house when closure was used. There has been some type of stigma attached to it since 1956. I do not have the mental block in respect of closure some people have, because I believe closure has its place, if the majority of this house is being frustrated day after day and week after week by a very small minority. Although this conduct is confined to a large party, I believe it is only a small minority in that party which intends to hold up the proceedings. I believe there is a proper use of some form of allocation of time so that the majority still can run this country. I think we in this party would be willing to accept our fair share of the amount of time allotted under the use of provisional standing order 15-A.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Chairman, I was under the impression that we would hear from a number of the Liberal members who were members of the national defence committee. It would appear, however, that possibly the officials of the minister's department have not finished writing their speeches for them, as was the case during the committee hearings. As has been suggested, possibly closure already has been applied to the Liberal members who were present during the hearings of the national defence committee.

At the beginning I should like to point out that I joined the committee on national defence in the very late stages of its deliberations. I was in attendance, however, long enough to realize that the Liberal members who served on this committee were there for the express purpose of feeding to the different witnesses whatever questions the officials of the department wished fed to them. This was a disgraceful performance on their part. With the exception of a few members who had enough on the ball to ask their own questions, the Liberal members were depending on the officials who sat behind them during the committee hearings to feed them questions to which answers were desired.

This afternoon we heard a very weak argument by the minister in respect of the unification bill. For 50 minutes he spoke about equipment and many matters other than the unification bill itself. At no time, other than in the last few closing remarks, did he concentrate in any way on the bill before us. He stood up and misled the house with the suggestion that because of integration or unification of certain operations in the services there had been a saving of 30 to 40 per cent. He used these percentage figures to indicate that there has been a terrific saving. If there is a staff in Washington or London, 30 per cent of that staff would mean the saving of only one person on that particular staff. Therefore his percentage figures will not mean a thing.

I should like to ask the minister to stand up in this house at the proper time and indicate that the percentages which he gave as savings are accurate. I should like him to say whether 30 per cent of a particular group, or 40 per cent of another group, were actually struck off strength or merely transferred to another branch of the service. Is the minister implying that simply by the reduction of a certain staff by these large percentages a saving has been accomplished? It is my understanding of the services that if a man is no longer required in his job he probably is transferred somewhere else.

The saving the minister implies is nonsense, unless the percentages to which he refers apply to people who actually are struck off strength. If he can give us this assurance, I will accept his statement that there is a saving. I suggest, however, that that is not the case. All we need do is look at the estimates for the Department of National Defence. It is nonsense and hogwash for the minister to tell the Canadian people that tremendous savings have been effected in the Department of National Defence.

I might refer back to the minister's propaganda team which sat in the gallery and fed propaganda to him. I say again that the saving the minister has implied is a lot of nonsense. In another place I would call it what it is, bluntly, but the rules do not permit me to do so. As appears at page 1582 of the evidence of the committee the minister wrapped up the summary by saying:

> Finally, may I say that in recommending the changes consequent on this Bill I do not wish to reflect in any way, on individual members of the Armed Forces. They are wonderful people and I am proud of my association with them. I have stated repeatedly, and I mean it with all my

heart, that the men and women of the Canadian Armed Forces are without peer anywhere in this world. They have served Canada well, in war and peace, and they deserve the deepest gratitude of the Canadian people.

Immediately afterward the minister went out and accused a loyal serving officer of the Royal Canadian Navy of being disloyal over an 18 month period. The minister should read his final words when he appeared before the committee when he said "I mean this with all my heart". It is strange that the minister then would go out and accuse a man, such as Admiral Landymore who has displayed loyalty and performed service to his country, of being disloyal over an 18 month period. This is the approach the minister takes. I might say that his remarks were about as far removed from the truth as they could be.

During the question period in the committee the same Minister of National Defence said that Admiral Landymore was fired for 18 months consistent disloyalty to the policies of the people he was paid to serve. Of course the press reports indicated that the minister made an apology in this regard. Having made the apology he then makes another statement which withdraws the apology he had made. In the first place the apology was not one which should have been publicized in the way it was, because the minister did not emphatically withdraw the charges he had made. Having accused Admiral Landymore of disloyalty over an 18 month period the minister, having been placed in a position where he found it necessary to make an apology, if he were any kind of a man, would have resigned his position instead of attempting to lord it over the serving officers in this country.

Not too long ago, after a briefing of the highest order by admirals and other members of the upper echelon of the NATO command, the minister released information which was classified. This is the type of man who speaks of loyalty and disloyalty. Hon. members on the other side are laughing so I shall repeat what I said: The minister should be behind bars. More drastic action might have been taken in other countries under similar circumstances, yet the minister merely stands and talks about disloyalty among serving officers in this country.

• (9:00 p.m.)

How does he back up his charges of disloyalty? During the committee hearings when he was asked about his charges of disloyalty against Admiral Landymore the minister said this, as recorded at page 1624 of the committee proceedings:

I do not think that he had any right to call that kind of a meeting. I do not think he had any right to demand personal loyalty from his officers, and now that you have raised the question I want to make this statement. I have never asked a military officer his politics, his religion, or for his personal loyalty. Yet Admiral Landymore in giving testimony before this committee said that he had extracted a promise from his officers.

The hon. member for Halifax then asked the minister the following question:

Mr. Forrestall: What type of a promise?

Mr. Hellyer: The promise was not to resign.

Because a serving officer asked his men not to resign from their commissions in the navy, the minister accused him of being disloyal over a period of 18 months. As recorded at page 1623 of the committee proceedings, the minister said that Admiral Landymore was fired because of 18 months of consistent disloyalty. The minister stated, as recorded at page 1623:

Yes, I think I could. I would say that following a meeting of commanders in Ottawa, as I recall, on November 19, 1964, Admiral Landymore fully understood what we had in mind. We planned to develop in this country a single service concept and that he was unalterably opposed to it at that stage and that he went back to Halifax to do everything he possibly could to prepare for an ultimate confrontation on the issue.

In reference to what the minister said regarding Admiral Landymore's understanding of the plans for the development of a single force in 1964, let me point out that the former chief of staff, Air Marshal Miller, indicated to the committee at that time there was no discussion about unification whatsoever. He indicated that there was no complete understanding of unification. He had only been retired for six months. How can the minister truthfully accuse Admiral Landymore of taking the action he took with a full understanding of what was to take place as far back as 1964?

The minister was asked why disciplinary action had not been taken against Admiral Landymore. I suggest that the hon. member who just spoke should read some of these answers in order to understand why we should not be limited in our time of debate, but given as much time as hon. members require. Let me remind the committee that the minister and the Prime Minister promised that ample opportunity would be provided for the discussion of this bill. In spite of that promise the Liberal majority on the committee rushed the conclusion of the committee's

sittings, even though it had been indicated that the members wished other witnesses to be heard. Surely this government will not propose closure on this matter in the face of that promise. This committee of the whole house is entitled to all the time it requires to delve into the matter of unification. I accept the Prime Minister's promise and I expect he will live up to it, regardless of what the Minister of National Defence may wish to do. His obligation means nothing. I have not depended on his words or promises for a long time, and in this instance I put my trust in the Prime Minister's promise that we will have an ample opportunity to examine every angle of this proposal for unification.

In answer to questions as to why disciplinary action was not taken against Admiral Landymore the minister said this:

> No. I said if the issue involved had been anything less serious or less comprehensive than the single service concept and he displayed the disloyalty which he did throughout that period, then I would have had to insist that he be court-martialled.

If I have ever heard a ridiculous statement, that surely is it. The minister implied that if the matter was less serious he would have taken more serious action. Where is the logic in that approach? Since the matter was apparently extremely serious he did nothing about it.

I am afraid I can see no logic in that approach. If someone can point out its logic, then I must have a complete misconception of law and justice. Why should a less serious charge for similar action in respect of a less serious subject demand more serious action by the minister? That is an idiotic approach; yet, so is the minister. This is the same type of logic he has shown throughout. The minister has consistently refused to face up to the facts and pay attention to the advice of his senior advisors.

Without further reference to the minister's answers, I should like him to consider again his remarks relating to the incompatibility of Admiral Landymore and his second-in-command. As I recall the situation, the minister said on several occasions that these two officers were incompatible. He was asked where he obtained this information and he indicated that the information came through official channels. Air Marshal Miller was asked to give his understanding of what official channels might mean. He replied that the commanding officer would necessarily initiate communications through official channels.

[Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South).]

In view of what Air Marshal Miller said, the reference by the minister to his information coming through official channels must be ridiculous, because this information must have come from Admiral Landymore. It is not the custom in the services of this country for subordinate officers to bypass their commanding officers when sending in reports. The commanding officer is always aware of what passes through official channels. In spite of this the minister has told us that he heard certain things about Admiral Landymore through official channels. Again I suggest to the minister that this is a lot of nonsense.

It is also interesting to note that the minister in referring to his source of information indicated that he spoke to junior officers. When asked where and when, he replied that he had met these people on many different occasions. The implication was that he could have met them at a cocktail party or something like that. I say to the minister that if he discussed anything in respect of this particular matter with a junior officer anywhere, whether it was at a meeting, a cocktail party, in his home or somewhere else, he was inviting that officer to break the written rule that is laid down which forbids any officer in the services to discuss political matters. Therefore the minister has been contributing to junior officers in the Canadian forces breaking the rules. Of course, what can we expect? What would the minister know about rules?

• (9:10 p.m.)

I understand that the minister is so determined to bring about unification that he is prepared to put his seat on the line on this question. Not everybody in the minister's party supports him. I would remind him that cocktail parties are held around here at which people drop the odd word. Some fellows get pretty loose in the lip at these cocktail parties. The minister should check this out, because he has not the support in his own party that he thinks he has. Perhaps on an occasion such as this somebody overheard the minister threaten to resign his seat and impose another calamity on this government, as though it had not suffered enough calamities already, unless the party saw fit to back him completely on the question of unification.

Having read the evidence of the recently retired chief of staff, according to the press reports the Prime Minister said he thought this matter required further looking into. The press immediately indicated that there would probably be some kind of saw-off in respect of unification. But apparently the minister

went back to the Prime Minister and made another threat, so the Prime Minister, having said he had read Air Chief Marshal Miller's testimony and having indicated that it deserved looking into, has now said he is once again in full support of the minister. The support of the minister has been on and off.

What interests me is that the testimony given to the defence committee by Air Chief Marshal Miller became available to this committee only today. So the Prime Minister was perhaps referring to the coverage given this matter by the press. If that is the case, I suggest that the Prime Minister should read carefully Air Chief Marshal Miller's testimony, and if he made a decision on the basis of press reports, having read this testimony I am sure the Prime Minister, in all fairness to the people of this country and the men and officers serving in the forces, will demand a second look at the unification bill.

In the committee an amendment was moved that before the unified force came into being members of the army, navy and air force, the services which are to disappear when unification becomes effective, be reattested and that each and every individual serving in the forces be given the choice as to whether he was to become a member of the Canadian forces. The Judge Advocate General gave evidence before the committee that this is just a matter of paper, and is not necessary. I say to the minister that it is not just a matter of paper. It always was the practice, but that practice is being discontinued; whether legally, I do not know. However, it would not be difficult to produce for the minister evidence to the effect that men who during the war served in more than one service were discharged from that service before entering another. Having been discharged from that service, anybody who served in two of the services during the war obtained two discharge certificates. I do not know whether this is just a matter of paper, but the evidence given before the committee is something that I will not accept. I can produce for the minister discharges obtained by individuals which show service in the army and in one of the other services. In other words, it is not just a matter of paper, and before a man is signed into one service he must be discharged from the other.

Therefore why should it not follow that if you are going to wipe out the army, navy and air force, the men serving in those forces should be given the choice of entering the unified force? It is said that this is not necessary, but there are a number of precedents in this country which indicate that it is necessary. During a national emergency, a time of war, no man in the services was required to do other than that for which he signed up. I would refer to the "Official History of the Canadian Army", which is recommended reading for the Minister of National Defence, who might learn something from it. I would point out that in the writing of this volume the author was given full access to relevant official documents in the possession of the Department of National Defence. On page 43 is set out the first precedent. This was referred to by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, but it bears repeating because I believe that if you wish to get anything across to this minister you have to keep pounding and pounding and pounding, and even then I doubt whether it will sink in because he has a stubborn attitude, for his own political reasons.

The minister has never denied that he threatened to resign if his party did not back the unification bill. I referred to that matter 10 or 15 minutes ago, and I remember a former Speaker ruling an hon. member out of order for not taking up a question of privilege within seven or ten seconds. I raised this matter 10 or 15 minutes ago, but the minister has never denied that he threatened to resign if his unification bill was not passed. He cannot deny it now on a question of privilege, because the time allowed for this has expired. I would ask the minister to pay particular attention to these words which appear at page 43 of the book to which I have referred:

> "Government decided to place militia on active service in Canada (mobile force). Although all submissions to council were ready and all plans made, we were horrified to hear—"

I repeat that.

> —we were horrified to hear the cabinet decided at the last minute to change the name of the mobile force from "Canadian Field Force" to "Canadian Active Service Force". The result being many changes, torn up stencils, and $65,000 worth of mobilization forms almost useless. Very hectic day—but we managed to get the general order 135/1939 issued and in the mail to all districts.

Here is a clear-cut precedent established during the time of an emergency, wartime, when it was required to re-attest all servicemen just because the cabinet at the last minute changed the name of the force. They were not abolishing any force; they were just changing the name of the force from Canadian Field Force to Canadian Active

Service Force. For the minister's benefit I read the following passage:

General order No. 135 announced that the governor in council had "authorized the organization of a Canadian Active Service Force" and had "named as Corps of the Active Militia" and "placed on active service in Canada" certain specified units. The accompanying schedules listed nearly 300 individual units and formation headquarters, including the headquarters of "1st Corps C.A.S.F.", the whole of the 1st and 2nd Divisions, C.A.S.F., and quotas of corps, army and lines of communication troops. In addition, this order incorporated in the C.A.S.F. the units and details of the non-permanent active militia which had been called out under general order No. 124 to guard vulnerable points and man coast defences. Some additions were now made to the original list. The N.P.A.M. soldiers on duty were attested into the C.A.S.F., except for those not wishing to enlist, who were released in due course.

• (9:20 p.m.)

This again is another well established precedent indicating that when the original list was changed the N.P.A.M. men were reattested into the C.A.S.F., except those who did not wish to enlist. They were released in due course.

The precedents are many, Mr. Chairman, and I do not have time to review them all. However, I will again draw the minister's attention to page 63 of the "Official History of the Canadian Army", where the following statement appears:

The decision to send a force overseas involved changing the basis on which men had so far been enlisted into the Active Service Force.

So the decision to send these men overseas required this change to be made. I continue:

The Minister of National Defence had explained to the House of Commons on September 11 that under the Militia Act (Section 68) no man could be required to serve in the field continuously for a longer period than one year, unless he had volunteered to serve for a longer period or "for the war". He suggested that if a decision were made to use part of the Active Service Force overseas the men might be "re-enlisted for overseas service".

I call to the minister's attention that at this time this country was at war. These men were in the active service of Canada, but before they were sent overseas they were going to be re-enlisted.

The statement issued on 19 september confirmed that this would be done, the men of both divisions being re-attested on a basis of volunteering for service in Canada or elsewhere for the duration of the war. Orders were shortly sent out that the whole of the Active Service Force was to be reattested in this way."

And so it goes on and on, Mr. Chairman. During the war active service personnel were reattested to be sent overseas. This minister, along with his supporters in committee who do not understand the matter, voted against giving the men of our services today the opportunity to be reattested. In other words, they were given no choice whether they want to belong to the unified force or whether they want their discharge. The members of that committee voted against giving our armed services a privilege that this country saw fit to give them even during time of war. They are denying this to our servicemen.

What, in effect, did these members do in denying our forces this privilege, Mr. Chairman? I would draw this matter especially to the attention of the members from Quebec. They voted for conscription—because that is what it is, in effect. There is no voluntary aspect to this unified force unless the men are given the opportunity to be reattested and voluntarily become members of it. Unless this is done, the minister, with the support of the members of that committee, is conscripting every serving man in this country today into this unified force and denying him the right to make his choice.

An hon. Member: Hogwash.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted to his speech has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

The Deputy Chairman: Is there unanimous consent to allow the hon. member to continue his speech?

Some hon. Members: No.

The Deputy Chairman: I regret there is not unanimous consent to allow the hon. member to continue his speech.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Chairman, on a question of privilege I realize I do not have consent but I would draw to the attention of the Minister of National Defence, who this aftertoon spoke for 60 minutes, that the understanding of hon. members was that we would be given the same opportunity. But I can wait. I can come back at him.

Mr. Andras: Mr. Chairman, as a member of the standing committee on national defence one of the things that has shocked, amazed and disturbed me is the superficial nature of the press reporting of the committee hearings. The testimony of many witnesses was only partially reported, usually just the sensational and negative portions of their evidence being

given. Other witnesses were not reported at all.

It is therefore with a great deal of pleasure and admiration that this morning I was able to read in the April 3 edition of the Toronto *Globe and Mail* a first class, and in depth, job of reporting by Mr. Anthony Westell. Mr. Westell, rather than simply accepting the highly sensationalized and one-sided versions from the wire service coverage of the hearings, obviously took the trouble to read the evidence in depth. Because of the professionalism and clarity of his article, and because it represents an independent and not always favourable point of view, I intend to record a considerable portion of this article on the record.

Mr. Churchill: Could the hon. member permit a question at this point? It has to do with Mr. Westell's article. How did Mr. Westell get access to the reports of the committee hearings, which reached the members only today at noon?

Mr. Andras: I quote:

The transcript of evidence taken by the Commons committee on defence, when it was studying the bill to unify the three fighting services, runs to more than 2,000 printed pages, or close to a million words. Searching through the record for the truth about unification is rather worse than reading the verbatim evidence in a hard-fought criminal trial to form an opinion on guilt or innocence.

At a trial at least some of the witnesses are disinterested and impartial; before the defence committee, all the evidence was, in fact, advocacy of a particular point of view, and much of it was impassioned. The admirals, generals and air marshals who appeared were all experts, and for each opinion expressed there was a contradiction of equal authority, but no other evidence.

Mr. Westell goes on:

In these circumstances, the debate—or rather, the trial of unification—is likely to produce far more heat than light, far more confusion than clarification. The jury, which is the public, will hear many speeches intended to sway its emotions, but few which will inform its opinion. All the facts and opinions are already on the record in the transcript of the committee proceedings.

As a background to the debate in the Commons, this is an attempt to isolate and analyze some of the main trends of thought and argument that appeared before the committee. To illustrate the difficulty, and the caution with which judgment must be approached, consider a few quotations:

Rear Admiral Jeffry Brock, fired as Maritime Commander by Defence Minister Paul Hellyer in 1964 and since living in retirement: "Our navy now, and its anti-submarine capability, is greatly diminished from what it was 2½ years ago."

Commodore H. A. Porter, director-general, Maritime Forces, presenting a brief prepared in consultation with the naval staff and present commander of Maritime Forces: "I think from the anti-submarine point of view we are more effective today than we have ever been."

Then Rear Admiral Landymore is cited. His opinion is:

"Unification has very little, if any, merit. It is change for the sake of change. It is unnecessary and expensive. It is oriented politically and not militarily."

On the other hand, the next paragraph states:

Rear Admiral C. J. Dillon, 36 years in the R.C.N., a supply officer who was Deputy Comptroller-General when he retired last year, recalled to undertake a special study for the Defence Staff, and a student of military history: "I think when all the froth is blown off the beer and we get over this period of adjustment these people are embarking on, I suppose I could say my only regret is that I am too old to participate any further... I have often said to people when they have talked about unification, "You ought to belong to my church". I happen to be an adherent of the Church of Rome and it is going through some very traumatic experiences these days. They are probably akin in some ways to what is over the horizon for the services. I think we can rise above this... I certainly will shed a tear for the Royal Canadian Navy, but I think we live in a world where we must adjust to change... I think it is all going to work out all right."

• (9:30 p.m.)

Lt. Gen. R. W. Moncel, vice-chief of the defence forces until he retired last year after becoming convinced that unification was going too far too fast: "... First, to translate the white paper (of 1964) into the force that it called for required, by all my calculations, a force of 150,000 at a budget of $2 million, accruing at 5 per cent. I could never do for less than that, what the white paper said could be done."

Air Chief Marshal Frank Miller, chief of defence staff until he retired last year, questioned about General Moncel's statement: "I do not know where he got those figures; they do not ring any bells with me, and I think they are on the high side for our present commitments... I do not see any real difficulty in our meeting our commitments up until now."

Air Chief Marshal Miller, at the close of his evidence: "... I am in favour of integration as we have it now, as it is developing. I am not closing the book at all on some future unification, but because of the need to get the integration machinery oiled up and working, I would not want a disruptive influence such as unification at this time to be thrown into the machinery."

General J. V. Allard, chief of the defence staff, commander of the Canadian brigade in Korea, a commander of a British division, an amateur yachtsman and a qualified pilot: "I would like to make it clear, therefore, that in making my presentation before you, I do so as the man responsible for carrying out the policy of the government through the Minister of National Defence, for ensuring that the defence forces we have today

are organized, equipped and trained and possess the morale to accept any task they have or are likely to be given...

I feel absolutely confident that this task can be carried out best by the reorganization of the forces as set out in Bill C-243 (the unification bill)".

These are merely a few examples of the contradiction and confusion of evidence before the committee. Critics of unification disagreed on the grounds for opposition. Exponents of the new policy supported it for different reasons.

Most of the critics were officers who had left the services, fired by Mr. Hellyer because they opposed his policies or retired voluntarily because they felt the reorganization of the forces was being pushed too fast. Most of the defenders of unification were serving officers.

There was a tendency in the committee to downgrade the testimony of the serving officers on the grounds that they were not free agents. It was argued that they had to support the government line because they knew Mr. Hellyer would axe them if they criticized. The ex officers, on the other hand, were held up as free agents speaking the unvarnished truth.

This seems unfair. The ex officers were out of the services, in the main, precisely because they opposed unification, and that was the point of view they expressed to the committee. The serving officers remained in the forces and had risen to the top jobs because they supported unification and their evidence was based on that belief. But both sides spoke from a background of distinguished military service and experience, and those who heard General Allard, for example, give his opinion would find it very hard to believe that he would perjure himself to please his minister, any more than Admiral Landymore would tell lies to embarrass Mr. Hellyer. It is easier and fairer to both sides to ascribe their conflicts to honest difference of opinion.

That does not help in making a judgment on which side is right. But some issues seemed to emerge as the main differences as the hearings proceeded.

There was comparatively little opposition to unification in theory or principle. The argument was over practice.

Many of the critics took the position that unification would make sense if Canada were going to concentrate upon development of a mobile peacekeeping force, but would be impossible, or worse, if the intention was to maintain international commitments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Europe and to the United States in the North American Air Defence Command.

Their argument, very simply, appeared to be that the army in Europe operates within the integrated NATO command, that the R.C.A.F. in Europe is part of a larger international force, that the R.C.A.F. co-operates with the U.S. Air Force in the defence of this continent, and the R.C.N. operates as part of the NATO anti-submarine defence. These forces do specialized jobs in their own environment in co-operation with the forces of other countries, and cannot, in good sense, be unified.

If, however, the Canadian forces were to be regrouped to operate independently, as a mobile peacekeeping force to police trouble spots or put out brush fire wars, unification would make sense. The R.C.A.F. would transport the troops and provide close support on the battlefield, and the R.C.N. would run, in effect, a shipping line to carry the heavy equipment. All three services would be operating together to one end.

For example, General Moncel: "In the light of the commitments that are undertaken and which indeed are spelled for us in the white paper, a unified force has no place. Now, if you want to change the commitment to a commitment—I could write one for you if you want—which would call for a unified force, then unification per se is obviously a good thing..."

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. As a result of my experience in the house, I submit it is not open to members to read at length, word for word, from newspaper articles. I have been following the hon. member for Port Arthur for several minutes and he has been quoting verbatim almost a whole column of this morning's *Globe and Mail* article on the question of unification. An hon. member may make reference to a newspaper article, but certainly not put it on the record of the house in extenso. The hon. member must be in a position to speak for himself, notwithstanding the qualifications of the man who may have written the newspaper article or the work he has put into it. Certainly, let us have the member's own views but not newspaper articles.

The Chairman: I think I would have to agree that the point of order raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West is well taken. It is not improper for a member to read from newspaper articles to support an argument that he is presenting to the house. However, up to this point the hon. member's speech has consisted almost entirely of the newspaper article. I hope the hon. member will conclude his remarks on that particular aspect as soon as possible and get along with his remarks on clause 2 of the bill.

Mr. Andras: With the greatest of respect, Mr. Chairman, I stated at the beginning that I was going to quote at great length from the article written by Mr. Westell. I feel it is absolutely pertinent to the debate, and I have a purpose at which I will arrive in concluding my speech. Unless there is a distinct ruling otherwise, I would ask your indulgence and continue to quote these very useful comments made by Mr. Westell. He goes on to report, for example, that General Moncel—

The Chairman: Order, please. I must again interrupt the hon. member and advise him that it is not improper for him to read a newspaper article to support his own argument. However, I believe it is improper for him to read a newspaper article which, up to

this point, has formed his speech in totality. I hope the hon. member will co-operate and make his own remarks on clause 2 of the bill.

Mr. Pickersgill: Perhaps Your Honour would permit me to raise a point of order which may possibly have been overlooked. I believe there have been rulings from the Chair on a number of occasions that any hon. member may quote from any source at all as long as he is willing to make the source his own and say that the views he is putting forward are the views he has adopted as his own. If one looks at the references he will find many to support this view. It is perhaps more frank to do this honestly and openly and admit who wrote the article than to deliver a speech in this house, the authorship of which is not so apparent.

Mr. Starr: They are all over on the other side.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, I would refer Your Honour as well to citation 144 on page 124 of Beauchesne which reads:

> It is a rule in both houses of parliament that a member must address the house orally and not read from a written, previously prepared speech, for the reason that, "if the practice of reading speeches should prevail, members might read speeches that were written by other people, and the time of the house be taken up in considering the arguments of persons who were not deserving of their attention.

Now, Mr. Chairman, so far, the hon. member for Port Arthur, as has been pointed out, has said almost nothing, but has read from a report appearing in one of the morning newspapers which is readily available to every member of this house if he wishes to read it. I suggest the point is well taken. Just referring to the article without taking the responsibility for the remarks being quoted is improper on two counts. First, hon. members should not refer extensively to newspaper reports and, second, they are not supposed to read their speeches. I am interested in the hon. member's thoughts, not in the ideas of some newspaper reporter.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Mr. Brewin: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, may I refer to the contribution by the Minister of Transport. He said, as I understand it, that it is all right to read from the newspaper article if the hon. member adopts that article. How can he adopt the article when it contains a variety of views expressed by other people, some of which are clearly inconsistent with each other.

I have listened carefully to what the hon. member has read. In my view it is an excellent article but I would prefer to read it myself rather than hearing the hon. member read it in the house. In any event, it is impossible for the hon. member to make those views his own. As I have said, a great many of the views are ones that I would adopt, but they are inconsistent with other views in the article. How the hon. member can adopt this article as his own I fail to understand.

Mr. Pickersgill: Perhaps I ought to say something, as the hon. member has challenged me directly. I read the article this morning, and I thought it was an excellent and judicious article containing many apt quotations. One could take those quotations, as Mr. Westell did, from the proceedings of the committee. If they were taken from the committee proceedings no one in the house would argue that it was improper to quote them. The mere fact that they were reprinted in the *Globe and Mail* does not make them any less quotations expressed during the committee proceedings. The hon. member does not need to accept those views, but interlarded with the quotations are the very sensible judgments of Mr. Westell, with which in the main I found it hard to disagree since they contain so much common sense, and which seem to lead obviously, and almost inevitably to a conclusion which may be distasteful to some hon. members. I did not find them distasteful, and obviously the hon. member for Port Arthur does not find them distasteful.

If he feels that Mr. Westell was able to put in convenient language the sentiments that he feels, it surely should not be wrong for him to be permitted to express them. At least he is honest enough to say who had produced them.

I can well remember a distinguished member of this house, the late Mackenzie King, quoting at great length from a speech of Winston Churchill without attribution until it was all over. Then he made a complete and frank confession. Mr. King was always frank.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: He revealed his source and nobody took exception to that.

I remember an occasion, when I was on the other side of the house, when I took up a sheet of paper to read column after column because, as I said, I wanted to be quite sure that my views on that occasion were put accurately. During the course of that reading Mr. Donald Fleming, who was sitting here,

interrupted me to say: "Nonsense. The hon. member is talking nonsense." Then I revealed that I had been quoting from something Mr. Donald Fleming has said three or four years before. Nobody said that was contrary to the rules. I suggest, in the spirit of the debates in this house, the hon. member for Port Arthur is following hallowed traditions.

Mr. Churchill: You are talking about parliamentary speeches.

Mr. Baldwin: What the Minister of Transport said may be true, but I would think that the article the hon. member for Port Arthur is quoting from does comment on proceedings which took place in a committee of this house, and as such the hon. member clearly infringed the rules. A committee of the house is part of the house. Citation 157 (5) of Beauchesne's fourth edition says this:

> It is not in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or communications emanating from persons outside the House and referring—

I emphasize "referring":

> —to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the house.

When the hon. member quotes from a newspaper article which refers to proceedings in a committee of the house and the hon. member seeks to use that in debate, I submit he clearly infringes this very definite rule.

The Chairman: Order, please. I think the committee has spent sufficient time on the point of order. I shall refer to the ruling made in the first instance. There is nothing wrong with a member's using an article from a newspaper to support an argument he is making. Perhaps this is a good time to suggest that the hon. member for Port Arthur be allowed to proceed with his remarks.

Mr. Andras: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I started by saying that one of the things that shocked me during the deliberations of the committee on national defence was the superficial reporting undertaken by the press. In quoting, as I said quite frankly at the beginning, at great length from the article by Mr. Westell, I was illustrating the difference between superficial and good reporting. Almost everything that Mr. Westell has said is pertinent to this matter, and will add weight to the deliberations of the committee.

Mr. Churchill: Let us have some quotations from the superficial reports.

Mr. Andras: I am sure we will have those later from the other side of the house.

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

For example, General Moncel said this:

> In the light of the commitments that are undertaken and which indeed are spelled for us in the White Paper, a unified force has no place. Now if you want to change the commitment to a commitment—I could write one for you if you want—which would call for a unified force, then unification per se is obviously a good thing—

Mr. Westell went on to say that this was the position which the New Democratic Party took from the beginning of the hearings, and it is the position from which they emerged at the end.

Mr. Nasserden: On a point of order, the hon. member who has the floor is deliberately breaking one of the rules of the house found in paragraph 6 of citation 157 of Beauchesne's fourth edition. In part that says the following:

> The rule is quite clear, that the quoting of a newspaper, an author or a book which reflects upon debate before the House, either directly or indirectly is entirely out of order, because members are here to give their own opinion and not to quote the opinion of others... Members may quote an article or a book stating facts, but a commentary on any proceeding or any discussion in the house, with the object of swinging an opinion to one side or the other, is out of order.

It is clear that the hon. member is contravening the rules of this house.

An hon. Member: Why not table the newspaper?

Mr. Andras: This was the position which the New Democratic Party took—

The Chairman: Order, please. I have already stated to the committee and to the hon. member the view the Chair takes with respect to the reading at length from a newspaper article. I invite the hon. member for Port Arthur to now proceed to his own remarks on clause 2 of Bill C-243.

Mr. Starr: He should resume his seat. He has no ideas of his own.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. Andras: One of the difficulties is that there is so much of this article with which I thoroughly agree that I would most certainly have not strayed far from it had I used it as a basis for my remarks. If I may, I will continue to quote extracts and quote from the committee reports which are pertinent to the point I was making. One of them is the contradictions in the evidence given by many of the retired officers who appeared before us. On this question of commitments, which the New Democratic Party found to be of such

great importance to them during the committee deliberations, the article says:

> Unfortunately, it is not that simple. Commitments to NATO are not immutable and are, even now, in the process of changing. And there is no clear line to be drawn between forces committed to NATO and those designated for peacekeeping, or restoring peace where limited war has broken out. Finally, there is no agreement among the critics of unification that a unified force would not be useful to NATO.
>
> As Air Chief Marshal Miller said: "I do not think there is any unanimity as to whether a unified force was a good contribution to NATO.

Mr. Churchill: Can the hon. member give us a page reference? On a point of order, the hon. member said he intended to give quotations from the evidence. Will he not give the page reference so that we can follow what he is reading in the evidence and see whether his statements are accurate?

Mr. Andras: I do not think I have time to do the detailed homework for the hon. gentleman.

The air chief marshal was saying he did not think there was any unanimity as to whether a unified force was a good contribution to NATO. Asked if a peace keeping force was compatible with commitment to NATO—

An hon. Member: Who asked that question?

Mr. Andras: Air Chief Marshal Miller replied:

> "Yes, exactly. It can be made up from elements of forces we need for NATO . . . I do not see that unification will add or subtract from our ability in any way in this."
>
> The committee spent a lot of its time arguing about commitments, but the picture never did emerge very clearly. Admiral Landymore, for one, was convinced that unification implied a secret intention by Mr. Hellyer to withdraw from international alliances. Mr. Hellyer insisted that the policy remains exactly as stated in the White Paper of 1964—to maintain existing commitments and, in addition, to build up capability for peacekeeping.

The article says, on this point:

> Asked whether Canada had intimated to its allies its intention to vary the commitment of the air division, (in Europe) Mr. Hellyer replied: "The modest reduction that is taking place this year has already been agreed. In so far as the future is concerned, we will have to indicate this to NATO, if my memory serves me correctly, in December of this year . . . We are not required to reveal our intention or to discuss our future plans and commitments except at that time . . . I think that during the course of the year, we will have to decide what to do for the following five-year period . . ."
>
> Considerations of foreign policy, obviously enough, influence Mr. Hellyer's position. While the defence committee was meeting, External Affairs Minister Paul Martin told the Senate foreign affairs committee that Canada cannot unilaterally withdraw forces from NATO without seriously endangering the stability of the alliance. But Mr. Martin did not rule out a change in the military commitment.

Mr. Harkness: On a point of order. The hon. member who now has the floor is deliberately and flagrantly disobeying your instruction and your ruling. He is continuing to read word for word from this newspaper article during the last two or three minutes, in spite of the fact that you have warned him he was not to do so. I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to see that your ruling is observed.

Mr. Andras: I should like to continue to make my point as to the contrast between the evidence given by the various witnesses, and if in doing so my remarks coincide very closely with this newspaper article in the *Globe and Mail* of April 3, it is a close coincidence.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Andras: I continue to paraphrase the article.

Mr. Brewin: Is the hon. member reading or not reading excerpts from the article by Mr. Westell in the *Globe and Mail*?

Mr. Andras: I am attempting to paraphrase it, Mr. Chairman, and to use quotations from the deliberations of the committee in establishing the contrast between the evidence given by the various witnesses.

The Secretary of State pointed out that air portable forces stationed in Canada are already committed to the defence of NATO's northern flank in Norway. Since he spoke, another mobile force in Canada has been committed to the NATO southern flank in time of war. It appears clear from all the evidence, but is nowhere officially stated, that the Canadian intention is to allow the R.C.A.F. nuclear attack force to run down until it passes out of existence in the 70's, but to replace it as a contribution to NATO with mobile ground forces carried by new transport aircraft supported by the new CF-5 ground attack naval plane, and backed by naval transport. This would be a unified force committed to NATO. It would also be the peace keeping or peace restoring force able to operate under UN command.

As several witnesses made clear, the double commitment of this force rests on the calculated gamble that Canada will not be asked to undertake peace keeping missions at the same time as it is called upon by NATO for

action in Europe. The argument appears to be that if a major war breaks out in Europe, no one will worry about keeping the peace elsewhere; second, that as major war is unlikely as long as NATO keeps up its guard, Canadian forces may as well be usefully employed on peace missions.

There is thus no clear line to be drawn between commitment to NATO and peacekeeping. The roles overlap, and the assumption of peace keeping responsibility does not necessarily involve withdrawing from NATO, or even a significant weakening of Canada's military contribution. The commitment argument, therefore, is not decisive, or even very enlightening, in resolving the dispute over unification.

Mr. Starr: You have lost your authority, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: I will have to ask the hon. member to co-operate with the Chair and, in the time which remains to him, to proceed with his own remarks on clause 2.

Mr. Andras: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to establish that one of the important factors in the deliberations of the defence committee or, for that matter, in any other committee of the house is a dependence upon the formation of public opinion by objective, hard working reporting in depth. I think the article from which I have been quoting reflects these qualities. Since I am prevented from quoting it completely I commend it to every member of this house, particularly to those who did not have the opportunity to sit on the defence committee. It is an admirable condensation and an excellent summary of the issue before us.

I believe the press has a responsibility to report fully and objectively. It is possible that the debate upon which we are now engaged will be prolonged and impassioned, and in order that the public may judge the issue on its merits I hope the standard of reporting matches that from which I have just quoted. If so, it will have done a great service to the public. This article contains, in my opinion, a very rational approach to the subject before us. It weighs the issues rather than the personalities and I believe we in the house for the balance of this debate might well adopt the objective thinking embodied in this article by Mr. Westell.

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

Progress reported.

[Mr. Andras.]

• (10:00 p.m.)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

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

TRANSPORT—REQUEST FOR RESTORATION OF SERVICE ON KETTLE VALLEY RAILROAD

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, on March 17 last, as recorded at page 14117 of *Hansard*, I asked the following question of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill):

> Mr. Speaker, I wish to transport a question to the Minister of Transport which is of national significance . . . Has the minister received a resolution approved by the annual meeting of the Kootenay-Boundary Chambers of Commerce calling for the restoration of passenger service on the Kettle Valley railway from Vancouver to Medicine Hat? If so, what consideration has been given to these representations which are supported by 150,000 people of all parties in British Columbia?

Whereupon Mr. Speaker said:

> This question of national significance should be placed on the order paper.

I fully understand that Mr. Speaker could not be expected to appreciate fully that this matter was of urgent and great concern to these 150,000 people in southeastern British Columbia. It has been of great concern to many organizations and the people I have mentioned for over five years because of the possibility of loss of this service from 1962 on, —and in that connection I hope I keep in line with the rules, even though I wish to quote from a press release by a man known as H. W. Herridge, parliamentary leader of the New Democratic Party and member for Kootenay West. This is the press release:

> THE ABANDONMENT OF RAILWAY SERVICES MUST STOP
>
> The government of Canada gave the Canadian Pacific Railway millions of acres of land and billions of dollars worth of natural resources in exchange for the building of a railroad. It seems that the C.P.R. has now forgotten all about these fabulous grants it received for providing services to the public. The C.P.R. continues to enjoy and profit from full possession of land and resources granted long ago but insists that all present services must be directly related to present profits derived from these services. Hardly a week goes by without the C.P.R. doing its best to fire an agent, discontinue passenger service or abandon a branch line.
>
> Will this practice be carried on until the C.P.R. tries to abandon the transcontinental railway line while remaining in full possession of the right of way?

The C.P.R.'s current proposal to abandon passenger service on the Kettle Valley Railway will be vehemently opposed. It is bad enough already that the C.P.R., which is the majority stockholder in the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company, should operate the Kettle Valley line basically for the convenience of its subsidiary. It will be far worse if the interests of the people of the Kootenays be ignored entirely. Should railway passenger service be abandoned, people will no longer be able to reach several areas. Alternative modes of passenger transportation just do not exist.

The Board of Transport Commissioners should refuse to authorize any further removal of agents, curtailment of services or abandonment of branch lines until a complete and co-ordinated national transportation policy has been worked out.

This, and this alone, can ensure efficiency for the railways, justice for their workers, convenience for our people, and progress for our communities.

I might say that later on all the municipalities between Lethbridge and Penticton protested the abandonment of this passenger service, all the chambers of commerce, all the unions in the area, the Canadian Legion branches, women's institutes, in fact everybody who could be mobilized to organize the protest before the Board of Transport Commissioners when it held hearings.

Now, Mr. Speaker, quite recently this matter arose again as the result of my bringing the question to the attention of the Minister of Transort during the debate on the transportation bill, and I received a letter from Mr. Guy Constable, of Creston, a very prominent Liberal in Kootenay East, who thoroughly endorsed my efforts. At the Kootenay-Boundary Chambers of Commerce meeting on March 10 he presented the following resolution:

Whereas passenger train service on what is known as Crowsnest-Kettle Valley Railway was discontinued in 1964 by reason of the ruling of the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada under section 314(1) of the Railway Act, it having been represented by the Canadian Pacific Railway that the train service was uneconomic, and

Whereas under Bill No. C-231 passed by parliament January 24th 1967 being legislation to define and implement a national transportation policy for Canada and to amend the Railway Act it is declared in clause No. 1 that an economic and efficient transportation service is essential to the well-being and growth of Canada, and

Whereas by the discontinuance of passenger train service as aforementioned 150,000 people in south-eastern British Columbia are deprived of service over this railway which runs from Vancouver to Medicine Hat, and alternative means of transportation are inadequate and unreliable and hazardous, especially during the winter months, and

Whereas the railway company has failed to develop and promote passenger train service, has been subsidized by grants of varying nature and by accounting methods separating freight and passenger receipts has represented to the Board of Transport Commissioners that passenger service is operated at a loss.

Now therefore be it resolved that representations be made to the Minister of Transport requiring the Canadian Pacific Railway to re-establish daily passenger train service between Vancouver and Medicine Hat via Crowsnest-Kettle Valley Railway with day coach and cafe sleeper car service, or in the alternative that the Canadian National Railways be granted running rights over this rail route.

This was the subject of a very interesting discussion at the annual meeting of the Kootenay-Boundary Chambers of Commerce. Later on I find the following in the Trail *Times* of March 10 ,1967:

Unanimous approval was given Monday to a resolution calling for restoration of the Dayliner service from Vancouver to Medicine Hat, Alta.

The resolution was the first approved at the annual meeting of Kootenay-Boundary Chambers of Commerce.

I am quoting briefly from this newspaper report.

Speaking to the motion, Mr. Constable said he had been in contact with Kootenay West M.P. Bert Herridge who had encouraged reinstatement of the service.

Mr. Herridge quoted the Minister of Transport as saying, "It is a very interesting suggestion and well worth consideration by the organizations concerned."

I could go on at great length about this, but I do urge the minister to give consideration to the wishes of the people in this area, and to a reconsideration of the Board of Transport Commissioners ruling which denied passenger service since 1964, so that we will be able to enjoy the passenger service which the people in this area are looking forward to in the future.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, in replying on this subject I regret that I have to substitute for my parliamentary secretary, because this subject is one which would be a little closer to him geographically than it is to me. I do not regret, however, that I do not have the despotic powers which I am sure the hon. member really does not believe I have, but which he suggests I might have—

Mr. Herridge: Does the cabinet not have the power?

Mr. Pickersgill: —to compel the Canadian Pacific Railway or even the Canadian National Railways to institute a passenger service. I think the hon. gentleman has used this forum, as is very proper, to voice a grievance of his constituents. I will be glad to draw a

copy of *Hansard* with these interesting newspaper quotations from several other important sources as well as himself to the attention of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I will also draw them to the attention of the Board of Transport Commissioners and in both cases suggest that they give them the kind of serious consideration the hon. gentleman requests.

IMMIGRATION—REPORTED DISCRIMINATION IN ADMISSION OF IMMIGRANTS FROM POLAND

Mr. Ralph Cowan (York-Humber): Mr. Speaker, the other day I rose to ask a question of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) regarding a Polish applicant who wishes to remain in Canada, having arrived here on a visitor's visa. At that time Mr. Speaker ruled that the question should be discussed at another time. I presume he meant on the adjournment debate as it is called. The adjournment debate allows but seven minutes discussion on the part of the person asking the question and three minutes of reply on behalf of the cabinet.

• (10:10 p.m.)

I am raising this question in respect of an individual by the name of Joseph Gruszka. I knew that if I were to ask a member of the cabinet to explain the phrase "non-discriminatory selection policy" which appears in the white paper on Canadian immigration policy 1966 at page 38 no one would be able to explain the three words "non-discriminatory selection policy" since "non-discriminatory" cancels out "selection" and "selection" cancels out "non-discriminatory. So a policy of non-discriminatory selection when boiled down means no policy at all. I do not mind there being an immigration policy, for this country, but I do object to people referring to it in praiseworthy terms when it does not justify the adjectives applied to it. We have discrimination in this proposed immigration policy just as we had in the past. In view of that fact, it is beyond my comprehension why we should be given a white paper that says there is no discrimination.

We in this country have been wringing our hands in sorrow because of the statement we have a brain drain to other countries throughout the world. I have said on more than one occasion I do not believe the brain drain is operating against Canada, because we are attracting more brains to Canada than are leaving because of the attractions of other countries.

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

In the case of Joseph Gruszka we are picking the brains of Poland and evidently telling Poland that having picked its brains we do not want the children of the sixth member of the family although we have accepted five members of that family already. Let me advise the house that there is a family by the name of Kawa living right across the street from me in the city of Toronto. There are five members of this family, two brothers and three sisters. Three of them are Canadian citizens, the other two not having lived in Canada long enough to qualify for Canadian citizenship. I understand they intend to apply the moment they have met residence requirements.

A sixth member of the Kawa family remained in Poland. Unfortunately he passed away in Poland, leaving a married daughter, the wife of Joseph Gruszka. He came to Canada last fall to visit his five uncles and aunts, whom we gladly accepted into this country. We show our non-discriminatory selection process by selecting these five members of the Kawa family to live in this country but when the son-in-law of the sixth member of that family, the man who died in Poland, endeavours to join his five uncles and aunts, he is told to get out of the country, and get out fast.

Not only was Mr. Gruszka instructed by the immigration office in Toronto to leave Canada, but the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) wrote a letter dated February 28 stating that Mr. Gruszka does not meet our requirements. It is very odd to me that five members of the Kawa family, now living in Toronto, met the immigration requirements, yet this sixth member is told that he cannot meet the requirements. We certainly picked the brains of Poland to the benefit of Canada in this regard and I hope we will stop wringing our hands about the unfair treatment we are receiving as a result of people from Canada emigrating to other countries. We are going out of our way to encourage the best people from other lands to come to Canada. Why do we say to the children of the sixth member of this Kawa family that they are not fit to be with us?

The recent white paper on immigration was flashed before the Liberal party by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, and we were supposed to cheer and support it in every way. Apparently these white papers come down from heaven. This white paper includes several references to restrictions, selections, and non-discrimination. However, in

the letter dated February 28 from the minister to myself he states in the first page:

> If nothing were done, the whole process of preselection of suitable and desirable immigrants would be disrupted.

How can we have pre-selection with non-discrimination as stated at page 38 of the white paper on immigration, which I have in my hand? Rather than ordering these people out of the country and stating that we have no discrimination, let us be fair and say that if the five uncles and aunts are acceptable, the children of the sixth member of the family are equally acceptable. I outlined in another place the kind of people who live on the street where I live. I have a vice president of an insurance company living alongside of me. We also have living on our street the general manager and vice president of a Canadian branch of an American concern. Next to him lives the owner of one of the biggest tea houses in Canada. Next to him lives a Canadian who owns two or three hotels and next to him lives the widow of the president of one of the great express companies of Canada, and next door lives a doctor. Right across the road from us live these Kawa immigrants.

Does that look as though Mr. Kawa could not look after his nephew, aged 28, who is over here; because if he can afford to move into the territory I have just named, he must be doing all right in this country of his adoption. This white paper talks about the fine people that we are bringing into Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I must advise the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) that the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. J. C. Munro (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, of course when the white paper claims that these non-discriminatory selection criteria are used it is in effect stating that the selection criteria being used will be the same with respect to proposed immigrants from all countries. There have been selection criteria based on part 31 of the regulations which have favoured one country over another in bringing immigrants into this country, as the hon. member well knows. It is the hope under the white paper that this type of discrimination in the application of selection criteria will be removed; that is why the term "non-discriminatory selection criteria" is used in the white paper.

Mr. Cowan: The term is contradictory.

Mr. Munro: It is not contradictory, if the hon. member would just listen to the explanation. It is based on the determination of the white paper to remove discrimination as between different countries, which has not been the situation heretofore.

Getting back to the question of Mr. Gruszka, he came to Canada as a visitor. I would advise the hon. member that my information is that his relatives indicated an interest in bringing him here as a visitor. He came here as a visitor, he was admitted in good faith as a visitor last November, and his wife and children are still in Poland. He then made application for landing, to stay here permanently, and it was refused. The minister has received representations, no doubt including those of the hon. member, and is giving consideration to them at the present time.

HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS—LOUISBOURG FORTRESS—RETURN TO WORK OF MEN LAID OFF

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I had occasion to ask the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Laing) whether the government had changed their attitude in respect of the policy of the development of Fortress Louisbourg. First of all I wish to convey my thanks to the minister for making himself available at this late hour, taking upon himself the responsibility of dealing with this matter and not delegating it to an assistant. I have chosen to make my representation at this time mainly because in order to have arrived at what might have been considered a satisfactory or more detailed answer would have required a number of supplementary questions being asked in the house this afternoon, and that of course would not have been too desirable at that time.

With respect to the development of Fortress Louisbourg, I need not impress upon the minister, because he is well aware of it, that this is a very worth while and necessary project in Cape Breton at this time because of the very acute unemployment situation there. It would probably be well to review some of the developments in respect of this project. Again, I am only repeating something about which the minister is probably well aware. Some time ago there was an intended lay-off at Louisbourg, and when this was brought to the minister's attention he was kind enough to make arrangements which meant that the lay-off did not take place.

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

• (10:20 p.m.)

Last November, I think it was, a similar lay-off was proposed. At that time an indication, whether official or not, was given that no money was available under the winter works program. Therefore this lay-off was the result. We made representations to the minister which clearly indicated that the only change in the financing of the winter works program was the doing away with the $500 winter home building bonus. This was admitted by the minister of manpower and the Minister of Labour. This fact having been brought to the attention of the minister the proposed lay-off last November was cancelled.

The answer that I received to my question this afternoon was this. I asked whether there had been any change in attitude toward this development—I do not know whether I am using the exact wording but the import of the question was the same—and the minister replied that he was not aware of any policy change in respect of the development of Fortress Louisbourg. If there had been a policy change the minister, of course, would be the first to know, in that this project comes under his administration. I accept the answer he gave this afternoon, even with the rider "not that I am aware of".

In case I am wrong, I should now like to impress upon the minister the great need for this government to do whatever it can to maintain the present employment situation in Cape Breton. I should not ask the government to maintain it as it is; I mean at least to keep it from sliding further back. To maintain it would hardly be the appropriate phrase to use, because I should like to see the government make an effort very much to improve the situation.

An opportunity to improve the employment situation there is very much presented by this development. The minister is well aware of what it means to the tourist trade in the area, and I impress upon the minister the need to consider the welfare of the people who have been working there, some of whom were laid off the past Friday, after having worked the project four to five years.

If there has been no change in the government's plans for this development, I see no reason why men who have been employed on this project for this length of time should now be given notice that their jobs are no longer available and that their service is no longer required. I would once again ask the minister to review this situation. If he is able to take the same action that he took on two previous occasions when lay-offs were proposed, I would thank him very much for it. I am also sure there would be expressions of appreciation from all the people involved in the lay-off, which I understand affects more than 40 workers. I would ask the minister to give every consideration to maintaining their status on the Louisbourg project.

[Mr. MacInnis.]

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has dealt with this matter of the building of the Louisbourg Fortress. I think it is important that we go into a little bit of history.

This project was advised a number of years ago by the Rand commission which investigated the coal situation on the island at that time. They suggested that the surplus labour there should be used on something constructive, and it was suggested that we should rebuild old Fortress Louisbourg. It was thought at that time that we should probably expend as much as $12 million to make it a gigantic tourist attraction, which I think it will become. So far we have expended about $5.5 million.

The hon. member asked whether there have been any changes. There have been changes since I took over the department. When I came to my department I found that those men were being paid $1.09 an hour, and I said that in my view a man could not be employed in these days at $1.09 an hour and produce anything. Since that time we have increased the wages by more than 50 per cent, and today I think we are getting more work out of these men.

However, I have the responsibility of creating something there. I do not want people digging around the place interminably, for a generation. We want to raise something above the ground which will be an attraction to people. The building that has been completed is a very fine one. We have for two or three years been keeping men throughout the wintertime, endeavouring to work outside in a climate which I am sure my hon. friend will admit is not one which men would ordinarily encounter. This last year, in response to representations made by my colleague the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen), we once again took on 44 men. This was not an official winter works program, but it was a works program within our own department to keep these men occupied during the wintertime.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am quite certain that a number of these men would have been drawing social assistance if they were not going to work. Weather conditions there are such in the wintertime that not a great deal of work can be done. We have exhausted the money. We exhausted it on March 31, and we have laid off the 44 men. They have been told that when we get to work again in the summertime,—and it is the summertime when we can get the greatest return from the men, because it is easier to work then—they will be taken on again as rapidly as possible. These 44 men will be given first call, except the odd one to whom we have indicated we are not going to be bound to take back.

There are a few of them we do not want back because we want work done there. We will be taking them back as soon as we can, probably in the month of May. The work is progressing fairly well. We are keeping relatively within our costs, but I want to have something produced. When completed, this will be an attraction for visitors, but until it is completed it is not going to be an attraction for visitors.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

APPENDIX

ANSWER TO QUESTION RESPECTING WATER EXPORT TO U.S.

Question No. 2,535—**Mr. Irvine:**

1. What is the present attitude of the government concerning the export of Canada's water resources to the United States?

2. Does Canada have a defined program for the assessment of present and potential water resources and, if so, what is that program in detail?

3. Has the government conducted studies to determine Canada's future water needs and the possibility of exportation of water to the United States and, if so (a) when and by whom (b) what were the terms of reference?

4. Has the government received from the government of the United States any invitation to discuss generally the long-term question of water export?

5. Does the government recognize a federal responsibility for conservation of water resources, and is there a national plan of conservation (conservation including control systems and pollution abatement measures)?

6. Is the government holding, or has it held conferences with provincial governments in connection with water resources and, if so (a) when (b) what were the results of such conferences?

7. What is the mechanism for acting upon recommendations of the international joint commission that apply to Canadian or partly Canadian water resources?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Departments of Energy, Mines and Resources and External Affairs as follows:

1. The present attitude of the government with respect to water export was discussed by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources in the House of Commons June 28, 1966 (*Hansard*, page 6997). In brief he pointed out that the question has not arisen in any concrete form, because there is at present no buyer and no seller. For our internal water management needs and to obtain knowledge which may be used to advise on export questions which may arise in the future, the government of Canada has undertaken and is undertaking, directly and in co-operation with the provinces, a large number of programs designed to increase knowledge of the water resources of Canada and to determine alternative means of developing these resources to meet present and future requirements for all purposes in the different basins and regions of Canada. The government proposes to strengthen and accelerate these programs as rapidly as resources permit and necessary arrangements with the provinces concerned can be made.

As a result of existing survey, mapping, resource inventory, planning and research programs, there is now a considerable body of information concerning the quantity, quality and potential for development of water resources in various river basins in Canada. Coverage is not adequate in many areas, however, and a systematic and rapid extension of resource inventory, comprehensive basin planning, water quality surveys, research and other programs is underway or proposed.

Information respecting existing water uses and future requirements for all purposes in the different basins and regions of Canada is, at present, quite inadequate for purposes of planning and policy formulation. This information is available for those basins in which joint federal-provincial planning studies have been undertaken and in certain other areas. Programs to develop a national inventory of water uses, to assess future water requirements, and, more generally, to study the growing economic implications of water development must be significantly and rapidly increased in co-operation with the provinces. Programs in these and related fields are under active consideration by government officials and discussions are being initiated with the provinces.

Investigation and studies undertaken through the above and other programs should enable the government of Canada and the provinces to determine the probable future requirements for water in the different basins and regions of Canada; the available supply of water to meet these requirements; and alternative plans and programs for development. These investigations will also indicate whether there is, or may be a surplus in any region available for export. The governments of Canada and of the provinces concerned will require this and other information to establish jointly a position on export if and when the government of the United States indicates that it might wish to consider the possible importation of water from Canada. This work is being undertaken by the newly established Water Sector of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, in co-operation with the provinces.

2. Canada has a large program for the assessment of present and potential water resources. This program concerns measurement and assessment of the quantity, distribution and quality of waters throughout the country.

(i) Streamflow Measurement: The first streamflow measurement in Canada by the federal government was made in 1894. An

organized program was initiated in 1908, has grown in size since and is being considerably expanded at the present time.

Approximately 2,300 streamflow and water level gauging stations are now maintained in Canada to provide records of water level and flow of many of the nation's lakes and rivers. Of this total some 2,000 are maintained by the federal government and 300 by the province of Quebec, which operates its own survey for this purpose.

The federal government plans to instal 200 additional gauging stations during fiscal year 1967-68 to increase its network coverage.

The capital cost of establishing gauging stations specifically requested by a province is shared by that province. The provinces also contribute to the operating costs of these stations. The federal government pays all of the costs for those stations it requires, and maintains the necessary national organization to implement the survey program. Other co-operating agencies share in the costs of the stations they request.

Surveys of suspended sediment are made of many rivers under observation that carry a significant concentration of solids and where the solids are likely to create problems in water management and use.

(ii) Chemical Water Quality Network: A chemical water quality network is being established by the federal government throughout the country with provincial co-operation, and is expected to increase to about 250 stations during 1967. Chemical quality studies lead to assessment of the hardness, physical characteristics, colour, potability and methods of treatment for municipal and industrial use. During the past 20 years reconnaissance assessments have been made of the chemical water quality of many of Canada's river drainage basins. This program is now being intensified and extended.

(iii) Groundwater: Studies of groundwater resources are being expanded through establishing a national observation well network in co-operation with the provinces. Assessment of the reserve in aquifers, the replenishment or recharge of groundwater, the potential yield rates and an understanding of hydrogeological features are all included in this program.

(iv) Glaciology: A glaciological program includes the measurement of mass balance, that is the increase or decrease of the reserves of glacial ice due to climatic variation. Five glaciers in British Columbia and Alberta, selected as indicative of various climatic conditions, are under critical observation during the ten year period 1965-1974. Glaciers are a significant source of supply of water to certain streams in the Western mountain region.

In addition to these largely federal programs considerable information on water resources is gathered continually by provinces.

3. (a) See answer to Question 1 above re studies respecting export.

(b) No comprehensive nationwide studies have been conducted on Canada's future water needs. The government of Canada directly, and in co-operation with the provinces has conducted a number of studies which have included some assessment of future water requirements within certain river basins, these included—the Fraser river study, the Columbia river studies, the Lakes Winnipeg and Manitoba study, and the Ottawa river engineering board study. Reports on these have been tabled in the House.

Other studies of smaller basins have been made on behalf of the International Joint Commission.

Some of the provinces maintain a continuing inventory of water use through the application of water licensing procedures, but an inventory for all Canada has not been maintained. The federal and Ontario governments, through a co-operative arrangement, are conducting studies of northern Ontario waters. One phase of these studies relates to present and possible future uses of these waters. The water resources branch publishes annually "Electric Power in Canada" which contains an inventory of developed and known hydro power sites in Canada.

In addition the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources is initiating discussions with provinces on the most efficient methods of conducting a comprehensive Canada water inventory of present use and future needs. An inventory of existing uses will be required before adequate consideration could be given to the determination of Canada's future water needs.

4. There has been no request by the government of the United States to the government of Canada to discuss the export of water from Canada to the United States.

The question of export has arisen at this time mainly because of private initiatives in the United States and Canada. The NAWAPA, Grand Canal and other suggested schemes diverting water to the United States are all private engineering concepts based on the, as yet, unestablished assumptions: that there is an economic demand for Canadian water in

the United States; that Canada has a surplus, over and above its own future requirements, with which it might supply this demand, or a part of it; and that it would be in Canada's national interest to export water to the United States.

5. The primary responsibility for the administration and conservation of water resources within provincial boundaries in Canada lies with the provinces. Nevertheless, the federal government recognizes responsibilities for conservation and planning because of the interprovincial and international character of many water courses, because of its constitutional responsibility for certain water uses and the strong national interest in the wise development and use of water resources.

Federal responsibility in conservation is recognized through legislation which permits federal-provincial participation in water dvelopment studies and research and in the construction of water development projects. This legislation includes the Canada Water Conservation Assistance Act, the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act, and the Atlantic Development Board Act. The federal government has also provided numerous water conservation reservoirs in connection with its responsibility for navigation.

In addition, federal representatives participate in the activities of a large number of international and federal-provincial boards which have been appointed from time to time to investigate and plan the development of various rivers. The national policy which has evolved provides for federal participation with the provinces in investigations to inventory water resources, to identify development possibilities, and to study the feasibility of water conservation works which would form part of an over-all development program. Studies of this type have been undertaken by the federal-provincial Fraser river board, lakes Winnipeg and Manitoba board, Ottawa river engineering board, Saint John river board, and the co-ordinating committee on northern Ontario water resources studies. On international waters or waters which cross the international boundary, the federal government conducts national studies and provides data and personnel for the engineering studies of the International Joint Commission.

To stimulate pollution abatement, the federal government provides financial assistance through the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to municipalities for sewage treatment facilities. This is supplemented in the Atlantic provinces by the program of the Atlantic development board. In addition, the tax relief offered to industry for accelerated depreciation of pollution abatement works provides a positive stimulus for pollution control. A number of federal departments and agencies, including Energy, Mines and Resources, National Health and Welfare, Fisheries, conduct research on water quality and pollution. Their work is being quickly expanded under the co-ordination of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. That department is also building a major research centre at Burlington, Hamilton harbour, for research into pollution and other water problems, particularly in the Great Lakes.

Clearly, a national plan must be built of many component federal, provincial and regional plans and programs encompassing all water uses. Such plans in Canada can be evolved only through continuing joint programs of the federal and provincial governments. We are proposing extension of comprehensive water development studies and the implementation of resultant programs under the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources as rapidly as financial and manpower resources and federal-provincial agreement will permit.

6. Yes. There have been a continual series of conferences with provinces to negotiate such joint programs as the Saskatchewan-Nelson basin study; the Nelson river power study; the Northern Ontario water study; the Bay of Funday tidal power study; the Atlantic provinces water resources study; and many others.

At practically all meetings of the Canadian council of resource ministers since 1962, water matters have been discussed. More recently in the last year, the Canadian council of resource ministers has discussed the pollution conference, the water for peace conference and the proposed seminar on water to be sponsored by the Canadian council of resource ministers. Of course, ARDA, PFRA and other federal agencies concerned with certain aspects of water matters also hold such meetings. However, no formal federal-provincial water conferences with all ministers, both federal and provincial concerned, have been held.

7. Under the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, the I.J.C. exercises both semi-judicial and advisory functions. In the former capacity the commission, under Articles 3 and 4 of the treaty, passes on applications affecting the

level or flow of boundary waters or waters flowing across the boundary. In the latter capacity the commission, under Article 9, examines and reports on questions arising along the common frontier referred to it from time to time by the governments of Canada and the U.S. The commission reports to the Canadian and the U.S. governments upon the facts and circumstances of any question so referred, together with such conclusions and recommendations as may be appropriate. The Canadian government considers the commission's report and discusses it with the authorities who would be involved in implementation of the recommendations in Canada. After studying the commission's report and recommendations, the Canadian and U.S. governments consult to reach agreement as to the action which should be taken on the recommendations. If the Canadian government accepts the recommendations it assumes responsibility for the necessary implementing action to be taken in Canada.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, April 4, 1967

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

[*Translation*]

VACANCIES

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received from the hon. member for Papineau (Mr. Favreau) and the hon. member for Richelieu-Verchères (Mr. Cardin) written declarations of their intentions to resign their seats in the House of Commons.

Pursuant to section 6 of the House of Commons Act, chapter 143 of the Revised Statutes, 1952, I have directed my warrants to the Chief Electoral Officer for an issue of writs for election of new members for the said electoral districts.

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

FURTHER REFERENCE TO SPEECH BY CHIEF OF DEFENCE STAFF

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to make a personal explanation. Yesterday the hon. member for Calgary North raised a question in respect of an alleged statement made by General Allard. He objected to the report attributed to the general criticizing opposition members' motivation in opposing the unification bill. I think it is now clear to all hon. members of the house that General Allard made no such charge. The report which served as the basis for the question raised by the hon. member for Calgary North was an error in translation by the Canadian Press wire service.

In my reply I stated, as recorded at page 14414 of *Hansard*:

> I did not know of the speech but I have complete confidence in the chief of the defence staff and he is at complete liberty to express himself publicly as he sees fit.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He is not.

Mr. Hellyer: I should have added, of course, that I meant within the general's responsibility as chief of the defence staff. If I had risen again on the subject I would have added this clarification and in addition would have suggested that I would prefer to take the question as notice until I had an opportunity to determine just exactly what the general had said.

I accept the responsibility for the impression that might quite properly be taken from my words. As I indicated, however, I have complete confidence in the general, and consequently he is not obliged to clear his public speeches with me or the associate minister. At the same time I regret very much the harsh words that were spoken in the House of Commons yesterday, because I am sure no member of this house would want to reflect unfairly on the chief of the defence staff, a very gallant and distinguished public servant.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, on this same question of privilege I, of course, regret that the Canadian Press dispatch in regard to the statements made by General Allard was incorrect. However, I now have a copy of yesterday's *La Presse* which gives a different version of what General Allard said, and which has not been denied as being incorrect. I shall not read the report in French. I shall give a translation of it which I have secured.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Harkness: Some hon. members laugh, so I will read the French and then we will get the translation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Harkness: It reads:

[*Translation*]

> This week end General Jean V. Allard commander in chief of the Canadian army has asked himself if certain members of the opposition, "these former ministers", really tell the truth and what they really think when they oppose the unification of the Canadian armed forces.

• (2:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

The translation which I will give is:

> This week end General Jean V. Allard commander in chief of the Canadian army has asked himself if certain members of the opposition, "these former ministers", really tell the truth and what they really think when they oppose the unification of the Canadian armed forces.

This is not as flagrant as the report we had yesterday, but I submit that in principle it is basically exactly the same sort of thing complained about; that is, an officer of the armed forces, particularly the commander in chief of the armed forces, impugning the motives of members of parliament in respect of the stands they take in this house. Although as I say the statements are not as flagrant as those reported yesterday, the basic principle is the same and I think this is a practice which must be brought to an end.

Yesterday I asked the Acting Prime Minister to take steps. I am glad the Prime Minister is now back and I would ask that he take steps to see that officers in the armed forces do not make statements of this nature which seriously impugn the motives of members of this house, and particularly members of the Privy Council who are ex-ministers.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, also on the question of privilege, I should like to say that I think this statement which has been read out is worse than the one read yesterday. This statement contains a speculation as to whether we are speaking the truth. It is all right for members of the House of Commons to make remarks of that nature, because other members can immediately reply to them and they can be either withdrawn or substantiated. In this particular instance General Allard must substantiate his statement, prepare another apology or provide some explanation as to misquotation. This statement which now appears in the language which he apparently used in the course of his address is one which I consider to be worse than the statement which appeared in the press yesterday.

I hope the Minister of National Defence, with regard to General Allard will exercise the right he has in respect of any officer in the forces and the right that he intended to exercise against Admiral Landymore, whom he accused of making statements which he was not authorized to make. Why must there be a special protection for General Allard? Admiral Landymore was threatened with court martial proceedings. I think it is quite contrary to the custom and practice within the services for the minister to get up and say that General Allard is entitled to make any statement he wishes. Let the minister or the Prime Minister take some action to discipline a person who makes these attacks on members of this House of Commons and makes accusations that they are not telling the truth. This, sir, is what I object to.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Harkness.]

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL

ANNOUNCEMENT OF APPOINTMENT OF HON. ROLAND MICHENER

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to announce that Her Majesty the Queen has approved my recommendation that Honourable Roland Michener be appointed as Governor General of Canada.

Mr. Michener needs no commendation to this house. We remember well his distinguished service as our respected and esteemed Speaker from 1957 to 1962. He was born in Lacombe, Alberta, the son of Senator and Mrs. Edward Michener. He graduated from the University of Alberta in 1920 and proceeded as a Rhodes scholar to Oxford University, where he studied law and obtained the B.A. and B.C.L. degrees. He was called to the bar of England in 1923 and to the Ontario bar in 1924.

Mr. Michener's whole life has been one of public service and in many capacities; in the R.A.F. during the first world war; as a member of the Ontario legislature; as secretary of that province; as a member of this house, and its esteemed and respected Speaker, and as high commissioner for Canada to India and ambassador to Nepal. His dedication to and interest in public service are shared by his wife, who will be of great and experienced assistance to her husband in carrying out his new duties.

The government has been deeply aware of the responsibility placed upon it in recommending to the Queen as her personal representative in Canada a successor to the late and beloved General Vanier, whose services to Canada will never be forgotten and whose passing we lament so much.

The position of governor general has been filled with great distinction during the 100 years of our history by 19 outstanding men, each of whom brought to the office some special quality and all of whom served Canada well. The standards that have been set in the past have been magnificently maintained by the last two Canadian governors general.

We will all, I know, be particularly appreciative of the willingness of Mr. and Mrs. Michener to assume such onerous responsibilities on short notice, in the full knowledge that in the next few months they will be faced with an extremely heavy program of duties in relation to our centennial celebrations.

I am sure the parliament and people of Canada will join me in extending to the new Governor General warmest wishes for success and happiness in the high office to which he is being called.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the appointment has not been unexpected. For the past four months it has been very clear from press references that Mr. Michener would be appointed. The appointment will receive widespread approval.

The Prime Minister has referred to the services of successive governors general. At no time in our history has the position of governor general been of more importance than it will in the next few years. Few realize the importance of the office. Many regard it as a sinecure consisting largely of ceremonial duties without constitutional significance. That view, widely held, is not based on experience.

During the time when I was prime minister there were two governors general, Right Hon. Vincent Massey and Right Hon. Georges P. Vanier. During the terms of both in respect for the traditional role of the governor general they were fully consulted as the representative of the Queen has a right to be. He also has the duty to give an opinion to the Prime Minister with regard to those things he believes necessary for Canada.

There are too many who hold the view that the position is obsolete or about to become out of date. Certain press references recently have suggested that Mr. Michener may well be the last governor general of Canada. Believing as I do in the monarchical system of parliamentary government, I see Canada in the second century preserving the form of government we have today.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Indeed, the governor general not only is the representative of the crown but the symbol of the crown in parliament. He is the linch pin of our whole system of British parliamentary democracy. Beyond his constitutional responsibilities the governor general can wield an immense power and influence for national good and unity, as a rallying point for all Canadians. He can be a stabilizing influence in times of ferment and discord within our country.

When I say these things I am simply outlining the manner in which the late General Georges P. Vanier carried out his duties. I did not have an opportunity of saying this at the time of his passing, and I may be pardoned now for the observation I am about to make, that he in his person did more than anyone living to bring about a new concept of unity within our nation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That was a measure of his dedication. The Prime Minister referred to the fact that when a country can mobilize people like this to serve, it is well for democracy. I recall so well the circumstances under which General Vanier was approached by me at the University of Montreal during the course of a visit to that city. It was only after earnest solicitation that he accepted the post.

To the new Governor General and his wife I wish the continuation of those high standards set by Right Hon. Georges P. Vanier and Right Hon. Vincent Massey.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I am sure there will be general approval of the appointment by Her Majesty of Mr. Roland Michener as the new Governor General of Canada. The Prime Minister is to be congratulated on having made this recommendation. This will be a very arduous year for a governor general in view of the heavy program that has been outlined. I have not any doubt at all that Mr. and Mrs. Michener will bring to their high office the dignity and friendliness which are so essential if they are to discharge their duties acceptably.

I think there is much to be said for having a head of state who is outside of and beyond partisan politics.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: I believe that has been the value of having a governor general and a personal representative of the crown as the head of state in Canada. We have been singularly fortunate in Canada in the governors general we have had over the years, certainly in my lifetime, but I think we can be pardoned for saying that we are especially proud of the Canadians who have occupied that high office. In Mr. Vincent Massey, an English speaking Canadian, and Georges P. Vanier, a French speaking Canadian, we have had two of the finest and most distinguished men to hold this office.

While Mr. Roland Michener follows a most outstanding succession, I have no doubt at all that with his record in the past of getting along with people he will also bring lustre to the office to which he is to be appointed.

Changes in Cabinet

I am sure members of all parties in the house will want to say that in so far as we as members of parliament are concerned, we will do everything we can to make his task easier and to make his occupancy of that office an outstanding success.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Hon. Roland Michener to the high office of Governor General of Canada does not surprise anyone as his name has been mentioned repeatedly of late.

I do not have the pleasure of knowing Mr. Michener personally but I heard many speak very highly of him. When he was politically active although I may not have shared his views, Mr. Michener has always been considered impartial, and as a Canadian who wanted above all else harmony in this land. His appointment to the high office of Governor General of Canada will doubtless please the whole nation.

Mr. Speaker, there will be some in certain areas of the country, and more particularly in the province of Quebec, who will naturally claim that this appointment constitutes a vestige of colonialism. I do not share that view in the least.

If we consider what the late General Vanier meant for the whole of Canada, we have to recognize that a governor general may fulfil a most important role in the whole of Canada since he is above partisan politics, above the political parties, the Governor General may—as the new incumbent will—consider the various elements which make up this country and try to hold the pieces together. From that viewpoint, the governor general does not constitute a trace of colonialism but a symbol of unity and understanding, in one word, the symbol of co-operation and respect by the various elements that make up our Canadian nation.

With all my heart, I wish the Governor General and Mrs. Michener long life. I wish them also every happiness in the discharge of their functions which will enable every Canadian to admire them and witness all the good they are in a position to accomplish for the future of the country and the elements that constitute Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, we join with others in welcoming the announcement just made by the Prime Minister. Canada has been blessed with a succession of able and distinguished governors general, and following the death of the late General Georges P. Vanier, Canadians have wondered who would be chosen to fill this very important position. Among those suggested as possible successors was Hon. Roland Michener, Canadian high commissioner to India and former Speaker of this house.

Mr. Michener is remembered, I am sure, for his kindliness, his impartiality and his sense of justice. He served with distinction in the office to which he was elected by this house. His service as high commissioner to India has been characterized by a quiet and effective discharge of his responsibilities as the representative of Canada in that country. Now as Hon. Mr. Michener becomes Governor General I am sure Canadians will extend to him and to Mrs. Michener the same pledge of loyalty and affection they have always given to those who have served as the personal representatives of Her Majesty the Queen of Canada.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) wants to rise on the same subject he can only do so with the unanimous consent of the house.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I regret very much that there is not unanimity.

THE MINISTRY

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CHANGES IN CABINET

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to announce certain changes in the administration. His Excellency the Administrator has accepted the resignation of Lucien Cardin as Minister of Justice and Attorney General, and the resignation of Hon. Guy Favreau as President of the Privy Council and Registrar General of Canada.

To these old and true friends I should like to express my deep gratitude for their unselfish and devoted service to the country through their service to the government since it was formed in April, 1963. Mr. Cardin served as associate minister of national defence and as minister of justice. Mr. Favreau served as minister of citizenship and

immigration, as minister of justice, as president of the privy council and as house leader. On his retirement from the cabinet Mr. Favreau has been appointed a puisne judge of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec. I have benefited greatly from their wise counsel, and I greatly value their friendship. To both I should like to express my sincere thanks and warmest good wishes for the future.

On my recommendation the Administrator has agreed to the appointment of Hon. Walter Gordon as President of the Privy Council, and Hon. John Turner as Registrar General of Canada. His Excellency has agreed to the appointment of two members of this house as privy councillors and members of the cabinet; the hon. member for Saint-Maurice-Laflèche (Mr. Chrétien), who has been parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance, and the hon. member for Mount Royal (Mr. Trudeau), who has served as my parliamentary secretary. The hon. member for Mount Royal will assume the office of Minister of Justice and Attorney General, and the hon. member for Saint-Maurice-Laflèche will serve as a member of the administration without portfolio.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ROUMANIA—EXCHANGE OF NOTES RESPECTING DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I wish to table an exchange of notes between the government of Canada and the government of the Socialist Republic of Roumania concerning the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two governments.

Mr. Speaker: Has the minister leave to table these documents?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONFERENCE ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND SECURITIES LEGISLATION

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, as the house is aware the Prime Minister undertook in response to a suggestion by Hon. Daniel Johnson to arrange, if other provinces were in agreement, for a preliminary conference of the ministers concerned to plan and initiate preparations for a federal-provincial conference on the whole question of financial institutions and securities legislation. The exchange of correspondence between the Prime Minister and Hon. Daniel Johnson on this subject was tabled in the house on February 13.

While it has not been easy to arrange a date which is suitable to all concerned, I expect that April 10 will be acceptable for the preliminary meeting of ministers in Ottawa, to be followed the next day by a federal-provincial meeting of officials. The purpose of these initial meetings is to identify, consider in a preliminary way, and initiate preparatory work for a future federal-provincial conference regarding financial institutions and securities and the various measures that could be taken by both levels of government to solve problems in these fields. The Canadian government will be represented by the Registrar General, the new Minister without Portfolio and myself.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): In so far as the announcement concerning this conference of provincial ministers of finance is concerned, of course it was forecast during the debate on the deposit insurance legislation. This debate indicated that at one time there was somehow what would appear to be an unfortunate lack of liaison with regard to this question of deposit insurance, as well as something which has been advocated in many quarters of the house, uniform securities legislation to protect the Canadian public from certain unsavory practices that have cropped up in the handling of securities in this country.

I hope this will be a fruitful conference, and one in which the undoubted authority of the federal government will be established once and for all without bringing into the field of banking any extension of the power of veto which has been unfortunately introduced as a result of certain provisions of the deposit insurance legislation act. We will hope, as soon as possible, to have a meaningful report from the ministers concerned. We hope discussions can be held by the minister and his associates in the cabinet with the house committee on finance, trade and economic affairs, because we are vitally interested in establishing this position thereby putting the regulation of our financial institutions on a proper basis. In so saying I do not believe our financial institutions are to be necessarily better if they are to be surrounded by a multitude of regulations.

Labour Relations

FINANCE

TABLING OF TARIFF BOARD REPORT ON COTTON YARNS AND ROVINGS

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have tabled today copies in English and in French of a report by the Tariff Board on reference 135, relating to cotton yarns and rovings for use in the manufacture of certain products including cotton sewing thread. I have tabled also a transcript of the evidence before the board at its public hearings.

I assure the house that the board's recommendations will be considered carefully by the government. Interested parties who wish to comment on this report should do so as soon as possible.

AIR CANADA

REFERENCE OF ANNUAL REPORT AND BUDGET TO HOUSE COMMITTEE

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, if I could have the leave of the house I should like to move a certain motion.

Mr. Speaker: Has the minister leave to make this motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Pickersgill moved:

That the capital budget of Air Canada for the year ending December 31, 1967, tabled March 3, 1967, the annual report of Air Canada for 1966 and the annual report to parliament for 1966 in respect of Air Canada, both tabled on March 7, 1967, be referred to the standing committee on transport and communications.

Motion agreed to.

LABOUR RELATIONS

PACIFIC COAST LONGSHOREMEN DISPUTE—TABLING OF REPORT OF COMMISSIONER

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, members of the house will recall that following the resumption, in December last, of work on the ships and docks in west coast ports and as one of the agreed terms leading to the return to work, I appointed Mr. Justice C. Rhodes Smith of the court of appeal of Manitoba an industrial inquiry commission under the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act to inquire into the work stoppage and make recommendations for the avoidance of similar situations. The commission has now reported.

I should like to ask permission of the house to table the commission's report today in

[Mr. Lambert.]

English. French copies will be available when the translation now under way is completed. The report is very lengthy, running to well over 100 pages, and this accounts for the fact that the French translation is not yet available. The commission conducted an intensive investigation into the causes of the dispute. I do not intend to comment on the findings and recommendations, but I do commend them for earnest consideration by the parties and all those who have the welfare of Vancouver and our other western Canadian ports at heart.

• (3:10 p.m.)

I should like, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the government to express sincere thanks to Mr. Justice Smith for his work, and to pay tribute to his work in this very difficult situation. I would also thank and express appreciation for the work of the two assessors, who were appointed to assist him, Captain H. J. C. Terry of Vancouver, and Mr. Joseph Morris of Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: Has the minister leave to table the report to which he has referred?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

SUPREME COURT ACT

AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE FOR JUDGMENTS IN BOTH LANGUAGES

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-286, to amend the Supreme Court Act.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that all judgments of the Supreme Court are written in English only, the purpose of the bill is to request the Supreme Court to present its judgments in French, in exactly the same way as it does in English.

[*English*]

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

MR. JUSTICE LANDREVILLE

INQUIRY AS TO ACTION PROPOSED BY GOVERNMENT

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Prime Minister if he would advise the house of the nature of the reply given to Mr. Justice Landreville's request for an opportunity to

present his case before the House of Commons. This was done in the United Kingdom in 1828. Is the Prime Minister going to give the judge this opportunity? When will the government bring in the measure which will bring this situation to termination?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when I read the letter from Justice Landreville to which my right hon. friend refers I acknowledged it at once, and then referred it to the legal advisers to the crown for an opinion on the request that had been made. I received that opinion this morning. I will be studying it with my colleagues, and I hope to be able to make a statement as soon as that study is completed.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is the Prime Minister giving consideration to the suggestion of Mr. Justice Landreville?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I am studying the reply of the Department of Justice to my request for information as to precedents and as to the proper course which should be followed in a matter of this kind. Until that study is completed I am unable to answer my right hon. friend's question.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—REQUEST BY UN SECRETARY GENERAL FOR CEASE FIRE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister whether he has had an opportunity to study the text of the proposal of Secretary General U Thant with respect to his declaration that there should be a unilateral cease fire by the United States in Viet Nam, under which United States forces would not fire unless fired upon. In view of the fact that the Secretary General has indicated that he may make a proposal for a specific date, or ask governments affiliated with the United Nations to make such a proposal, is Canada prepared to support this suggestion by the Secretary General?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we read with great interest the report of the Secretary General's statement, and we have been in touch with the Secretary General for clarification of that statement, which has certainly been ambiguously reported in certain quarters. As soon as we get that clarification we will be able to make a reply to the Secretary General.

His last proposal is apparently along the lines indicated by my hon. friend, that there should be a unilateral cease fire on the part of the United States. But there is apparently the exception which has been referred to, that this would not apply to returning fire that had been aimed at United States forces, and this might make for a very inadequate cease fire. This is the kind of clarification we are trying to obtain.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. I would ask the Prime Minister whether he was correctly reported to the effect that the suggestion by U Thant, referred to by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, was unrealistic. Is that what he meant in the concluding words of the answer he has just given?

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker. The first report of the statement I saw was to the effect that without qualification or reservation of any kind there should be a unilateral cease fire on the part of United States forces. This seemed to me to be a cease fire on one side while the other side kept firing, not a very practicable suggestion. If there is a qualification to the effect that a cease fire should be maintained except against those forces that are continuing to fire, that is another matter and we are giving consideration to it.

Mr. Douglas: A further supplementary question. May I ask the Prime Minister, since he has looked at the text, whether that text does not include the words "only to fire if fired upon", and would that not answer the question that has been posed?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, it was not in the report that I saw initially. In any event I think those words should be clarified before a decision can be reached.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, may I address a supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the tremendous urgency in this matter, and the danger of escalation, would the secretary of state discuss with the chairman of our committee on external affairs an early meeting of the committee, at which time the committee could go into this very urgent matter?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I have already done that, Mr. Speaker, and I understand that the meeting is to be called on Tuesday next.

Inquiries of the Ministry

INQUIRY AS TO EXTENSION OF REPRESENTATION IN PACIFIC AREA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Now that Canadian diplomatic representation in eastern Europe has been increased I should like to ask whether the government is giving consideration to increasing its representation in the Pacific region. I could name some of the countries where we are not represented, or where our representation is shared. This is a region where Canadian trade interests are of great and increasing importance. I am sure that Canadians, particularly in the western provinces, would like to know whether efforts will be made to increase our representation in that area.

Mr. Speaker: Order. This is a question of a very general nature; it does not appear to me to be of extreme urgency.

WEST GERMANY—REPORTED PROPOSAL TO REDUCE ALLIED FORCES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): My question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Would the minister advise the house whether Canada was apprised beforehand of the agreement apparently reached among the governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and West Germany with regard to a serious reduction of forces in West Germany by both the United States and Britain? If so, what is the attitude of the Canadian government toward this agreement? Has Canada signified any intention to follow a similar course in the future?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I had discussions last week with representatives of the British government and of the United States government. There is no basis for that story. I am sure the discussions which are taking place between the governments of Germany and the United States and between the government of Britain and the other two governments will result in arrangements which will not warrant the conclusion the hon. member has drawn.

Mr. Lambert: This may be the interpretation the minister places on it, but it is certainly not the interpretation which is placed on it in other quarters.

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

Mr. Martin (Essex East): It is not an interpretation.

Mr. Lambert: In any event I will ask the minister whether consideration is being given by the Canadian government to the withdrawal of dependants from Europe as has been done, in fact, by the United States.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No, Mr. Speaker. And the answer to the preface to that question is that this is not an interpretation. I made a statement based upon information given by the governments concerned.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

FURTHER REFERENCE TO STATEMENTS BY CHIEF OF DEFENCE STAFF

On the orders of the day:

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he condones the statement attributed to General Allard by the newspaper *La Presse,* a statement which impugns the honesty and motives of certain privy councillors who are members of this chamber. If he does not condone those statements, what disciplinary action does the right hon. gentleman propose to take to ensure that there will be no recurrence of this sort of thing?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): One of the statements attributed to General Allard has already been corrected by the Canadian Press which was the origin of the original report, and I think I should be very careful about commenting on other statements attributed to him until there is an opportunity to test the accuracy of the reports of those statements also.

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT OF DAIRY POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): I have a question to direct to the Minister of Agriculture. In the light of many representations made during the Easter recess by the O.F.A. and the O.F.U. on the subject of the hon. gentleman's recent dairy policy announcement, will the minister say whether he is now prepared to amend that policy?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): The policy as announced remains the policy. I have heard many comments on it, many of them favourable, I am pleased to inform the hon. member.

Mr. Diefenbaker: You must have been out of Canada.

Mr. Greene: I am seeing representatives of the farm organizations with respect to this policy.

Mr. W. M. Howe (Wellington-Huron): When is the minister going to give complete details of the dairy policy for 1967-68?

Mr. Greene: I believe the statement made in the house speaks for itself. It is the entire statement, subject of course, to any action which the national dairy commission may take.

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture. Will the minister soon be in a position to issue statements with the cheques which go out to individual farmers under the dairy policy?

Mr. Greene: I am hopeful that very shortly statements will be included on the stubs of the cheques to indicate to the farmers the nature of the payment and quantity of milk involved.

FINANCE

DRUGS—INQUIRY AS TO REMOVAL OF SALES TAX

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the commitment made by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Gordon) on April 26, 1965, when he was minister of finance, confirmed on March 29, 1966 by the present Minister of Finance, that a recommendation from the special committee on drug costs and prices for the removal of the sales tax from drugs would be followed by legislation to that effect, may I ask when we may expect this legislation?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): I have studied the report of the special committee on drugs. I have also reviewed the statement I made at the time of my main budget last year, and I can assure the hon. member that it would be the intention of the government to proceed to remove the sales tax on drugs as part of an over-all effort to reduce the price of drugs.

Mr. Knowles: May we expect such legislation in the present session?

Mr. Sharp: I cannot speak for the government. Certainly if it is possible to take meaningful action with respect to the general subject of the price of drugs I hope it will be possible to do something about the tax.

Mr. D. V. Pugh (Okanagan Boundary): Is it the intention of the Minister of Finance and the government to remove the sales tax on building supplies at the same time?

Mr. Sharp: No, Mr. Speaker.

HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS

LOUISBOURG FORTRESS—RETURN TO WORK OF MEN LAID OFF

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Inasmuch as the government is keeping within its budget, will the minister reinstate the workers who have been laid off in connection with the Louisbourg project?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): The hon. member and I had a conversation about this in the house last night after ten o'clock during which I think we said everything on this subject which was worthwhile. We shall reinstate these men as soon as they can do work outdoors.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): It is because of the statement made last night that I wish now, on a question of privilege, to draw the minister's attention to what he has said and give notice that I will raise this matter for further debate at ten o'clock. I refer the minister to his answer—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member state his question of privilege?

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): My question of privilege involves the ambiguous answers we have received from ministers of this government and my endeavour to obtain satisfactory answers to questions I have directed to the hon. gentleman. I would draw the minister's attention in particular to the words he used as reported in *Hansard* at page 14471 in the first column, where he said the money had been exhausted. Just across the page, only a few hundred words later, he said "We are keeping relatively within our costs..." In view of conditions in Cape

Breton at the present time and the answer the minister gave me yesterday in the house to the effect that there had been no change in policy, I ask this government whether on my representations, or on the representations of my hon. friend from Cape Breton North and Victoria or else on the representations of the Minister of National Health and Welfare, they will not do something for these men, and never mind this nonsense.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[*Translation*]

INQUIRIES OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Prime Minister.

Since the resignations within the Liberal party are weakening the government's position, is the Prime Minister considering calling a general election next June?

[*English*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend will be relieved to know that the answer is in the negative.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, in order to promote a spirit of national unity during our centennial year, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he intends to reply officially and without delay to the statements made recently by the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) concerning bilingualism in Canada?

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, my question is intended for the right hon. Prime Minister. Can he tell us whether it is true that the Liberal Women's Association is threatening to withdraw from the party if the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) keeps on making stupid and irresponsible statements with respect to French Canadians?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This question contains allegations and is, therefore, out of order.

[*English*]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

EXTENSION OF DISABILITY PENSION INCREASE TO DEPENDANTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. E. Brown (Brantford): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Would the minister advise the house whether consideration is being given to increasing the pension rate for dependants receiving veterans disability allowances?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I have answered similar questions on a number of occasions in the past. The entire matter is under study, as I have indicated, and in due course a statement will be made after conclusions have been reached.

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR SUPPORT PRICE FOR NEW BRUNSWICK POTATOES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Hugh John Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of great urgency for the Minister of Agriculture. Is the minister able to inform the house as to the decision regarding the request for a price of $2.10 per barrel for surplus potatoes submitted on behalf of the potato growers of New Brunswick by the government of our province?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the government's emergency program for the relief of the potato growers, whose plight was caused by excess production last year, was announced prior to the recess and provides for a percentage payment of 65 per cent of the ten year average price of potatoes, which does not amount to $2.10.

Mr. Flemming: As a supplementary question, is the recent request of the government of our province for a somewhat improved program receiving consideration?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, we have received such a request for an improved program and it is receiving consideration, but no change has been made to date in the program as announced.

Mr. David MacDonald (Prince): As a supplementary question, has the minister had a communication in the last day or so from either the government of Prince Edward Island or the legislature expressing their dissatisfaction with the program as announced previously by the minister?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall any specific communication from Prince Edward Island in this regard but I shall be glad to take notice of the hon. gentleman's question and check to see if there is such a communication.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

NATO—DISCUSSIONS RESPECTING ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. I understand that the seven nation nuclear planning group of NATO is meeting in Washington later this week and according to United States Secretary of Defence McNamara will be discussing the deployment of an anti-ballistic missile system. Will Canada be participating in these discussions with respect to the installation of such a system for North America?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the discussions will cover a wide range of problems affecting the alliance, including all aspects of the application of nuclear power and the effects of the use of such weapons systems. I imagine this will cover the whole alliance but not specifically the Canadian aspects. Any possible Canadian aspects would, I think, be discussed bilaterally between ourselves and the United States.

Mr. Brewin: As a supplementary question, would the minister be able on some appropriate occasion to make a statement on the policy of the government in regard to the installation in Canadian territory of such a system or part of such a system?

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, I have already given the hon. gentleman and I think all hon. members an assurance that there will be a discussion in the house on this subject before any plans are finalized that would involve Canada. I think this is a reasonable assurance because it is a very important area of development.

Frankly, I hope the negotiations between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will be successful and that they will agree mutually not to deploy these weapons systems. I think this would be a good place to end the arms race and put the money to more productive uses. However, in the event that this should not be possible and the negotiations become fruitless, we shall have to discuss the technical details carefully, and that would be the time for debate in the House of Commons.

DIVORCE

INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF REFORM LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether the government is giving consideration to the introduction of legislation to provide for an extension of the grounds for divorce? At present divorces are only granted upon the grounds of adultery. Is the government considering legislation to cover the ground now recognized in British law in legislation passed at Westminster?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the government is considering and will be considering recommendations of parliamentary committees on this and other matters with a view to taking appropriate legislative action.

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Prime Minister to clarify the statement he made in Vancouver in this connection over the week end. He referred to legislation concerning birth control and divorce reform. Did the Prime Minister mean it would be presented in the spring session of parliament or not until the fall?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be difficult to introduce legislation on a subject of this importance before the autumn because of the existing calendar year, among other things.

INDUSTRY

REQUEST FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF AUTOMOBILE AGREEMENT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister based on the brief presented to the government by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association which in part urged that a careful study be made of the effect on the Canadian auto industry and its employees as the result of the Canada-United States auto agreement. In view of this would the Prime Minister now consider my suggestion that the Canada-United States auto agreement be referred to a standing committee of the house so that a careful examination could be made of it?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has based his

question on the brief of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association which I received myself only this morning, and I would like to study the particular part relating to what my hon. friend has said before replying in the house.

HOUSING

SUGGESTED INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF LOAN CEILING ON EXISTING DWELLINGS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington-South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Labour who is responsible for housing. In view of the existing critical housing situation is the minister giving consideration to increasing the $10,000 loan ceiling applicable to the purchase of existing houses?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hales: Further to my question, Mr. Speaker; in view of the fact that only 71 loans have been approved since this program was put into operation some time ago, does the minister not feel that serious consideration should be given to extending—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question is argumentative.

Mr. Nicholson: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member would want to be accurate. This legislation was introduced last November.

Mr. Speaker: That is not a question of privilege.

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. In view of the Prime Minister's interesting speech out west dealing with new initiatives in the field of housing to meet the present crisis, has the government decided upon such initiatives and what is the nature of them?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we certainly are considering them now, and I hope the minister responsible will be able before long to make a statement in the house.

REPORTED ADVANCE BY CORPORATION TO YORK TRUST CO.

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with a question that was put by the right hon.

[Mr. Pearson.]

Leader of the Opposition on March 22, as recorded at page 14,331 of *Hansard*, when he inquired about certain advances made by C.M.H.C. to the York Trust and Savings Company during the year 1965. I might say that as a matter of policy C.M.H.C. does not provide information about particular loan transactions. Borrowers, however, are themselves free to volunteer whatever information they see fit, and in this particular instance York Trust and Savings Company did indicate in its annual report for 1966 that it had made use of section 11 of the National Housing Act during the previous year and that it was able to reduce its indebtedness to the corporation from $20 million to $5.2 million.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): A supplementary question, would the minister say that this type of transaction is a common one or were the Sinclair Stevens' interests placed in an unusually favourable position in the matter of that $20 million?

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, section 11 of the National Housing Act provides for short term credits of this nature. The purpose of the section is to encourage banks, insurance companies, trust companies and other lending institutions to invest money in existing mortgages and to promote the development of secondary mortgages under the National Housing Act.

IMMIGRATION

REPORTED PRESENCE IN CANADA OF GERMAN WAR CRIMINALS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, and I do so at the request of a number of persons who are quite concerned about this matter. In view of the statement made on the C.B.C. on April 1 by Mr. Simon Wiesenthal that Canada is harbouring at least 15 nazi war criminals and that he advised the Canadian government of this fact some time ago, has the minister been advised by Mr. Simon Wiesenthal of these war criminals being in Canada and, if so, what action does the minister intend to take on this information?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt that the question is one of urgency to the extent that it should be asked at this time. I suggest it should be placed on the order paper.

[*Translation*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

FEDERAL OBSERVERS AT QUEBEC ROYAL COMMISSION ON CRIME

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the new Minister of Justice and, at the same time, I should like—

An hon. Member: He has not been sworn in yet.

Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix): —I am still going to ask my question, Mr. Speaker, and he might answer it later.

Is it the intention of the new Minister of Justice to send observers of his department to attend the sittings of the royal commission on crime established by the Quebec government?

I think that the minister might take this question as notice and answer it later on.

GRAIN

QUEBEC—POSSIBLE SALE OR LEASE OF ELEVATOR

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Could he tell the house whether all branches of the departments concerned have now made their views known concerning the possibility of selling or renting Quebec city grain elevators?

[*English*]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I am afraid those discussions have not concluded yet, sir, but I hope they will soon.

VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL TRAINING

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF CORRESPONDENCE WITH PROVINCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Would the minister agree to the tabling of any correspondence between the provinces and the minister or his department about Bill No. C-278, respecting the occupational training of adults, before this bill proceeds to a further stage in the House of Commons?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I have no objection if the interested provinces have no objection. If the hon. member wishes to identify the correspondence he would like to have tabled I could get in touch with the provinces and if they have no objection I will be glad to table it.

Mr. Fairweather: Thank you.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

INQUIRY AS TO DECISION ON NAVY HYDROFOIL PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. I understand the hon. gentleman is now ready to answer questions which were asked earlier by the hon. member for Pictou and myself regarding the future of the hydrofoil program.

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, as a result of the fire which occurred in the ship on November 5, 1966, a thorough review has been made of the entire program and it has been decided to seek Treasury Board approval for continuation of the hydrofoil project. Ship launching is now scheduled for mid-1968. Following contractor's sea trials, weapons system installation and over-all system evaluation, it is hoped to complete the project by mid-1970.

I should emphasize, however, that this is a development program. It is being completed as part of an over-all desire to increase our scientific knowledge in a number of areas of interest to Canada and our allies.

TRANSPORT

VANCOUVER—DISCUSSIONS RESPECTING CROSSING OF NORTH ARM OF HARBOUR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. In so doing I should like to express our gratitude for his visit to Vancouver recently and, since he looks so relaxed now, to suggest that it might be a good place for him to retire.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): You mean a good time.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Winch: Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent visit of the Prime Minister to Vancouver, his tour of the harbour and his telephone conversation with the premier of British Columbia, may we be informed concerning whether he anticipates appointing a cabinet colleague to meet with provincial and municipal authorities on the matter of a new bridge or tunnel crossing the north arm of Vancouver harbour?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, my conversation with the premier of British Columbia and representatives of municipalities, which I found to be a very helpful one, visualized the initiative being taken in respect of these discussions by the government which has the initial responsibility in this matter; that is, the government of British Columbia. I emphasized to the premier of that province that if and when he would initiate these discussions a minister would go to Vancouver immediately. He suggested that perhaps the initiative should come from the mayor of the city of Vancouver. My reaction to that was that it should come either from the mayor or the premier and that it should come quickly. I said at that time we would send a minister to work out the details so that all levels of government would know exactly what was happening and what part of the cost they should bear.

AIRPORTS

VANCOUVER, B.C.—REQUEST FOR ACTION ON TUNNEL OR BRIDGE APPROACH

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister was in the land of the daffodils over the week end did he discuss with the premier or other officials certain plans for access to the Vancouver international airport over the Fraser river?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, but at the moment we have been in touch with the minister concerned, the minister of highways, and have asked certain questions arising out of the discussions we have already had. Until those questions are answered it is difficult for us to state exactly the extent of our commitment in this regard. The situation is that the federal government has a certain commitment concerning the axis road and when we receive the information requested we will be able to make progress.

[Mr. Pearson.]

CO-OPERATIVES

INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. In view of recent representations, is it the intention of the government to proceed with legislation at the next session to provide for incorporation of co-operatives at the federal level?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): It will not be possible this session, Mr. Speaker. If my hon. friend will await the speech from the throne he will then be able to see the proposals for legislation which we hope to be able to put forward during the next session. Perhaps I should add that there will be no delay between the one session and the other.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

INQUIRY AS TO INTENTION RESPECTING SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE F

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board and he may wish to take it as notice so he can consult with his colleague the Secretary of State. Is it his intention or the intention of the government to ask the committee of supply for approval of supplement F to the 1966-67 estimates?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue and President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which will be considered by the government depending on how legislation before the house is proceeded with. I should like to discuss this matter with the Secretary of State and my other cabinet colleagues before stating what the policy will be.

REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF REPORT OF AUDITOR GENERAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of National Revenue whether it is the intention of the government to refer the Auditor General's report for 1966 to the committee on public accounts.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue and President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I think it would be

useful to do this very early in the new session. I say this with the belief that this session will not last very long. I believe this would be better than referring it to a committee now and then having to refer it to another committee. If this session should be prolonged I would have no objection to referring the report.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT BY MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Would the Prime Minister take parliament and the Canadian people into the government's confidence and have the Secretary of State for External Affairs report to parliament on the changing posture of Canada in respect of defence and external affairs?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Moose Jaw-Lake Centre.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

EXTENSION TO FARM LABOUR—REQUEST FOR FAMILIARIZATION PERIOD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. E. Pascoe (Moose Jaw-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Now that unemployment insurance is compulsory for farm labour, can the minister give assurance that penalties for failure to obtain insurance stamps will not be imposed for a reasonable period while farm operators and employees reach a full understanding of their responsibilities under the new plan?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, fortunately or unfortunately the Minister of Labour cannot give an assurance with regard to the administration of a federal statute. The responsibility for carrying out the program under this act rests with the Unemployment Insurance Commission. This responsibility has been delegated to it by parliament. All I can say is that in respect of the new legislation I am quite sure the commission will be reasonable and judge each case on its merits.

COAL

BRITISH COLUMBIA—SYMPATHY FOR VICTIMS OF MINE DISASTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. V. Pugh (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a question of privilege and express my sympathy to the miners and their families who suffered during the recent mining disaster at Natal in the province of British Columbia. May I ask the Prime Minister whether steps are being taken by the government to provide some aid in this regard?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am sure all members of the house want to associate themselves with the expression of regret that has just been made. The government has already sent a telegram to those who have suffered. I have personally sent one as well. I join with the hon. member in placing on the record our feeling of sorrow and regret regarding this very tragic accident. It is our hope that the nine miners who have been taken to hospital suffering from serious injuries received in the disaster will soon recover. So far as the second part of the question is concerned, the suggestion is under consideration. The parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Transport is on the spot and will be reporting to me within a day or two.

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary and I had similar thoughts in our minds. I intended to refer to the same matter and direct my question to the Prime Minister or the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources in order to obtain their comment.

I am sure this tragedy brings a realization to all of us of the dangers faced by the men engaged in this type of work. Having worked in a coal mine and having been fortunate enough to survive an explosion, I realize something of what these men have gone through. I appreciate the remarks of the Prime Minister.

CANADA LABOUR (SAFETY) CODE

INQUIRY AS TO PROCLAMATION AND PROMULGATION OF REGULATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Can the minister say whether the Canada Labour (Safety) Code, which was assented to on December 21, 1966, has been proclaimed and have the regulations under that act been promulgated?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I recall that considerable progress has been made with the regulations.

That was my information at the time of my last inquiry before the Easter recess. I will take the question as notice and advise the hon. member at an early date.

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

AMALGAMATION OF NAVY, ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The house resumed, from Monday, April 3, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof—Mr. Hellyer—Mr. Batten in the chair.

The Chairman: Order, please. When the committee rose last evening clause 2 was under discussion.

On clause 2—*Canadian forces, Canadian armed forces.*

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Chairman, I had intended to confine my remarks to the proposal contained in this bill regarding a single unified force, but since the long speech made by the minister yesterday contained so many misstatements and so much propaganda I feel it incumbent upon me to comment and set the record straight.

At the outset let me express my disappointment in the minister who has continued to create confusion in respect of integration and unification. Many of the difficulties we have experienced so far as this bill and the whole question of unification are concerned have occurred because the great majority of interested people in this country have been unable to distinguish between integration and unification as a result of the minister's use of these terms as being synonymous. Yesterday the minister said in effect that one might call this proposal integration or unification and that any discussion in regard to differences was merely an exercise in semantics. It is my belief that if members of this house and the general public had been clear two or three years ago as to the differences between integration and unification there would have been a great deal less confusion and we might have proceeded in a much more orderly way.

Let me once more state the differences between these two terms. Unification as we find it referred to in this bill and during the meetings of the committee in recent weeks means the formation of a single unified force by the abolition of the navy, army and air force. Integration, on the other hand, means putting together in a single administrative service, those aspects relating to paymasters, vehicle maintenance, the supply of food and all other administrative functions. The two things are quite different.

Anyone in Canada who has studied this whole matter is generally in favour of the principle of integration, although many complaints have been made in respect of the manner in which integration has been implemented by the present government. Generally there has been agreement in respect of the principle of combining administrative services. Most of our complaints and differences of opinion can be related to unification and the abolition of the army, navy and air force. As I say, if this matter had been made clear it could have been looked at by the general public in a much better light.

During the course of the minister's speech he stated that logic leads to the inevitable conclusion that integration must result in unification. Let me say to him what has been said to other ministers in the past, that if one starts with false premises and information he will inevitably arrive at false conclusions. That is exactly what the minister has done.

I should now like to refer to specific statements made by the minister during his speech yesterday. At that time the minister stated:

> Every opportunity has been afforded those who are opposed to this concept to make their views known.

That statement is completely incorrect. During meetings of the committee we asked that a considerable number of witnesses be called, many of whom have not yet been heard. As most members realize, several meetings of the committee were entirely taken up by arguments on whether or not more witnesses should be called. This was the result of motions by Liberal members of the committee that no more witnesses be called and that we wind up the hearings of the committee. The members of this party argued during the course of two or three meetings that we should call additional witnesses, particularly the former chief of the defence staff, Air Chief Marshal Miller. Eventually we did secure four more witnesses, but to state that every person who was opposed to this concept and wanted to make his views known had an opportunity to do so is completely false and incorrect. A considerable number of people who asked to appear before the committee never did appear because they were given no opportunity to do so and, as I say, the Liberal members of the committee tried to cut the hearings off even before we had heard the last four witnesses.

• (4:00 p.m.)

The next point upon which I should like to comment concerns the minister's remarks as reported at page 14430 of *Hansard* for yesterday. He said, dealing with some of the strategic considerations and so on involved in this question:

All the while that these two matters were being attended to, preparations were in hand for the writing of a long range defence plan for Canada. Study groups were set up which included representatives of the navy, army, air force, the deputy minister's staff and the Defence Research Board.

The minister went on to say that these studies covered a wide range of activities and he specified them. I think the only reason the minister put this in his speech was to try to give the impression that the reports which were prepared by the staffs supported his views in regard to unification. All the senior, retired officers who appeared before the defence committee did not support the minister's views. Not a single one—I repeat, not a single one—of those senior officers who are no longer members of the defence staff supported the minister's views on unification. Some of them said that unification was complete nonsense and they would not have anything to do with it. Others said that it might be all right in the course of time but certainly it should not be tried for a period of three to five years. In view of the fact that the senior officers who are now free to speak have all opposed the minister's ideas with regard to unification, it seems to me he is trying to fall back on these anonymous reports.

I should like to ask the minister—in fact I challenge him—to file these reports in the house so we can see what they do say. I have heard something of these reports. There was one produced by a very brilliant gentleman, now deceased, Mr. Sutherland. I have heard about two or three others that were produced. I have also heard that not a single one of those reports supported the minister's ideas on unification. They supported his ideas on integration. They laid out the advantages of integration, how it could be proceeded with and so on, but not one of them, if my information is correct, supported the minister's ideas on unification. Once more I challenge the minister to table these reports and let us see what they contain.

Following that the minister gave a general strategic appreciation. I do not disagree with this appreciation. In fact I have frequently spoken in much the same way and along the same lines both when I was minister of national defence and since. I think that part of the speech was perfectly all right, although it had absolutely nothing to do with unification. It was a general strategic appreciation and from that point of view was all right. However, I disagree completely with the statements which follow with regard to improving the flexibility of our forces by the changes proposed by the minister, that is, by putting into effect the unification of the forces. In my view, and this view was also the view of some of the competent witnesses who appeared before the committee, rather than improving the flexibility of the Canadian forces by these means we will considerably decrease their flexibility and make them less able, particularly from any combat point of view, to carry out the roles and activities which may be demanded of them.

The next matter upon which I should like to comment is dealt with at page 14431 of *Hansard*. The minister's statement reads as follows:

First of all—

The minister is talking about how much things were improved after he became minister.

—we reversed the policy of 1959, that the Canadian army in so far as new equipment was concerned would only be equipped to training scale for the three-quarters of the army in Canada and to full equipment for the brigade group overseas. I know that my hon. friend from Calgary North has questioned this, but I have the policy before me. It was established in 1959. The formal decision was taken and it applied to over-all equipment purchases. Therefore the policy then in effect, which meant that only one-quarter of the Canadian army would be equipped and available to fight overseas, was reversed.

That is a piece of complete nonsense. The minister raised this matter in the committee and in the committee, of course, unlike here, I had the opportunity to cross-question him. I should like to go over the evidence given in the committee with regard to that point to show how completely wrong is this statement which the minister continues to make in spite of the fact that it has been disproved, namely, that the Canadian army during the period I was minister was equipped to only three quarters of its scale and that there was a policy that that was the extent to which it would be equipped.

Mr. Hellyer: That is correct.

Mr. Harkness: I had never heard of any such policy until the minister raised it in the committee. That was the first time I had heard of such a policy. I can assure the house that when I was minister of national defence

there was no such policy; as a matter of fact, the army was equipped to full war scale.

Mr. Hellyer: It was not, during the time you were minister.

Mr. Harkness: The minister can mutter away as much as he likes, but I am telling you, Mr. Chairman, and the committee what the actual situation was, not what this Minister of National Defence thinks it was. During the period I was in charge of the department and responsible for its policies, I say categorically that I had no such policy and, in fact, that the army was equipped to full war scale in most cases.

This matter demonstrates how difficult it is to deal with this minister. This matter was dealt with in considerable detail in the committee. I cross-questioned the minister on it and forced him to admit that the statements he had made in regard to these matters were not correct. But when he comes back into the house and makes a speech to the committee on this bill he reiterates the statement. In his speech of yesterday the minister talked about myths; he said he wanted to explode some of the myths. The minister is the greatest builder of myths so far as military affairs are concerned that we have ever had in this country. It is extremely difficult to deal with him because after one has exploded one of these broad, general remarks that he makes it does not make any difference to the minister. He comes back in some other place a few days later or a few weeks later and repeats the same, completely false statement that he made before.

As reported in the committee proceedings for February 23, 1967, at page 1600, I was questioning the minister as follows:

Now, next you get on to this matter you have brought up two or three times: "Three-quarters of our army was equipped only to training scales". This is not correct. What about our tank regiments; were they only on training scales when you took over?

Mr. Hellyer: Have they been acquired since the change in policy?

Mr. Harkness: I said: were our tank regiments on training scales of equipment only, when you became minister?

Mr. Hellyer: My contention, Mr. Harkness, was that this is a policy adopted in 1959; it might not apply to—

Mr. Harkness: I am asking you a specific question, and I do not want a general answer on the general line you give which does not come down to specifics.

• (4:10 p.m.)

The minister was being asked a specific question but went around in large circles and in the end avoided answering it. The advantage of a committee such as the defence committee is that its members can get down to specifics. The minister answered the question in the following way:

I think we had quite a surplus of tanks.

In other words, the tank regiments were not only up to full equipment but had a surplus of tanks. I then said:

Yes. In other words, then, as far as our armoured corps was concerned, it was not on training scales; it had full war equipment. What about our artillery regiments? Were they on a training scale only?

Mr. Hellyer: Again, Mr. Harkness, if you are talking about towed guns—

Then he tried to drag in a red herring because at that time there was nothing but towed guns.

Mr. Hellyer: There should have been.

Mr. Harkness: I could say just as readily that there should have been machine guns in the battle of Waterloo and the troops would have been much better equipped if they had had them. In actual fact, at that time our troops were entirely equipped with towed guns, as they are still. The minister went on to say:

—I think we have had a surplus of those.

In other words, we had more guns for the artillery regiments than were required. He went on to say:

This, I think, is more or less irrelevant to the decision you took that this policy would not be continued after 1959.

Mr. Harkness: What do you mean, the decision I took, and what policy?

Mr. Hellyer: That in future you would provide only training scales.

Mr. Harkness: My contention is that the forces were not equipped on training scales; that the statement that they were on training scales is completely incorrect. I am going over them arm by arm, in order of their seniority, and you have admitted that the armour was up to war establishment. I think you have admitted, at least indirectly, that the artillery was up to war establishment, and, in fact, that we had a surplus of guns. Is that not correct?

Mr. Hellyer: Speaking from memory with respect to the tanks and the towed guns themselves, I suspect that it is so.

He said that after having admitted that the units were not only up to establishment but that there was a surplus of equpment for them. I continue reading:

Mr. Harkness: Yes.

Mr. Hellyer: I think we should extend this into other fields, including ammunition and new equipments that were being programmed, where the more current policy applied.

Mr. Harkness: Naturally, Mr. Chairman, I think it is evident to everyone in this committee that an army cannot be equipped with equipment and actually in possession of equipment, which has been ordered but not yet delivered, but as far as the equipment laid down for the army is concerned, my contention is that this statement the minister has made that three-quarters of our army was equipped only to training scale is completely and utterly false.

Mr. Hellyer: With respect to those two equipments, Mr. Harkness, were they acquired during your time as minister?

Mr. Harkness: No, they were there when I became minister. Now, as far as the infantry is concerned, was the infantry not fully equipped with rifles, machine guns, anti-tank weapons, trucks, mortars, and so forth?

Mr. Hellyer: I would say: with ancient trucks, with ancient wireless, and with no armoured personnel carriers at all. As you well know, in the appreciation of our capability in Europe these were chronic deficiencies which were reported and about which nothing was done for a considerable period of time.

Mr. Harkness: You say, ancient rifles; how old were the rifles?

Mr. Hellyer: I did not say ancient rifles.

Mr. Harkness: You said, ancient equipment, generally. How ancient were the rifles?

Mr. Hellyer: If I said rifles—and I do not think I did—I did not mean to. I said, wireless and trucks.

In actual fact the rifles of the infantry battalions in Europe and in Canada were the same FN rifles which they have at present. They were secured some years before that and it was hoped that this rifle would be adopted universally by the NATO forces. The same thing applied to mortars, to machine guns and to other pieces of equipment. The minister tried to wriggle out of this and instead of getting down to the actual combat equipment he went on to speak about trucks. He said:

I said, wireless and trucks.

Mr. Harkness: All right, how ancient were the trucks?

Mr. Hellyer: Oh, ancient enough that it is time they were replaced.

Mr. Harkness: Well, how ancient were they? You make another general statement; I want you to get down to specifics. How ancient were they?

Mr. Hellyer: Which truck are you talking about?

Mr. Harkness: I am talking about the general issue of trucks. As a matter of fact—

Mr. Hellyer: Yes, Mr. Harkness, but general issue trucks are divided into categories too. If you could be more specific on that, I could get the answer for you.

Mr. Harkness: We will take jeeps; how ancient were the jeeps?

Mr. Hellyer: I will have to get that answer for you.

Mr. Harkness: I will tell you; I think you will find that a considerable number of them had just been bought and the same thing applies to a large number of the other trucks. There was a constant stream of new trucks and equipment coming into the army during the period prior to when I was minister of national defence and during the period that I was minister of national defence. As I say, I do not think you can point to any specific arm of the army to which this statement truthfully can be applied: Three-quarters of our army was equipped only to training scales. You have not been able to mention one single instance yet where it applied.

Mr. Hellyer: I think the infantry were not adequately equipped anywhere, and that certainly applies to three-quarters in Canada, and probably to a very considerable extent to the units in Europe as well.

This goes on for another page. However, throughout this exchange the minister did not establish one single, specific instance in which the army was not equipped up to war establishment. He did not establish that the equipment was old, obsolete or anything else along that line. All he did was to draw a red herring by saying such things as that they did not have armoured personnel carriers or they did not have self-propelled howitzers, when in actual fact much of this equipment, particularly the armoured personnel carriers, was on order but had not yet been delivered and in fact was not delivered for several years. I think this is an outstanding example of what we were faced with in the committee when dealing with the minister. First he made a statement of this kind and when it was demonstrated that his statement was incorrect he turned right around and made it again. As long as we have a minister of this kind there can be no confidence in the minister on the part of members of this house, members of the armed services or members of the general public. As a result there will be an unsatisfactory state of affairs in the defence department.

The next statement of the minister on which I should like to comment deals with a considerable number of matters. It is to be found on pages 14432 and 14433 of *Hansard*. In all instances the minister tried to demonstrate that he has achieved great savings in manpower.

He mentioned intelligence services, information services and various other services and said there had been a 30 per cent saving in manpower here, a 40 per cent saving there, and so on and so forth. Of course there have been certain savings in manpower through the combination of staffs. Nobody disputes that. But the whole purpose of this statement is to try to persuade members of this house and the general public that the minister has

made great savings and therefore, by implication, they are going to pay less by way of taxes, whereas the exact opposite is the case. The total cost for defence has gone up. In fact this year it has gone up by as much as $115 million. Except for one year it has risen ever since the present government took office. In addition to the fact that the cost of defence has not gone down and the taxpayer is actually paying more for defence, he is in fact paying a great deal more for less defence. The number of people in uniform is down by some 20,000 and is continuing to decline. There are not enough people to man the ships, the infantry battalions, the armoured units and all other units which are under strength. Not only are we expending more dollars for defence but we are getting a great deal less defence for every dollar expended.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Hellyer: Nonsense.

Mr. Harkness: The minister, as usual, says "nonsense". All he ever does is to say "nonsense" and make general statements which he cannot substantiate. Even though he cannot substantiate them he keeps on repeating them. Apparently he believes it is a good propaganda technique to repeat something, no matter how false, and that if repeated often enough the people will believe it.

Mr. Foy: Can you substantiate everything you say?

Mr. Harkness: Yes, I am able to substantiate everything I say. As a matter of fact the hon. member was a member of the committee and will therefore realize that I substantiated any claim I made there.

The next statement the minister made was with regard to recruiting. The minister said, as reported on page 14433 of *Hansard*:

> Notwithstanding the problems which inevitably arise in the first year,—

He is referring to integration and unification.

> —and a reduction of 33 per cent in personnel—

That is recruiting personnel.

> —we were able to recuit more people in 1966 than in the previous year.

Later in his speech the minister repeated the statement that he had been able to recruit more people in 1966 than in either of the preceding two years. If we wish to look at the actual number of recruits in those years, we turn to the brief the minister presented to the committee on February 23 to which a table is attached showing the number of recruits for the regular forces in each of the years from 1956 to 1966. The figures are as follows: 1956, 17,281; 1957, 19,739; 1958, 15,252; 1959, 12,047; 1960, 12,690; 1961, 16,092; 1962, 14,283; 1963—this is when the minister took over—11,804, the lowest figure since Korea, 1964, 10,539, again a new low so far as recruiting is concerned; 1965, 9,883 and 1966, 10,822.

The figure in 1966 is up somewhat from 1965 and it is up very little from 1964. However, those two years were the poorest two years we have had since the Korean conflict so far as recruiting is concerned. The minister compares 1966, which is a little better but not very much better, with the two poorest years in recent history so far as recruiting is concerned and then tries to make the claim that recruiting has improved. This is another deliberate attempt to try to deceive the general public as to the state of recruiting in the armed forces.

Recruiting is not the whole story so far as the strength of the forces is concerned. While this number of recruits was being secured in 1966, what number of people left the service? There were 10,822 people recruited, people coming into the forces for the first time, but a number of men left the service and many of them had been trained for years and years. They were at the peak of their efficiency when they got out or were fired. The number of people who left the service during that time totalled 14,792. There was, therefore, a decrease or wastage in the strength of the forces totalling 3,970 during 1966.

However, the situation was worse than that. At the end of 1966 there were 1,763 people who were still carried on strength but who had actually been discharged or were on terminal leave. The actual wastage in the service for 1966 was, therefore, 5,733. There were that many fewer people in the services than at the start of 1966. In spite of that fact the minister gives us these figures concerning recruiting and makes the statement that recruiting has greatly improved. This statement is designed to give a totally false impression to the people of Canada as to what the situation is not only in regard to recruiting but in regard to the effective strength of the armed forces.

The Chairman: I am sorry, but I must advise the hon. member that the time allotted to him has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

The Chairman: Does the hon. member wish to continue? Does the committee give unanimous consent for the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Harkness: I should like to thank the committee, Mr. Chairman, and I will not carry on for very much longer. As a matter of fact, I should like to come back to some of these matters and particularly to consider the matter of unification with which I have not actually dealt yet, and for that I must apologize to the committee. I have been concerned about answering some of the misstatements made by the minister. There are one or two more with which I should like to deal, but I will not impose upon the committee for too long. The minister stated, as recorded on page 14434 of *Hansard*:

> One of the stated intentions of the savings that could be made was to use those savings for new equipment for the armed forces.

A bit further along the minister said something else along similar lines about the savings which have been made and which could be used or will be used to improve the equipment of the forces. Yes, it is right on the next page, following an interjection by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre:

> I think my hon. friend will appreciate that a reduction in personnel had to be made in order to make a diversion of funds for the acquisition of equipment and that, of course, was one of the objects of the exercise.

The minister goes on with quite a few comments with regard to equipment and does the same sort of thing he attempted to do in committee, that is, to persuade the members and the general public that since he took office a great deal more money had been spent on equipment as a result of the savings he was able to make in manpower and so forth. The committee had presented to it a chart which showed the percentage of the defence dollar spent on equipment. The indication was that the amount had been going down and down every year until the minister became minister and then it began to level off and go up a little. I took objection to this chart and said it was false. This caused quite a stir amongst the minister's officials but finally they had to admit that it was. In fact, they tried to cover this up by saying that the chart had been mislabelled or something along that line.

The actual fact, Mr. Chairman, is that in spite of everything the minister has said with regard to saving money and so on the money expended on equipment since he has been minister has been a smaller portion of the Canadian defence dollar than was the case before he took over. If we start in 1961-62, the percentage of the defence dollar which was spent on equipment was 18.8 per cent; 1962-63, 14.8 per cent; 1963-64,—we are still in the estimates which I prepared—16 per cent; 1964-65, 13.4 per cent and 1965-66, which is the last year for which we have the expenditures published by the Auditor General, 12 per cent. This is the actual situation so far as expenditure on equipment is concerned, and yet the minister continues in every speech he makes to try to sell the point to the members of this house and the general public that he has been saving money on administration expenses and buying more equipment.

Mr. Hellyer: Hear, hear.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Harkness: The minister claps his hands. Nevertheless, the Auditor General's report gives the exact figures showing how much has been spent on equipment and they disprove completely what the minister says. This makes no difference to him. He comes right back two or three days later or whenever he has the opportunity and makes the same completely false statement again. Once more I say that this makes for an extraordinarily difficult position so far as the members of this committee are concerned because we cannot place any credence in anything the minister says or the statements he makes.

I have a considerable number of other matters on which I wish to speak, Mr. Chairman, particularly in connection with the narrow question of the single unified force provided for in the bill. However, I do not want to trespass on the good nature of the house and I will come back to that at a later time.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege arising out of the speech to which we have just listened by the hon. member for Calgary North, who has shown with great clarity that this house has been deceived by the Minister of National Defence. This is destructive of debate in this house. It is destructive of consideration of a bill as important as the bill now before us.

The hon. member for Calgary North has shown so clearly, by three outstanding examples, that the minister is misleading this house and the Canadian people. I do not see how we can carry on a serious discussion in the House of Commons on a bill affecting the

defence services of this country if we are going to be faced with statements on the part of the Minister of National Defence which are palpably untrue.

It has been shown that he was quite wrong in what he said about the equipment of our forces to training scale in Canada. It is shown by the committee evidence quoted by the hon. member for Calgary North that he was quite wrong. Yet the minister repeated this statement in his speech yesterday. It has also been shown that he has misled the house with regard to the strength of the forces. He has said that there has been an increase in recruiting, without acknowledging the wastage that has occurred at the same time which has resulted in our forces in fact being seriously depleted.

How can we carry on a sensible discussion in a situation such as this with a minister of the crown who is not giving the truth to the House of Commons, Mr. Chairman? I suggest that serious consideration must be given by the government to this situation. It should be brought to the attention of the Prime Minister.

My point of privilege is that we simply cannot carry on a discussion such as this with the minister failing to give accurate information to the House of Commons. I am prepared to let the minister answer the charge I am making immediately to see whether he can clear up the statements that have been made by the hon. member for Calgary North, but I do not want simply a repetition of things he has said before concerning which he has been found to be not accurate.

I will deal with this matter at length when I speak in the course of the debate, Mr. Chairman, because I drew attention to matters such as this on November 4. But yesterday we again had a repetition of these statements, and the minister has now been shown by the hon. member for Calgary North to be at fault and to be misleading the house. What more dangerous thing can be done than that? How can the members of this house vote sensibly and with accuracy on the bill that he is presenting to us if we cannot rely on the statements that are made by a minister of the crown? That is the situation we face at this particular moment, and I think it is only right to give the minister a chance to reply. If he does not reply I think there is other appropriate action that might be taken.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, I hope that the time the hon. gentleman has taken will be charged him as one intervention in this debate. I certainly will reply—

Mr. Churchill: You are not going to stop my speaking in this debate.

Mr. Hellyer: I will certainly reply in some detail, to some of these spurious allegations which have been made this afternoon, but at a later stage of the debate. I too get a little sick of hearing this repetitious nonsense from the hon. member for Calgary North.

Mr. Flemming: He proved everything that he said.

Mr. Hellyer: He cannot prove the things he said because they cannot be proved.

Mr. Flemming: He quoted from the record and gave the page.

Mr. Hellyer: He was quoting vague generalities.

Mr. Ricard: He was reading from the text.

Mr. Flemming: He also gave the page.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words in the course of this debate, not to oppose unification or integration of our armed forces, or anything of the kind, but merely to obtain some information on specific aspects of the Canadian armed forces.

But before I do so, Mr. Chairman, I want to protest strongly against the earlier outbursts, of the hon. members for Calgary North and of Winnipeg South Centre (Messrs. Harkness and Churchill) against General Allard. I wonder why those two former ministers of national defence hound the Chief of Staff, if not precisely because he is a French Canadian.

Mr. Lambert: Now, that is nonsense.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, it denotes partisanship, politicking; it smacks of racism; in short it shows a spirit of denigration which does not belong in this house.

Mr. Lambert: No more than the nonsense you are now talking.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I see that some hon. members are hurt, which confirms one thing: the truth hurts.

Mr. Ricard: You do not know what the truth is.

Mr. Grégoire: I would like to advance arguments against the way the hon. members for Winnipeg South Centre and Calgary North act with the chief of staff of the Canadian forces. I think that this is improper, and that indeed those two members should withdraw their words and stop behaving as they do.

Mr. Lambert: An old crow is always croaking.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I see the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) is seeking to protect his colleagues; he should rather seek to protect the truth; it would be much better.

Mr. Chairman, the first point I want to make is what the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ricard) is saying; he wants to speak but is never heard, although this once he is talking. The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot will see that last Saturday in *La Presse* he was called a minister on the way down, or something like that, in the House of Commons. I apologize for not knowing the French translation of the word, but that is going down.

• (4:40 p.m.)

In any case, Mr. Chairman, those remarks were made and I see that they were shocked by them; they do not like to be told such things. Well, if they do not like it, let them desist, that is all.

The first thing I want to bring up about unification is this one. Has the number of air force pilots decreased because of unification of the armed forces? Or will the pilots who had enlisted for three years be kept for a much longer period although they have asked for their release?

One knows, Mr. Chairman, that under a program designed to train officers for the regular army, namely the R.O.T.C., students can enlist for three years and pursue their studies in the Royal Canadian Air Force.

Mr. Chairman, for some time now, those flying officers, who have their wings and a permanent officer's commission, who are aircrew members of the R.C.A.F. and who should normally be discharged toward the end of May 1967, since they gave their regular notice in October 1966, that is six months earlier, and who were sure their undertaking would be respected by the R.C.A.F., found employment with civil aviation companies or elsewhere, but today the powers that be refuse to give them their discharge and say: We are short of pilots. And they are told: We cannot give you any answer, because no decision has been taken.

When those young men enlisted in the R.C.A.F., they were told certain things and today they are told an entirely different story. They are now told that instructions from the Canadian armed forces headquarters specified that flying officers holding a permanent commission are required to complete five years' service as trained pilots from the date they obtained their wings.

And, Mr. Chairman, I read this in a letter signed by Brigadier Doucet, executive assistant to the Minister of National Defence.

They are told that they are now required to complete five years' service as trained pilots, but when those young men enlisted in the air force, they were told that they were signing up for a three-year term. And they are also told:

> This requirement applied to R.O.T.C. pilots as well as to other pilots.

But when those young men enlisted in the R.O.T.C., they had signed up for a three-year term. However, they are told:

> This requirement is justified, because it costs the armed forces a lot of money to train pilots.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the authorities knew that when the men signed up. Why were they not told the truth then? Why were they misled then? Today they are told: You will spend two more years of your life as pilots in the armed forces. And that, when these young people could more easily find jobs today in civil aviation or elsewhere in the civil service?

The letter continues:

> Believing that they were entitled to be discharged after the three years of compulsory service provided in the case of students in the R.O.T.C.—

They admit this.

> —a young man submitted an application for release to be effective on the date of termination of his commitments toward the R.O.T.C.

It is said:

> In the meantime, the Canadian forces headquarters informed all pilots having been in the R.O.T.C. and having asked to be discharged, that their application would remain in abeyance until the study in question was completed and the results made public.

How does it happen, Mr. Chairman, that we make a young citizen sign a contract when he enlists and, when the time comes to release him, although he respected all the terms

of his contract, the R.C.A.F. repudiates the contract and compels the young airman to stay two more years in the air force when there was no provision for that extension.

And the last paragraph adds:

—that a decision on the subject is anticipated in a very near future and that the final result will be disclosed.

Mr. Chairman, that is not the contract which was signed by the young Canadian who joined the air force. He enlisted for a three-year period to get his wings.

I would therefore ask the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer) and the Associate Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) to answer this question: does the R.C.A.F. disavow its commitments toward the young recruits at the time they entered R.O.T.C.? Is the R.C.A.F. ready to fulfil its commitment as the young airmen have respected theirs toward the R.C.A.F.? And those young people who had signed up for three years after getting their wings, will they be released after three years or will they be forced to stay five years although they signed up only for three years? I would like to know what the R.C.A.F. intends to do about this. Would the R.C.A.F. and the Department of National Defence disown their commitment toward those young people?

Mr. Chairman, that is the first point on which I am asking for an answer from the department, namely if actually those who enlisted for a period of three years will now have to stay in the service for five years, and I would like to know if the R.C.A.F. will respect the commitment made, that is a period of enlistment of three rather than five years. I hope that the Minister and the Associate Minister of National Defence will be able to answer that question.

A second point I should like to deal with in this debate on the bill to amend the National Defence Act—

Mr. Cowan: Not Pascal.

Mr. Grégoire: No, Mr. Chairman. I pick up a book and the member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) wonders whether I shall quote Pascal. I will not. But I should like, Mr. Chairman, to quote another author, a Canadian citizen, a French Canadian, a French speaking Quebecker, Mr. Marcel Chaput. I have here his book entitled: "J'ai choisi de me battre." Mr. Marcel Chaput, doctor of chemistry, is a good Quebecker who was employed by the National Research Council.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

He resigned in 1961. Now, he is working to gain independence for Quebec.

The book is published by the Club du Livre du Québec. On page 45, there is a chapter headed: "French Canadians in the armed forces."

And Marcel Chaput wrote that at one point when he was with the National Research Council, and before he joined the independent movement in Quebec, he was directed toward operational research.

I should like to quote a passage found on page 44 of the book written by Marcel Chaput:

From this post in operational research created by the Department of National Defence, I acted as scientific adviser to Civil Defence. But the appetite of operational research knows no bounds. It is interested in all problems. Thus the department invited me, a French Canadian, to explain to him one day why, first of all, there are, proportionately speaking, fewer French Canadians than English Canadians in the armed forces and, secondly, why the former advance more slowly in the services than the latter. Are French Canadians less talented, lazy or antimilitarist?

That was his question. To continue quoting from the book written by Marcel Chaput:

It was perhaps expected that my work would confirm the old belief that young French Canadians are not attracted to the army and, therefore, do not enlist, except for those who do not manage to find a place anywhere else, which would leave some doubts as to their intellectual ability.

Figures in hand, I first demolished the preconceived notion that French Canadians do not enlist in the armed forces.

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) wants to make comments which could be of some value at another time, but which are holding up our consideration of the bill for they are not directly concerned with it. If the hon. member wishes to make a separatist speech, there are other places and other occasions which are more suitable.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to hear the voice of the hon. member for Dollard (Mr. Goyer), because I think it is the first time, in at least a year, that I see him rise.

Mr. Goyer: The hon. member for Lapointe is often out of the house.

Mr. Grégoire: That remains to be checked.

Mr. Chairman, this was not a separatist speech, because we do not want to separate

anything; we are in favour of Quebec's independence in collaboration, in co-operation. He has called that a separatist speech; it is perhaps less tiresome to hear than his oversimple speeches, but these things must be said.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, I believe this paves the way for a question that I wish to address to the Minister of National Defence in connection with unification, and I think it must be recognized, under the circumstances.

I now go back to my quotation.

It may have been expected that my work would confirm the old belief that the army does not appeal to young French Canadians and that they therefore do not join up except those who cannot find jobs elsewhere, which might raise some misgivings about their mental capacity.

Mr. Goyer: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Grégoire:

I shall first do away with the prejudice—

The Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Dollard has risen on a point of order to draw attention to the fact that the standing orders of the house are perhaps not being respected at the moment.

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Chairman, we are used to blackmail tactics on the part of the member for Lapointe, just as we are used to his empty chit-chat. If the member for Lapointe will kindly indicate to the committee how his remarks may become a question to the Minister of National Defence, we shall listen. On the other hand, he should not trick the house and take the opportunity to make a speech which has no bearing on the matter now under study, and bring it to a close with unkind remarks without putting a question to the Minister of National Defence.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, the member for Dollard—

The Deputy Chairman: Order, order. I ask the hon. member for Lapointe to resume his seat, as I would like to stop this exchange on the standing orders. I believe the hon. member for Lapointe is entirely in order when he talks of the participation of the French speaking element in our armed forces, when he says it is more or less important, that perhaps it should be greater, more important, according to the ranks filled by French speaking Canadians.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I thank you. But first of all I should like to rise on a question of privilege concerning the intentions which the hon. member for Dollard ascribes to me. I must say it is extremely mean of him to do so. Moreover, I had just said that I would connect this to some questions asked in relation to the matter now under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, my question of privilege—

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I would ask the hon. member for Lapointe to resume his seat. I do not think his question of privilege is justified. The hon. member for Dollard rose on a point of order only to say that the hon. member for Lapointe was perhaps out of order. Therefore, I would ask the hon. member for Lapointe not to continue in this vein and to restrict his remarks to the bill we are now discussing.

Mr. Grégoire: Very well, Mr. Chairman. In fact, I consider this an event in the life of the hon. member for Dollard, to whom it does not often occur to let out his frustrated feelings. He had an opportunity to do this and I consider the matter settled. If he wants other opportunities to evaporate his frustrations, which I fully understand, I will be very glad to give him some:

And I go on:

With statistics in my hands, I destroy—

I am still quoting the book entitled "J'ai choisi de me battre" by Marcel Chaput, a book which I urge the hon. member for Dollard to read. I quote:

With statistics in my hand, I destroy first of all the notion that French Canadians would not enlist. If their number in the army is not proportionate to Canada's demography, it is not because they do not enlist, but rather because they do not stay in the army.

Thus among the ordinary soldiers and non commissioned officers the average length of service of the French Canadians is only three and a half years, whereas it reaches five and a half years for the other Canadians. More striking yet is the difference in the years of service between the French-Canadian officers and the others: English-speaking officers average 21 years of service; French-speaking officers average 11 years of service, that is about half less. English-speaking Canadians make a career in the army; French Canadians cannot bring themselves to follow their example.

With the authorization of the department, in November 1959, I delivered on that matter a lecture to the annual conference of ACFAS held that year at the University of Montreal.

That finding made the headlines in the papers the next day. French Canadians are, proportionately speaking, as attracted to the army as any other group of Canadians, but once they have enlisted, they start thinking about getting out of it. The next step was to wonder why. I wanted to take that step but the English-speaking authorities of the Department of National Defence would not let me.

Mr. Chairman, who was the minister of national defence in 1959? The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness). He should be here listening. I quote again:

> I wanted to take that step but the English-speaking authorities of the Department of National Defence would not let me. Or more precisely, they knew the answer: the French Canadians find out very soon after enlisting that they are members of a foreign army.
>
> At the time I am writing this, I learn that the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission on bilingualism and biculturalism has just discovered my study on the French Canadians in the army and will put it in its files.

That is my first question, which is directly linked with the unification of the armed forces.

On the verge of unification, I should like to ask the minister and the Associate Minister of National Defence whether they intend to extract from the files the defence department that study which Marcel Chaput prepared when he was working under the National Research Council, at the request of the Department of National Defence. I should like to know if the minister and his associate minister intend to take this study out of the mothballs and examine it, to find out what its conclusions were?

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, on the eve of unification, I should like the minister and the associate minister, because, in my view, the associate minister is just as important as the minister—they are associated in the management—and that he also has many virtues, many talents—

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): I agree.

Mr. Grégoire: This is why I am always appealing to both, Mr. Chairman. Among all the Quebec ministers, if there is one who, in my opinion, has endeavoured—I hope that he will not take advantage of my complimentary remarks to act in the opposite way tomorrow—to defend the rights of French Canadians in the past, it is he. In fact, I even consider that he is the only one, and I am pleased to pay him this tribute.

An hon. Member: Which one?

Mr. Grégoire: The Associate Minister of National Defence. Some hon. members could perhaps follow his example.

At all events, Mr. Chairman, a survey on the army was made by Mr. Marcel Chaput in 1959. He was not then, far from it, an avowed independentist and, furthermore, he was not active in their ranks. He was interested in those problems as should any other French Canadian citizen. He made a survey on behalf of the Department of National Defence to come to the conclusion that French Canadians did not remain very long in the army, and I quote the reason given by Mr. Chaput:

> —it is that French Canadians find out very soon after enlisting that they belong to a foreign army.

Mr. Chairman, after quoting those excerpts, I would like the minister and the associate minister to tell us what their department intends to do in that connection? Do they intend to bring forward the study made by Mr. Marcel Chaput and give it the publicity it deserves, because it is only then that we shall see whether the department is really interested in making the reforms suggested.

I hope, but I am doubtful somewhat, that the department is interested in making reforms in that field and, if so, let it produce and publish that study, and tell us whether it is intended to take the action suggested by Mr. Marcel Chaput at that time.

• (5:00 p.m.)

It is claimed that the Laurendeau-Dunton commission brought it out of the dust, that they have just rediscovered this study. I would then ask the Associate Minister of Defence and the Minister of National Defence whether they intend to read it, to publish it and to make the necessary corrections.

Mr. Chairman, there is a third point I should like to raise. It will be remembered that last summer, I think, or a year and a half ago, possibly two years ago, a note had been posted on the board at the Bagotville base, signed by an air force sergeant, announcing that in accordance with a decision of the authorities, the use of French as a working language was prohibited there.

I had put a question at that time to the Minister of National Defence, who had answered simply this:

> We will inquire into the matter and will give you an answer later.

Mr. Chairman, 12 months, perhaps more, have elapsed since the Minister of National Defence said that he would inquire into the matter and give an answer later. We never had an answer from the Minister of National Defence to a question I put a year ago whether it was true that such a notice had been posted saying that only English was the working language at the Bagotville military base, that French was prohibited. The

minister never answered, gave no explanation. I wonder whether today, when we are considering unification of the armed forces, it would not be the proper time to give an answer because, Mr. Chairman, that may mean many things. Unification. This means that the French and English languages are unified and that it has been decided that English will now be the only language. Is that also part of the armed forces unification plan?

For instance, would the minister tell us about the notorious regulation in army manuals providing that English is the only official language in the Canadian army. This regulation applies to all, except the 22nd Regiment, I believe. But, aside from that, for all the other Canadian forces, army, navy and air force, English is the only official language, and French is not recognized.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to know from the minister whether that regulation is still in force; whether it was amended; if so, when and by whom? I should like to know whether the minister could give the house a new copy of the regulations, more specifically of that regulation, if it is still in effect or if it has been changed.

It is advisable to ask ourselves some questions, since we have never been told that this rule had been changed. And the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) is right when he says that English is the only official language, since it is laid down in the regulations of the army, the navy and the air force, except in the case of the Royal 22nd regiment called the Van Doos. It is the only regiment to have that privilege, that is to have French in addition to English as a working language.

Then I should like to know from the Minister and the Associate Minister of National Defence if any step has been taken in connection with that rule. Does the minister intend to change it, or has he already changed it so that in the future, the hon. member for York-Humber could say:

Well, from now on, English is not the only official language, but the army rules state that both languages are official. And I am sure that the hon. member for York-Humber, with his open-mindedness, would only be to happy to be able to say that both languages are official. He is generous; he is only too willing to have two official languages.

But for the time being, he rightly says that there is only one, since only English is acknowledged in the Canadian armed forces, save when we are granted concessions and privileges.

So I should like the minister to tell me what measures were taken with respect to the unification of the armed forces? Does the old rule still apply? Will it continue to apply or has it been amended?

I should like to raise a fourth and last point, Mr. Chairman, which may be a little more delicate. In the very near future, Canada will celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the battle of Vimy. For all the Canadian people, of course, it is an important celebration since Canadian soldiers participated in the battle and won a great victory. In fact, several among us number relatives who fought on that battleground where the fiftieth anniversary of the battle of Vimy will be celebrated.

It happens that the battle took place on French soil, that the celebration will take place on French soil where veterans of the Canadian army and representatives will be in attendance. The Canadian army, the unified or integrated forces of the Canadian army, are happy to celebrate that victory but the French government will not participate officially as it would have wished in that celebration and many Canadians might not be as satisfied as they should be, because they will be represented officially, I mean not by members of the Canadian government, not by Canadian senators, not by Canadian members, not by the chiefs of the Canadian armed forces, admirals or generals but by Prince Philip of England. I want to say that I have nothing against him but what surprises me is the fact the army and the government have asked Prince Philip to be the official spokesman for the Canadian army and the Canadian veterans at the celebration of a battle won by the Canadian army.

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): Mr. Chairman, I take the liberty of speaking at this time in order to correct the statements just made by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire). I fully realize that he is sincere and of good faith, but the Canadian government and the Canadian army will be represented at the Vimy celebrations by your humble servant. I am going there as the official delegate of the Canadian government, and I propose to bring along and to read a statement from the Prime

Minister which will be two thirds in French and one third in English.

It should also be pointed out in all fairness that Prince Philip has been invited as a representative of the Queen of Canada at that ceremony and, therefore, he will enhance it by his presence. Canadians will find there again a participation fully along the lines of their constitution.

A minister of the crown will head the Canadian delegation and, moreover, circumstances would have it that he should be of French origin. As I said earlier, my statement or the message I shall convey will be two thirds in French.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to realize that my intervention led the Associate Minister of National Defence to explain several points.

However, Mr. Chairman, I do not withdraw what I said. I am glad I enabled the Associate Minister of National Defence to explain several points and I shall even ask him to be even more explicit, for according to French and Canadian newspapers, Prince Philip is heading the delegation as the representative of the Queen of Canada. There may be someone from the government to represent Canada, but Prince Philip will come first as the representative of the Queen of Canada.

Therefore, I would ask the Associate Minister of National Defence to tell the house who will take precedence to speak on behalf of Canada? Will it be Prince Philip or the Associate Minister of National Defence?

• (5:10 p.m.)

I hope it will be the Associate Minister of National Defence, and that is what I should like to know. Could the hon. minister give me an answer? Who will have precedence in speaking on behalf of Canada?

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): Mr. Chairman, if the house will allow me to answer the question, I would refer the hon. member for Lapointe to the press release issued by the Department of Veterans Affairs. The hon. member for Lapointe will understand that the Vimy ceremony is organized by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

According to the press release published in the newspapers, the head of the Canadian delegation in Vimy will be the Associate Minister of National Defence, Mr. Léo Cadieux.

Therefore, I have quite the impression that in delivering my speech in Vimy, I will act as interpreter of the federal government at this ceremony and I will speak not only on behalf of the cabinet and the government, but also on behalf of the Canadian people, in paying tribute to those valiant Canadians who fought for liberty in 1917 at Vimy.

Mr. Grégoire: Then, Mr. Chairman, I can only conclude from the remarks just expressed by the Associate Minister of National Defence, that for representing Canada, speaking on behalf of Canada, the Associate Minister of National Defence will have precedence over everyone else. He will speak on behalf of Canada, the Canadian army, Canadian veterans, at the commemoration of the battle of Vimy.

The Associate Minister of National Defence —if I understood correctly what he has just told me—will have precedence over everybody else. Can the Associate Minister of National Defence tell us whether or not this is a fair statement?

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): Mr. Chairman, to enlighten the hon. member for Lapointe, I will repeat to him that the form of my speech in Vimy will be the reading of a message from the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada. Therefore, I do not see who, apart from the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada, can speak on behalf of the Canadian people. I will be the bearer of a message from the office of the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. Guay: He still does not understand.

Mr. Grégoire: I will not waste time on those remarks.

I must tell you, Mr. Chairman, that the Associate Minister of National Defence knows me well enough to realize that I understand very well. But what I wanted, Mr. Chairman —and sometimes it does good to insist and to have a point cleared up—was to have the associate minister himself say it because it has much more weight than if the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Guay) had said it. Of course if it is the hon. member for Lévis who says so it has no weight, no importance whatsoever, but if it is the Associate Minister of National Defence—

Mr. Guay: What do you represent in Ottawa?

Mr. Grégoire: —it means something because it is said by someone in authority.

The Deputy Chairman: The member spoke for exactly 35 minutes; I understand that

there have been a few interjections by the hon. member for Dollard (Mr. Goyer) and that the hon. member for Lapointe has put a series of questions to the hon. Associate Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux), but I think we can all agree that the time of the hon. member for Lapointe has expired.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I shall close my remarks at this stage, and if I want to elaborate on some points, I shall have another opportunity to do so.

[*English*]

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, the white paper of March, 1964, which we now find to be a very interesting document, set out five main priorities. At page 24 of that document we find those priorities stated as follows:

> The choice of priorities outlined above is based on the following assessment:
>
> 1. Forces for the direct protection of Canada which can be deployed as required.
>
> 2. Forces-in-being as part of the deterrent in the European theatre.
>
> 3. Maritime forces-in-being as a contribution to the deterrent.
>
> 4. Forces-in-being for U.N. peace keeping operations which would be included in (1) above.
>
> 5. Reserve forces and mobilization potential.

Those were the five basic priorities upon which this government founded its current defence policy. The same white paper made it clear that the NATO commitment as we have understood it for many years would continue, probably using what the minister described in the white paper as a declining proportion of our defence resources.

We were told that the peace keeping role was to be given increased emphasis and the anti-submarine role was to be continued without major change. It was also indicated that air transport facilities would have to be substantially augmented. While it was noted that the NORAD commitment would probably require a declining proportion of our forces, it was indicated that the CF-101's assigned to the task would continue to be used during the life of the aircraft and that the Bomarc squadrons would continue to form part of our defence system as long as they remained an essential part of the NORAD system.

These suggestions were the result of a brief survey but they are generally accepted by students of the white paper. My conclusion is that the role of the armed forces as set out will continue into what we might describe as the foreseeable future but that the peace keeping role will be given greater emphasis in the future.

Since that white paper was written a decided and notable change in policy has taken place. The policy adopted by parliament, rightly or wrongly, was that which was outlined in that white paper. The policy now being pursued is very different. Let me quote what the chief of the defence staff said on February 28 of this year to the standing committee on defence. At page 1760 of volume 27 of the proceedings and evidence of that standing committee he said:

> Canada now wants, while remaining faithful to its existing commitments, to decide itself on the part it wishes to play in the new international society. This is not only its right; it is also its duty. It is its duty to participate to the best of its ability in peace-keeping by supporting the organization which had made itself the champion of the smaller nations—the United Nations Organization.
>
> In short, that is the transformation proposed by the white paper. That is what we are trying to do. My duty is to organize the military forces in accordance with government policy.

The white paper did not speak of the transformation of roles or policies and it did not indicate there would be a change in form. Indeed, quite the contrary was indicated. If that paper indicated anything it indicated only that there would be a change in emphasis, not a change in policy or role.

Throughout the committee proceedings it was stated that unification would only make sense if there was a single role but would make no sense at all if we continued our existing roles. While existing roles remain, the policy of continuing the existence of the army, navy and air force, identifiable as such, is a constant and continuing necessity. One might ask why that is the case. Let me use the air division in Europe as one example.

The air division in Europe is an integral part of the whole air defence system. It was organized and is operated and supplied not as a separate autonomous unit but as a unit forming part of the whole defence system. It works with and is dependent upon the whole system. The only conclusion I can come to, and indeed the evidence of the senior officers who appeared before the defence committee bears this out, is that the air division in Europe cannot be unified.

The brigade group in Europe forms part of the whole military network. Let me read

what the chief of the defence staff said in this regard:

• (5:20 p.m.)

> Missiles are rapidly replacing bombers, and air defence is no longer the exclusive concern of aircraft, anti-submarine defence is no longer the exclusive concern of ships, and the land forces need aerial mobility. And we are asked why the forces have to be unified.

No matter how often that suggestion is made, the facts of the matter are not related to the ability of one part of the Canadian forces to work with another part of our arms but the ability of Canadian forces to work with and be an integral part of international fighting and defence organizations. If we have a mobile force with its own tactical air support—this is the intention, so we are told, and that the role of the CF-105 is about to be changed—that force can operate successfully only in the direct defence of Canada. Let me repeat that. If we have a mobile force with its own tactical air support, that force can operate successfully only in the direct defence of Canada. The mobile force must give up its tactical air support if it is to be used internationally simply because the control of tactical support of this nature is centralized so as to be available for the support of all ground forces in whatever theatre of operations Canadian troops find themselves as the result of Canada's commitments. In other words, the unifying of our forces into a single force reduces, not enhances, our ability to work in an organization such as NATO. In fact, I would say that in some cases it totally nullifies our ability to work in such an organization.

As long as we intend to maintain the roles laid down in the white paper it would be military nonsense to unify the existing three armed services. The conclusion must be drawn from the expert knowledge made available to the members of the defence committee by witnesses, many of whom were chosen by the minister himself to fill the top posts of operational and organizational responsibility in the defence structure of Canada, that a unified force could not fulfil the role laid down in the white paper. Some of these men were subsequently retired, forcefully, arbitrarily or by mutual consent. As I say, Mr. Chairman, their opinion was that a unified force could not fulfil the role laid down in the white paper. The full, sheer and continuing weight of the evidence of every former senior serving officer who came before us supports the contention that a unified force will not be able to meet and

[Mr. Forrestall.]

fulfil the role set for us in the white paper of 1964.

Let us see what some of these men had to say in support of that position. In the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of February 16, as reported at page 1222, General Foulkes said to the committee:

> Anyone who has exercised higher command in war, or who has been engaged in planning at SHAPE, or who has even been exposed to SHAPE exercises, will be aware that the cardinal principle dealing with the operation of air forces is that of maintaining the maximum centralization of these forces. Parcelling them out in penny packages is most wasteful and creates complete chaos in the air over a battlefield and a grave risk that many of our aircraft will be shot down by the neighbouring forces.

It would seem logical, therefore, that our tactical air forces should be organized not as a force united with other forces of Canada but as a separate force with its own command structure so that it can be used both nationally and internationally with equal facility. Since our role in NATO remains unchanged this would appear to be a vital necessity. Even in the context of small wars, brush fires, and indeed of peacekeeping, this would appear a must unless we are going to go it alone in our undertakings in the world.

What did General Moncel have to say on this subject? As reported at page 1305 of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the committee, February 20, that estimable gentleman, a very distinguished Canadian, said:

> In the light of the commitments that are undertaken and which indeed are spelled for us in the white paper, a unified force has no place.

When asked if by "commitments" he meant our commitments to NATO, NORAD and so on, in accordance with our understanding of collective defence, his reply was, "Precisely." One must therefore conclude, in the light of this testimony and the weight of similar statements, many of them backed up with facts and experience, that to unify our forces while we maintain our existing roles as laid down in the white paper is militarily impractical and logically makes no sense.

What did Air Vice Marshal Hendricks have to say about this? As reported at page 1447 of the committee proceedings of February 21, he said:

> There is a final fallacy which appears in this concept of where we are heading, and that is that we can operate by ourselves. We can operate by ourselves only if what we do is very, very simple indeed—

Again, the conclusion to be drawn is that it is necessary to organize our armed forces so

they can dovetail readily with NATO or any other alliance that may be arranged. But unification will not permit ready organizational dovetailing capability on the part of our armed services.

Let us come back to the role of the armed forces. The minister has repeatedly stated that the roles are the roles as they have been presented in the white paper. It must therefore be obvious that already the rapidly accelerating degree of integration of the armed forces is on the way to creating an organization which, when fulfilled, will become less usable with our allies than our present tri-service organizations.

Moreover, if unification is carried out and Bill C-243 is passed by this parliament we will be endangering our ability to work satisfactorily with our allies. However, there is one escape route. Unification may make sense if it is the intention to drop the roles as laid down in the white paper in favour of the single role of peacekeeping, brush fire operation and so on or, if you wish, create a mobile force for the defence of Canada within Canada and defending only Canadian soil.

General Moncel underlined extremely well the inflexibility of our present system and the narrowness of the limits of a unified force. He said:

> If you want a unified force that somehow is going to call up a need for a seagoing element that is essentially a transport element, that is fine—write your commitments accordingly; but do not then turn around and say that you want a fighting, deep sea navy next week, because you will not get it.

It is impossible to get it in that situation. The decision on the role or roles must be taken first, and after that the decision must be taken on the military organization necessary to fulfil the role or roles. We have to get the cart back behind the horse where it belongs. In view of what the white paper says, and in view of what unification requires in the way of a single role, it is obvious that this bill must be shelved until a close scrutiny has been given to the defence requirements. These contradictions, obvious and devious, must first be studied and understood before we proceed. On seven different occasions attempts have been made both in committee and here in the house—as a matter of fact I believe it is now eight or nine occasions—to have this matter referred to the standing committee on external affairs or to a combined committee on defence and external affairs so that we may guard against, if nothing else, becoming the laughing stock of the world.

It is a useful practice to examine what armed forces have been doing since the end of world war II. In Korea—and I am neither an old general nor a young seaman, nor have I had any military experience other than a brief period in the militia in Canada—unless I am much mistaken both our land and sea forces fitted in very well with the forces of other nations which participated, even though they were separate forces. I think I am right in saying that the Cuban operations were almost exclusively maritime. The organization of a separate United States navy seems to have fitted this picture extremely well. In Viet Nam today the armies of the United States, New Zealand, Australia, South Viet Nam and other contributing forces co-operate effectively under one over-all, unified command. If I remember correctly, Suez was a military operation which brought French and British land and naval forces together successfully. I cannot visualize how the operation might have been carried out had the contribution of one of these key nations been by way of a unified force.

• (5:30 p.m.)

We had another type of commitment such as the one in Korea. Could a unified force have worked there effectively? The lessons of history do not necessarily bear that out—in fact, quite the contrary. First, our tactical air forces could not reach anywhere on the other side of the Atlantic or Pacific oceans unless transported there by ships or refuelled in flight by very expensive aircraft which as a matter of fact we do not yet possess. But even if they were finally placed in some foreign land how could they fit into the structure of the forces of our allies who would have centralized the control of their tactical air forces?

How would our mobile force with its headquarters in the province of Quebec, miles from the scene of operations, deal with the land forces? Surely the component of the land force would have to be separated, as our brigade group in Europe is separated now, and this in turn would call for an army and not a unified force. The navy, likewise, would be operating almost exclusively in a naval role together with the navies of other nations. It would appear that as part of a unified force it would be poorly served, indeed most inadequately served, by such an organization.

However one looks at this thing, the conclusion that constantly rears its head is that unification, as long as we are working in

alliances and contributing to collective national defence, is a change with little to commend it except that is is different. The organization of our forces must be compatible with those of other nations. I reiterate that it must continue to be so as long as the role of our defence forces continues to be the one which was set out in the white paper of 1964.

In committee proceedings No. 14 at page 440 the Minister of National Defence made the following remarks:

> I hope that I have been able to indicate that our defence objectives have not changed substantially ... and that we are prepared in these particular meetings to relate the policy to the structure, roles and equipment required by the forces.

Subsequent to that statement a succession of expert witnesses clearly stated—and I repeat it because it bears repeating—that unification is simply not compatible with the roles outlined in the white paper. Air Chief Marshal Miller made this point most emphatically. General Moncel, General Fleury, Air Marshal Annis and Admiral Landymore all made the same point from their own particular viewpoint based on their expertise and experience. Here we have top officers with outstanding qualifications and very recent experience, particularly so far as Air Chief Marshal Miller is concerned, and representing the three fighting environments and the support component, all clearly of the opinion that unification and the roles outlined in the white paper are incompatible, that there is no way of joining them together. Admiral Landymore pointed out quite emphatically that it would mean the end of an effective maritime defence for Canada and that Canada's international maritime commitments could not be fulfilled.

In the same connection General Moncel said the following, as appears in committee proceedings No. 22 at page 1333:

> The more the navy is forced into carrying the soldiers up and down the coast of Nova Scotia to the exclusion of everything else, the exclusion of going to sea; the more their equipment is rationalized with the army equipment; the more out of phase they get with allied navies—

In fact, General Moncel made this statement as appears at page 1332 of the committee's proceedings:

> I think if you want some form of intervention and peacekeeping on a minor scale, if you are satisfied with that and do it in conjunction with other countries, that you could have a unified force and do this thing. But, bear in mind the size of it—
>
> The kind of force that Canada can sustain alone, abroad, on a protracted basis, on a decent battlefield day, fighting at what we called FFC rates, is about a battalion.
>
> [Mr. Forrestall.]

He said that this was what we could support ourselves, both logistically and also, I suppose, in dollars and cents.

He also said, as appears at page 1313 of committee proceedings No. 22:

> If you press this thing forward your commitments must obviously vary with what the force is capable of doing. If you press a unified force through to its conclusion, you are going to have to drop some commitments, or change them.

At page 1317 General Moncel further warned:

> The planning heads have got to keep their wits about them and stay on top of this. It must be a progressive thing all the time, towards the most effective Canadian defence force. This is the object of the exercise; it is not unification. Surely the object must be to have the most effective Canadian defence force ... once you have unified it you are not going to un-unify it.

On the other hand, we have General Allard and Air Marshals Sharp and Rhyno indicating support for the policy. Bearing in mind that the latter are serving officers with no small obligation to see eye to eye with the minister on defence matters, it would appear to me that the weight of evidence does not favour unification. Perhaps it is unjust to these officers to suggest that their testimony might be somewhat reserved because of their relationships, but it is a fact that none of the present defence staff made any attempt to show, for example, that if our forces were unified they would be compatible with the forces of other nations. This may be an accidental omission, but the very fact that the air division and the brigade group in Europe will retain their exclusive air force and army structures respectively leaves me in some doubt that they were aware of their omissions, especially in view of the fact that the chief of the defence staff gave his testimony after all the others I have named with the exception of Air Chief Marshal Miller. The fact also that the chief of the defence staff used the words: "the transformation proposed by the white paper" indicates to me that he has begun to put far more emphasis on peacekeeping than on fulfilling the roles laid down in the white paper.

The acceptance of any clause of Bill C-243, other than those which were brought in to tidy up some legal matters, will mean tacit agreement or willingness on the part of the members of this house and the people of Canada to accept the total withdrawal of Canada from its existing commitments. These are long-time commitments. Frankly I do not think that this is what we should want or indeed what is needed for this country, but it

is what we will get so long as we try to match unification to the defence roles in the white paper.

• (5:40 p.m.)

I am sorry the Minister of National Defence is not in the house. I wanted to make some remarks in connection with the statements made by General Allard in his speech over the week end but I will let them go until a later time. I will simply conclude by reiterating that the force and the sheer weight of evidence dealing with ranks, dress, morale, the roles of our forces, the organizational faults, the incompatibility of the unified force in terms of our foreign commitments, the supposed increased efficiency, and the dollars and cents savings which we have not seen yet, at least not in the form of hardware which was to have been the initial purpose, all point to the inadvisability of pursuing unification now. All of the evidence by virtually every serving officer who was forced to retire prematurely or who happened, by coincidence, to have come to the end of his time, points to the inadvisability of pursuing total unification now. Even those who suggest that there might be merit in the concept of a unified defence structure for Canada caution about the speed we are travelling along this avenue and point out that we are blindly going ahead without bothering to read the road signs first.

Mr. McNulty: Mr. Chairman, during the recent and, I might add, exhaustive study of the problems of the unification program by the defence committee Canada's anti-submarine role came in for close scrutiny. Numerous wild charges were made in the committee to the effect that the navy is being destroyed and that there has been a serious reduction in the operational effectiveness of our anti-submarine forces. A close examination of the evidence given in the committee proves that this is not so.

The first point I should like to consider is the allegation that the navy and particularly our anti-submarine forces are being destroyed. This allegation is not in accordance with the facts. On December 7, 1966, the minister informed the house, as recorded on page 10825 of *Hansard*:

> The naval share of the current five year equipment and equipment development program, ending March 31, 1971, is approximately $460 million. This represents a 23 per cent increase in the navy's share in equipment and equipment development over that spent in the previous five years.

This hardly seems to me to be evidence of an attempt to cut down our maritime forces. Charges were made also that the effectiveness of our anti-submarine force had been seriously reduced during the past three years. I would refer those who want the facts to pages 1926 to 1928 of the minutes of evidence of the defence committee for March 2, 1967, where they will find an excellent statement by Commodore H. A. Porter, the director general of maritime forces, on the effectiveness of our anti-submarine role. This statement was made by him and is recorded on page 1927 of the committee evidence. It should be noted that Commodore Porter prefaces his remarks by saying that his testimony is not just his own personal judgment but is the professional opinion of competent officers who are specialists in anti-submarine warfare. The suggestion has been made that a certain reduction in the number of frigates over the past three years has decreased our anti-submarine capability. On this point, Commodore Porter said:

> Although it had been planned to dispose of the older world war II destroyers and to place some frigates in reserve as the new destroyers became available, this plan was postponed for a number of reasons including the Cuban crisis of late 1962. Thus, by mid-1963 the Royal Canadian Navy was seriously overextended in maintaining this large number of ships in commission. In particular, some ships were manned with as little as 70 per cent of the crew required for operational efficiency. In addition, in order to man ships, even at that level, crew members from a ship entering regular overhaul and refit periods were transferred to a ship just completing such a period. Changes of 100 per cent in the manning billets in a ship within one year were not unusual.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see how the navy's effectiveness was in any way enhanced by keeping in commission 17 out of date under-manned frigates at the end of their useful life and whose operational effectiveness was far below potential. Indeed, Commodore Porter pointed out, as recorded on page 1927 of the committee evidence:

> As a subsidiary effect, the morale and efficiency of the men were affected owing to the doubling of duties in undermanned ships, the constant changes from ship to ship, and the reduction in the normal opportunities for many of them to enjoy home life.

Having established the problem, Mr. Chairman, what are the solutions? We have to go on the premise that effectiveness comprises three factors, namely, men, equipment and vessels. The men, we know, are of the highest calibre in the world. There is no question about that. But what of the ships? Commodore Porter says this, as recorded on page 1928 of the committee evidence:

> It is believed that in spite of the reduction in the number of ships, the effectiveness of the maritime force has not been reduced since the early 1960's but has improved and significantly so in

certain areas. It is confidently expected that in the period ahead the new ships and helicopters under procurement action now as well as the planned retrofit of new weapon systems in older ships, will provide the maritime force with a greatly increased operational effectiveness when compared with 1963.

This point was continually raised during the committee hearings. Some hon. members opposite could not understand, or apparently did not wish to understand, that it is possible to have a more effective anti-submarine force today with fewer ships than we had in 1963, that quality is just as important, if not more, as quantity. I am no expert in this field. However, it seems to me only common sense that if the weapons and mobility of the fleet are greatly improved, as they have been, that the number of vessels, particularly those which are undermanned and obsolete, is practically immaterial.

I should like to give four examples:

1. The commissioning of the operational support ship, H.M.C.S. *Provider,* which permits an increase of 3 to 10 anti-submarine escorts to remain on continuous station 1,000 miles off shore in a force of 18 ships—a gain of three times the operational effectiveness according to Commodore Porter. Two more operational support ships are on order. These will further substantially enhance our ability to conduct anti-submarine operations, both in peacetime and in an emergency.

2. The addition of one submarine, with two more on order.

3. The conversion of seven *St. Laurent* class destroyers to carry Sea-King helicopters with mobile anti-submarine systems which give the force a tremendously increased mobility. I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, from the evidence that was presented to the defence committee by senior professional officers, that our anti-submarine capability has been greatly enhanced over the past four years because of the acquisition of the vessels just mentioned.

What about weapons and weapons systems? Surely they are critically important when considering the effectiveness of our maritime forces. Let us just examine them for a moment.

• (5:50 p.m.)

First, Mr. Chairman, we have the introduction of the variable depth sonar system for underwater detection of submarines. We have the introduction of the Mark 44 anti-submarine torpedo. There are improvements in the long-range detection systems in some aircraft and ships of maritime command. We have

[Mr. McNulty.]

real improvement in the undersea detection and tracking system and, of course, anti-shipping rockets for the Tracker aircraft. Under development for the navy as well is the Sea Sparrow all-weather, close-range, surface-to-surface missile system which is to be fitted into the four new helicopter destroyers and two new operational support ships.

We have talked about the operational effectiveness of our maritime A.S.W. forces under the categories of men, vessels and equipment. We know we have the best men. We also know that although there are less ships in commission today than there were, say, in 1953, their effectiveness has improved significantly because of modernization, refit and mobility. Finally, we know that these ships now have and are getting better and more devastating weapons and weapons systems.

With all these known quantities, Mr. Chairman, I find it difficult to understand why anyone should feel nervous about our maritime forces in the A.S.W. role being less effective than they were previously. Actually, I feel that Canadians should be quite heartened by the facts of the situation, that we are not only effectively meeting our commitment to NATO's SACLANT forces but that there is great promise for improving upon this capability in the 1967-70 period. Our naval experts serving today who are truly experts on the situation tell us that there is really no cause for alarm at all.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Chairman, it was a little over a year ago during the debate on national defence in this house that my colleague from Halifax made the point that he thought morale in the armed forces, and more particularly in the Royal Canadian Navy with which we are most familiar, was confused. Since the hon. member did not say it was bad—admittedly he did not say it was good but he did not say it was bad—this remark gave some comfort to the Minister of National Defence and the Associate Minister of National Defence. I think that if my colleague were to assess morale in the Royal Canadian Navy today he would indeed say that it was bad. When he and I have been home we have had the experience of almost daily contact with officers and men of the Royal Canadian Navy and have had an opportunity to assess their feelings. At times we have been bombarded with the problems of those who feel that service life is no longer attractive.

If there is any question among hon. members opposite that morale is not a problem in the Royal Canadian Navy, I should like to

refer to the daily orders of H.M.C.S. *Saguenay,* a destroyer-escort, for Monday, February 27, 1967. I have before me a photostat copy as reproduced in the Dartmouth *Free Press* for March 17. Part of the daily orders reads as follows:

> There will be no leave until morale improves.

The words "no leave until morale improves" have been underlined by the person who sent this excerpt to the Darmouth *Free Press.* So any attempt to gloss over the suggestion that morale in the services is not the same as it used to be before these strange processes got under way is defeated, and the minister can find no comfort in the state of the morale in the Royal Canadian Navy today, which he can observe just as easily as we can.

A few weeks ago, on a Saturday, a poor lost soul came to see me. He is a civil servant, one of those who work in an office where some form of integration has taken place. As a result of the administrative changes within his office he did not know who his immediate superior was or the man above that immediate superior. In fact, he did not know quite a few of the men in the chain of command until he got to the very top of the administration of H.M.C. Dockyard.

This person related to me something that has happened to quite a number of people who now work as civilian support for the services. These people are confused. They do not know the proper chain of authority or command in the offices in which they work, and when they ask someone whom they think might be their superior officers in that chain of command they get no satisfactory answer. This case of the poor lost soul in one of the establishments supporting the Royal Canadian Navy in Halifax is just one of the many human examples that exist under this integration and unification plan.

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? The hon. member referred to an order which had been posted on the *Saguenay* on February 27, I think he said, indicating that no leave would be granted. I should like to underline the fact that on Monday, February 27 the *Saguenay* was at sea, so certainly some of the naval personnel at Halifax have not lost their sense of humour.

Mr. McCleave: It is possible they have not lost their sense of humour, and that is one way to look at the situation. But I presume that application must be made for leave and this is a matter which is dealt with during the course of a voyage and as the ship approaches port. So if this was an attempt at humour it was an ill-conceived attempt. It meant enough to some people at least that they raised a fearful row, or attempted to, by sending this extract to one of the newspapers in my area.

I did not have the advantage of being a member of the defence committee, though I have read a large part of the evidence presented to the committee. It seems to me that an objective examination of the evidence that was presented, including the remarks of the minister and the associate minister and of those who supported them in their beliefs, as well as the remarks of the former officers who do not support these concepts, would lead any fair-minded person to say that the preponderance of the evidence clearly went against the Minister of National Defence and the unification bill that we are now studying.

In this regard one could mention the evidence of such people as Rear Admiral William Landymore and others, but I think that the most telling evidence was that presented by a man who in a way was responsible for getting the unification show on the road, a man who had something to do with working out the integration that had preceded it. I refer, of course, to Air Chief Marshal F. R. Miller, who was chief of the defence staff when it was formed in July, 1964 and who left that staff in 1966 after approximately two years' service. Surely, the words of a man who worked closely with the Minister of National Defence and the associate minister are words which are well worth weighing when hon. members are considering the bill before them. I intend to review some of the more pertinent points which Air Chief Marshal Miller made.

• (6:00 p.m.)

First, we find him making this point in answer to the hon. member for Vancouver East, as reported at page 2290 of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence No. 35:

> So that when we embarked on the problem, when the government made this decision that we would go for integration, we were not too sure what it would be, and we regarded it as a pragmatic operation which we would set up—an organization using three services, that would ensure that there was single direction, single management applied to the three services. We saw the next step, the step which is now called unification, as being a subsequent step sometime later.
>
> I do not think anybody is ever completely satisfied with an organization. We made very many changes in our first integrated organization we set

up, I imagine that they are still making changes. However, the large basic organizational frame is there, and I think it is a good one as far as an integrated defence staff is concerned.

So Air Chief Marshal Miller is giving his blessing to the idea of integration. Further on we read these words.

Mr. Winch: I follow up, then, with my next question. While you were chief of staff, was the policy of unification a matter of consultation between the military and civilian authorities, or were you obeying an assumption from the Minister of National Defence?

Air Chief Marshal Miller: I would think the best way to phrase it would be that it was an understanding that that was where we were going. I did not have what I felt was an instruction from the minister. It was an agreement to the policies set out in the white paper. The timing and the method were not spelled out there.

As we know from statements which have been made from time to time during this debate there was certainly no spelling out of the concept of unification in the white paper, though I think there was one mention of it on page 19. On page 2291 of the committee proceedings there is the following statement by Air Chief Marshal Miller:

The area of unification is a very sensitive one, as you well know. It strikes at the traditions and the feelings of a lot of people. I did not see, up until the time I left, that the return from pressing the unification sign was commensurate with the disruption and the great concern to the man in uniform that would result from it.

In other words he is saying, I think, that the "pros" on the side of unification are far outweighed by the "cons"—by the havoc which was being created. This is understandable in the light of the witness' previous statement that he never did get any heart to heart talks with the minister as to the road the hon. gentleman intended to follow.

I turn now to the evidence given by the Air Marshal as it appears at page 2297:

Mr. Harkness: Another thing which was brought up by a number of witnesses is that there was a threat that unification would inevitably—when you had a single unified force—result in a considerable loss of expertise in the three different environments of the sea, air and land warfare. What is your view on that?

Air Chief Marshal Miller: Well, that is predicated on the people being dissatisfied with the conditions and leaving. If the conditions are made attractive and information is made available to all the people, you might not lose them—I do not know. The big thing is the loss of people. I do not think we can force people to stay on if the government unilaterally tears up their contracts. If they join the navy and the navy disappears, you have, in my view, to give the men an option as to whether they will continue in the new service or whether they will leave. The decision with which you are facing those men has to be very carefully considered and prepared for.

Mr. Harkness: You would contemplate then that there might be a considerable further loss of highly trained personnel as a result of this move if it is made, going into effect.

Air Chief Marshal Miller: That is very well worth consideration. I do not think you will ever know what it is until you spell out what the conditions are and put them up to the men and see what the reaction is.

Mr. Harkness: That is one of the possible serious results.

Air Chief Marshal Miller: Yes.

I should have noted earlier that Air Chief Marshal Miller did not go before the committee with a prepared statement. He made his remarks off the cuff and anyone reading his evidence will appreciate that here was a man speaking from his heart and from his mind as to his actual experience. The whole tone of the evidence inspires a belief in its trustworthiness. As reported at page 2300, the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona is asking questions of the witness:

Mr. Nugent: Would I sum up your attitude accurately if I suggested that the case is simply this: Whether or not unification should ever be brought in and how quickly it would be brought in would be determined by a survey of the results of integration after these experiments had been finished and there had been a chance for an appraisal of their success or failure.

Air Chief Marshal Miller: Certainly the question of taking on unification was predicated on the integration—you call it experiment—the effort working.

Finally I should like to quote what this distinguished officer had to say as reported at page 2302. The hon. member for Kootenay East is the questioner:

Mr. Byrne: Then, do you believe that the implementation of Bill C-243 would result in significant demoralization of the various forces?

Air Chief Marshal Miller: If rushed, I would think so.

Mr. Byrne: If rushed. Do you consider that Bill C-243 is the exemplification of unification, that is, that it is exemplified in this bill?

Air Chief Marshal Miller: Yes, I think it is.

These are warnings which should cause the minister and the government of which he is a member, though a member diminishing in value, to pause. On reading the remarks made by the Prime Minister at a press conference which followed Air Chief Marshal Miller's presentation I thought the Prime Minister was about to take the statesmanlike step of switching on the red light and stopping this process until things had shaken down in the Department of National Defence. That was my impression of the Prime Minister's first

reaction to the testimony of Air Chief Marshal Miller before the committee. Then something happened—I suspect it was a long distance telephone call from an annoyed Minister of National Defence—and the Prime Minister backed away from his previous comments.

It has often been said by those who favour unification and integration that they do so because the concept is new and because it will save money. I do not think it will save money—the budget of the Department of National Defence does not bear out that contention—and as for its novelty, it might be expected to appeal to young people. However, I should like to quote the results of a survey which was carried out in the Halifax area. A questionnaire was distributed to high school and university students and interested adults who visited Dalhousie University during a two day meet the public campaign. About 1,200 questionnaires were returned and, quoting from the *Chronicle-Herald* of Wednesday, March 22, these were the results:

• (6:10 p.m.)

On the issue of armed forces integration, 50 per cent were opposed, 42 per cent were in favour, and 8 per cent didn't care one way or the other.

This survey was carried out by, believe it or not, the Student Liberal Association at Dalhousie University. I once had occasion to become aware of the weight of this splendid organization. They helped nail my hide to the wall in the 1963 election so I quite respect them as adversaries. The survey they carried out would, I think, embrace a fair number of members of that organization and, to put it very succinctly, the results showed that half of the young people polled did not believe in the policies of the Minister of National Defence. Many of these people are those who might be expected to support him when he takes part in the steeplechase approximately a year from now, let us say, for succession to leadership of the Liberal party.

It is no wonder then, sir, that the Tri-Service Identities Organization, in its summation recently sent to all members of parliament, was able to present some ten arguments why unification was not a viable way of moulding our armed forces. Point No. 2 in its summation is an interesting one. It reads:

Claims that other countries are following the Canadian example have not been substantiated. In fact government intentions as expressed in white papers on defence in the United Kingdom, France and New Zealand show no indication of emulating the Canadian plan which will be carried forward if the bill is enacted. Informed persons in both the U.S.A. and United Kingdom, as evidenced by recent articles and statements, have indicated concern or disenchantment with the Canadian experiment.

But I do not suppose the Minister of National Defence is any more proficient in reading adverse opinions from abroad than he is in listening to adverse opinions at home.

A few minutes ago the hon. member for Lincoln made a point concerning the reduction in operational ships of the Royal Canadian Navy and argued that the ships remaining in service, because of their increased weaponry and other new refinements, are much stronger warships than existed ten years ago. Of course this is true, Mr. Chairman. I do not think it is an act of genius to discover this fact, but the hon. member goes too far when he suggests that we in the opposition misunderstand the effect of the reduction in the number of ships that are operational.

We grant that any one ship is superior in its fighting abilities, anti-submarine warfare abilities and detection of submarines than the same ship was a few years back. But what we are saying is that if we continue to reduce the number of ships and are left with one or two they may be vastly superior but they will not have the same over-all effect as a fully operational fleet.

The MacDuff Ottawa Report in the Dartmouth *Free Press* of March 2 makes a point which I think is a valid one in assessment of the type of criticism heard in the defence committee. It reads in part:

—what they consistently attack is integration—the process that has been going on for three years, that many of them developed and carried out, the process they say is good.

This has given the defence committee hearings a somewhat unreal air.

As an outsider in respect of the defence committee that point struck me as quite a valid one. In other words, Mr. Chairman, we are still in an area where many of the problems associated with change in the Department of National Defence arise because integration itself has not yet fully worked itself out. I am not surprised at this and in a way do not hold any minister responsible for it in the sense that the department is a very large organization indeed and when you have a large organization it becomes extremely difficult to make changes within it.

I noted the case a few moments ago of the poor lost soul who could not ascertain the chain of command in one of the civilian offices attached to the military establishment

in Halifax. I think that part of the failure to achieve the maximum benefits of integration can be laid to the system itself. We are taking something very huge and trying to change it about. But I do not absolve the minister simply because Parkinson's law happens to be in effect in dealing with this matter. The fact is that the minister himself, by the golden handshake he has given many of his best advisers, or the golden boot might be a better way of describing it, has created havoc in his own organization. By reason of his failure over the past year to support his officers, particularly those in the navy, because of his failure not to berate publicly his own unnamed spokesmen in the department who have tried to turn the naval service into open class warfare, the minister has a great deal of responsibility in this particular area and much of what is happening is a result of the minister's own personal and unique way of doing things. In that respect I would wish that he could learn more from the very gentlemanly Associate Minister of National Defence who has somehow, despite all the uproar, managed to remain high in the esteem of every member of this committee.

Finally, sir, I would quote a program presented in somewhat jocular fashion in a letter by a Robert N. Clements of Spring Garden Road, Halifax, to the editor of the *Chronicle-Herald* and printed in that publication on February 9 this year:

> Sir,— It is hard to understand the timidity of Defence Minister Hellyer and his advisers in the promotion of the program of unification now being presented to the Canadian public through parliament.
>
> Why hesitate and refrain from a complete job? Why not rename the future defence service as the Canadian Water, Land and Air Department (CWLAD)?
>
> The senior officers could be listed as superintendents, first, second, and third class, and all the other ranks known as journeymen.
>
> Judging from samples of a few selected recruits displayed on television during the past several months, this action would attract such desired types in sufficient numbers to keep the service from complete collapse.
>
> A simple denim coverall would be good enough for the lot, and equipment could be reduced to a bucket and mop for the navy, a pick and shovel for the army, and some rubber balloons for the air department.
>
> The colossal saving would more than finance complete medicare for the whole country, without cost to any provincial government, with enough left over to do away with Health Minister MacEachen's means test and supply all old age pensioners at least 150 per month at age 65.

[Mr. McCleave.]

• (6:20 p.m.)

> Following this achievement, our government could turn its limited talents and time toward the integration of sundry splinter groups for unification of Canada into one country, rather than the present collection of Balkan-type states.
>
> As a start it could eliminate any further activity by our $5,000,000-plus, B and B commission which to date has merely served to stir up and create more bad feeling than any other activity in recent Canadian history.
>
> Further suggestions are available on request.
>
> Robert N. Clements

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it is again a matter of regret that a workable national defence policy could not have been evolved by members of all parties meeting in a committee with the type of witnesses that were heard by the committee on national defence but with the advantage that a very emotional issue had not been presented beforehand and therefore the advantage that concrete proposals could have emerged which would have represented the best common denominator of thinking in respect of this highly important field. As I say, I am sorry it has not happened in that way. The records of the committee on national defence contain too many harsh interjections by members with reference to each other and red hot clashes of personalities. This matter should not have become a highly personalized issue. I venture to suggest that this would not have been the case had the Minister of National Defence taken the advice to call upon an all-party committee of the House of Commons to deal with the problem of national defence in the future and perforce our external affairs policy which should be considered at the same time. That course was not taken. The government is following a course which has been proven to be one of folly. We shall continue to offer all the resistance we can to it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, like all my colleagues I thought that everything had been said about that bill during the many sittings of the parliamentary committee and during the hours we spent discussing it at the various stages.

Like many other hon. members, I also felt that it was better to keep quiet in order to expedite the passing of this bill, because many of us are under the impression that everything we hear now is repeated and rehashed. The same arguments, the same testimonies are constantly being brought forward. There is nothing new and I think that all Canadians

are beginning to be fed up with those endless discussions which fail to settle anything and take up the time of the house.

But nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, two incidents happened yesterday and today which prompt me to make an intervention that I shall try to keep as brief as possible.

The first deals with the opportunity seized by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire)—I am sorry he is not in the house and that the rules did not allow me to say this in his presence—to harp once again on his separatist string. Of course, this afternoon, his intervention was weak and sad in many respects. He put forward baseless arguments; for instance, he referred to the forthcoming celebration of the Vimy battle, and the Associate Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) left him without a leg to stand on, to use a current expression. He also brought up another disgraceful incident purported to have occurred in Bagotville two years ago and he dragged out musty files authored by Mr. Marcel Chaput, that other high priest of separatism. He very nearly would suggest to the minister, in order to settle the problem, that he appoint Mr. Chaput as commander in chief of our army and he himself would become a little corporal, a corporal in camouflage, in which he would undoubtedly excel, to judge from the way he never misses a trick to promote his separatist ideology, with such success as we have witnessed this afternoon.

What seemed most scandalous to me, Mr. Chairman, was to observe the member for Lapointe who seeks to appear as the saviour of the Quebec nation and who never misses a change to grab the headlines and claims to be the only member in this house to defend the rights of the people of Quebec when he opened wide his arms to the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) himself a well-known wrecker, even a saboteur of national unity in this country.

We have seen earlier the Quebec separatist leader embracing the Ontario separatist leader; we have seen them billing and cooing, but back in their own ridings, one will say that he wants to protect the French Canadians, the other, the Canadian people.

Mr. Chairman, I was wishing a while ago that the rules allowed me to snap a picture of those two members of parliament whose ideologies are miles apart—or should be, if they are logical with themselves—whispering compliments to one another, exchanging suggestions to improve somewhat their vicious procedures which only boil down to destroying the understanding between the two main racial groups in the country.

I think this warrants a protest, Mr. Chairman, for it eloquently reveals the wolf in sheep's clothing and I am sure that the people of Quebec will soon realize that the leader of the Ralliement national is nothing but an imposter whose arguments do not hold water and who excels at making mental reservations and at twisting the truth to suit his purpose. Such an attitude had to be brought out into the open, Mr. Chairman.

Another incident occurred yesterday. The integrity of General Allard was questioned here in this house.

Mr. Chairman, General Allard was born in my riding and lived in my home town. He is somewhat younger than I am. I saw him grow up, go to school, go through his first campaign in the army. I know him well and I must say, in all sincerity, that he is a man of unassailable integrity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Mongrain: Had he not been convinced that unification, that the integration which the government proposes to bring about were a good thing, I know he would have resigned rather than speak against his convictions.

Therefore, I think it rests with me, Mr. Chairman, to rise and defend him against his detractors.

And I am surprised that so much consideration has been given to the military men, the generals and admirals who sharply criticized that policy of the government and whom we read the evidence with attention and even respect. Many of those who allowed such a free criticism of the government will not permit the authorities of the Canadian army to defend the policy of their government as loyal Canadians should do.

I think that is illogical and that someone should point it out. It is the duty of General Allard to defend unification, because it is the policy of his government. I have never thought that it belonged to the servicemen to establish the policy of the country. Moreover, it behooves the government to establish the policy of the country and the military men to respect it. This is what General Allard is doing: his duty.

• (6:30 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Mongrain: And had he acted differently, he would have been disloyal and he would have deserved the dismissal which some of his colleagues had to face.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said that the morale of the troops was low. I am a bad judge in these matters. I choose to take General Allard's word, for he is better acquainted with them than I. However, should it be true that the troop's morale is low I believe that many members of this house should confess their guilt for it would be the result of their efforts to bring discredit on the government's policies and the high officers who are trying to implement them.

What would you think, Mr. Chairman, of someone who told 30 students in a classroom that their teacher was not following the right course because he insisted upon following the instructions of the School Board and the school principal? You would say: that is disloyalty. And eventually those students would lose confidence in their teacher. Their morale would suffer. The same thing happens in the army at the present time. And I think that members abuse here, in this house, of that criticism, and that they take advantage of too many circumstances to put in a bad light the responsible heads of the Canadian army who, for conscience' sake, want to defend the government policy.

Generals and admirals with a vast experience were called upon to give evidence. Everyone said what he had to say. It remains now for the government to adopt a policy, and neither those in favour of unification nor those against it can be muzzled, unless closure is to be imposed here.

Mr. Chairman, I think it should be added that General Allard is not a man who speaks through his hat and that he earned through hard work and experience the position he now holds. I should like to give, as briefly as possible, that it may be placed on *Hansard,* outline of the experience which allows him to speak knowingly of all the problems of the Canadian army.

1933: He received his commission in the non-permanent active militia.

At Trois-Rivières, Mr. Chairman.

1939: He went on active service and became a major in the Trois-Rivières Regiment (armoured). Between 1939 and 1943 he held several positions in Canada and overseas to become, in 1943, second in command of the Royal 22nd Regiment in Italy.

At the front. I feel that the fact that he risked his life for his country in 20 battles, that there might be peace in the world, should be reason enough to spare him the sneaky attacks now inflicted upon him.

December 1943: While acting commander of the 22nd, General Allard received the "Distinguished Service Order" (D.S.O.) for his courage, initiative and military competence in the battle of the Arielli, near Ortona.

January 1944: He assumed command of the 22nd Regiment and, in September, his outstanding record, in the break-through of the Gothic line, brought him a first bar to his decoration.

March 1945: He was promoted to brigadier, and was placed in command of the 6th Canadian Infantry Brigade in Holland. During that period, he received a second bar.

1945-48: He was sent to Moscow as military attaché to the Canadian Embassy, and he later became commander of the eastern Quebec command.

1950-51: He spent a year at the Imperial Defence College in Great Britain, then became vice-quartermaster general of the Canadian army.

1953: He was appointed commander of the 25th Canadian infantry brigade in Korea and represented Canada at the signing of the cease fire at Panmunjon on July 27, 1953.

1954: He was commander of the 3rd Canadian infantry brigade at Valcartier, then commander of the eastern Quebec sector until his promotion to vice-chief of staff of the army in Ottawa in 1958.

November 1961: Her Majesty the Queen approved the promotion of General Allard as commander of the 4th division of the British army on the Rhine, in Germany, the first Canadian to hold such a post.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Mongrain:

October 1963: He came back to Canada as major-general in charge of survival operations at army headquarters.

1964: At the time of the integration of armed forces, in September, he was promoted to the rank of lieutenant-general and appointed chief of operational preparedness.

September 1965: He took charge of the new mobile force command.

1966: On July 16, 1966, he was promoted to the rank of general and appointed chief of defence staff for Canada.

Decorations: In addition to his decorations received for bravery, General Allard is commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, was awarded the Croix de guerre and the Légion d'honneur by France, the Lion of Bronze by the Netherlands, and the decoration of officers of the Legion of Merit by the United States.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, he has not learned his calling solely through books. He has learned it through practice. In fact, he took training in the navy and the air force.

In the air force, for instance, he has accumulated more than 1,000 flying hours aboard Tiger Moths, Pipers, Cessnas as well as aboard L-19 Birddogs. Then, he chalked up a lot

of flying time as co-pilot on Dakotas, Beechcrafts, Seabees, Beavers. He also flew the British Hunter as well as CF-104's, CF-101's, DH-125's, Mystère 20's and CF-5's.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that this man is rather extraordinarily competent; his services to his country and to the peace of the world, deserve the respect of every man in this house and should at least protect him from such insinuations as were made when it was said that he supported unification and integration because he had to agree with the minister for reasons of personal advancement. He is not that type of a man and I know he would have the guts to resign if he was not convinced in his mind and in his conscience that it is the thing to do.

So, as the member for Trois-Rivières, I rise in the defence not only of a good citizen, but of a great Canadian, a great servant of Canada intent on maintaining peace in the world. And I urge my colleagues to show more consideration for services rendered and to stop wasting the valuable time of the house.

• (6:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to see the minister back in the house. Earlier he was absent and I hope he has dined well.

When I was speaking earlier, I suggested that the basic groundwork for a proper and adequate review of the legislation now before us could not be laid by anyone else in the house other than the minister, because he has ample time to set forth his views and understandings of the bill. Members must direct their comments to appropriate provisions; for that reason many of us will be on our feet on several occasions during the course of the next few days.

At this time I should like to extend the remarks I made earlier and outline my understanding of the state of the unification concept at the time the committee meetings concluded. It seems appropriate, in view of the marked division of opinion in respect of Bill C-243, that the minister reassess the evidence given to the committee and the meaningfulness of proceeding with the bill at this time.

We have been told quite emphatically that the government cannot accept any substantial amendment to the bill, that the acceptance of any such amendment would constitute want of confidence in the government and might force it to go to the people for a decision. I am not one of those who believe this should not be done. On the contrary, I feel quite strongly that if the people of Canada were properly advised and informed in respect of this measure, they would like to express their opinion on the merits of unification. I suggest this in light of the evidence and opinions which came to our attention during committee hearings.

During the course of those hearings, one very important fact came to light. Senior officers, past and present, openly declared their support for integration. The opponents of unification were most emphatic on this point, and most agreed with the principle of integration. Many of them, in fact all of those men who were retired earlier, worked very hard to achieve integration. Most of them felt that once the problems in respect of the implementation of integration had been solved, and procedures had been developed, not only could it be successful but in terms of serving members of the armed forces, efficiency and dollars and cents savings, it could be achieved.

• (6:40 p.m.)

It is my opinion, based on the evidence presented to the committee, that the time required to put integration into full effect and properly on the rails varies from three to five years. No one in the present or past defence staffs, in the higher echelons of the defence structure, denied that a great deal of work had yet to be done to bring integration to the end planned and hoped for by the minister and those directly responsible for its implementation. The task involved appears to include a vast amount of organizing in connection with establishments, procedures of supply and materiel, ways and means to judge the cost of various programs, various ways in which economies can be made and money saved, and consideration of the areas of waste that must be eliminated.

There appears to be a very large task of cataloguing in this respect. Indeed it is very desirable that this work should be carried out. In short, Mr. Chairman, there would be considerable work involved in this program, in the opinion of one senior officer who appeared before us. We were told that there already exists in one command a two-year backlog of paperwork. This work involves every branch of the Department of National Defence, including the commands which have been integrated. Not all of them have been

integrated, because some cannot be; but there appears to be a vast amount of tidying up, consolidation if you like, and assessing of the merits and demerits of the steps that have been taken to date and those that must be taken as the weeks and months go by.

This being so, in my opinion we have now to weigh the merits of proceeding with unification at this time. We must do this if we are to proceed in any orderly manner toward the goal that the minister desires. As we know, parliament has approved unification in principle. It remains my very real conviction that had the evidence now available to us been made available prior to this stage of the bill, quite possibly the house would have had second thoughts about giving approval in principle to the bill.

Let us review briefly where we stand on the question of unification in terms of the urgency of moving forward with the program at this time. The chief of the defence staff, General Allard, gave us his reason for urging passage of the legislation now, and proclaiming it. His contention was that the officers and men of the armed forces have been kept in doubt for a very long time and the decision must be taken now, or without undue delay. His recommendation was that the legislation be passed forthwith and without such delay. Perhaps I may quote from the committee proceedings of February 28, the last paragraph on page 1769, where General Allard is reported to have said:

> Finally, I would refer to the question regarding any suspension or delay in proceeding with the final stage of the reorganization, and that is unification. I sincerely believe a postponement or delay in starting—and I insist on this word—starting this final stage would have a most serious effect on all of us now serving and on our recruiting prospects. What the serviceman is saying to us today is, "Get on with it."

If I might be permitted an aside, what the serviceman is saying today is that he is so fed up and disgusted with what is happening that anything is better than this constant living in limbo. General Allard continued:

> And in my opinion any delay—one year, two years, five years, or even a few months—would seriously impair morale.

I question whether morale could be any more seriously impaired than it is now. However, I continue to read what General Allard said:

> This proposal is not designed to cope with the past. It is for the present and the future. Although youth today is prone to disregard the past we intend to retain those things that are worth while and at the same time to build for the future.

[Mr. Forrestall.]

> This, then, is not for people of my age and older, but I hope that I at least can be part of those who helped to design the organization. I am convinced that not only is it right but that it will appeal to the youth of today and tomorrow.
>
> In summary, then, gentlemen, the situation is this: The idea of a single force, in a single, distinctively Canadian uniform, working, living, training and—most important—thinking together as one entity is an exciting and challenging idea. After all, it is designed to meet the problems of a modern world—a scientific world—which is growing away beyond the barriers of the past at a speed that cannot stand the slow pace of yesterday. For all this, you know that we do not intend to proceed in haste—I said it was a starting point—but rather in a carefully planned manner which will extend over a number of years. All that is required now is the authority to do so.

That is a fairly strong endorsation of the government and the defence people to get on with what General Allard terms the starting point of this new piece of legislation. He tells us that there is no other course, or at least he implies that. As I have mentioned, he says this quite forcefully. I suggest that there is a second course of action which we should consider and which would indeed achieve the very worth-while standards and requirements that General Allard has mentioned in relation to morale. He suggested that if we do not proceed with this legislation now, morale will worsen.

The second course of action is not one that is acceptable to the minister or the government, but I suggest it to them because I think it should be given some consideration. This second course of action is that the whole unification procedure be shelved, put on ice, and the men in the three services be informed that this will be done. It should be made clear that this program, which in any case, as I understand it, would take some five years to implement, will not be resurrected until the end of that period.

This course of action has many advantages. First, it will allow adequate time, by all estimates, to complete the necessary work in connection with the all-important phase of this matter, namely integration. Second, it will allow clarification of two important matters. The first is the distinction between unification and integration, which has not yet been successfully defined and spelled out. It will allow a period of clarification in this regard. There could then be implemented or initiated a study and a plan of the reorganizational change necessary, so that in fact the best of the old and of the new could be melded to provide Canada with what I am sure we all desire, namely the most effective force, in terms of our foreign commitments, for the

least possible expenditure of dollars and cents.

● (6:50 p.m.)

Indeed, none of us disagree with what General Allard has said in this respect. Very recently we have heard His Holiness the Pope cautioning the people of the world about the inadequacies of some of their present thinking. I will not quote his words but they are a guidepost, a sign and an indicator that what we are doing is not for ourselves but for those who will follow us. It is therefore our responsibility to make sure that what follows is the best. This is our motivation.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, this will permit time for a total organizational study and a reassessment of the necessity for moving toward total unification. It would permit the integration process to be fully studied and worked out after which, according to a plan which would be prepared, we could make a decision about total unification. It is of great importance to recognize the necessity of advising the serving officers and men. This should be one of the first things to be done. We should let them know where they stand, what the plan is, and that they will participate in the period of reassessment and in the full implementation of the first stage of the program of the integration process. We should let them know that the final outcome of the plan and the degree to which it is successful in terms of the standards set down by the minister, the economies and efficiencies, will be based upon these factors.

As I said, it will provide a second benefit. It is not unrelated but indeed it is entirely different in the sense that it would give a new generation of serving forces an opportunity to understand better the changing roles of the defence structure of a country such as ours. It would give these younger men the opportunity of themselves assessing the proper military course. It would provide an opportunity for the world war II combat officers and men to proceed to their normal retirement. It will allow time for another minister to succeed the present Minister of National Defence. Indeed I cannot imagine an effective cooling off period under the present Minister of National Defence. As I said, it would give a new minister with new ideas and new approaches a possibly different understanding and approach to this problem, and an opportunity to bring his expertise to this end product toward which we are proceeding.

Third, it would allow time to assess fully the economic factor in what is proposed. It has been stressed that unification will cost very little. Some of us have doubts that the real economies have been studied and are all known. That is certainly quite true of integration and completely and totally true of unification.

Fourth, it would give us pause to consider a revised white paper. I have commented on this in the past. It has seemed to me almost incredible that we are making such a major move in our defence posture based on a white paper that now must be nearing four years of age, a paper which was produced in March, 1964, which means that its drafting must have been commenced in late 1963. It is therefore certainly three and a half years old. As I said, it would give us pause to consider a revised white paper concerning the roles and commitments that the next two or three years may require of Canada, in terms of its contribution to the collective defence of the free world.

It would give us time not only for a reassessment of the white paper in terms of defence but also in terms of our external affairs policy. There has to be some satisfactory solution to our NATO assignment, to our place in NORAD, and our position in the United Nations Organization in relationship to our desire to contribute to the peacekeeping role of that body.

Finally it would allow time for a healing of the relationship between the armed forces and the government. I think we delude ourselves when we attempt to suggest that at present this relationship is good: It is not.

May I call it seven o'clock, Mr. Chairman?

The Deputy Chairman: Shall I rise, report progress and request leave to sit later this day?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Progress reported.

[*Translation*]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: The hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard), Indian affairs—inquiry as to payment of kindergarten teachers; the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire),

transportation—inquiry as to report on maritime study; the hon. member for Okanagan-Revelstoke (Mr. Johnston), external affairs—inquiry as to extension of representation in Pacific area.

[*English*]

Shall the committee resume the business interrupted a few moments ago?

Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, before the committee resumes its sitting may I point out that I believe it is accurate to say that there is general agreement among the members that the sitting should be suspended this evening between seven and eight o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): My intuition has suggested to me that it was the desire of the house to adjourn for one hour, but our proceedings require the unanimous consent of the house before we can do so. Shall we resume the business interrupted a few minutes ago and go back into committee of the whole?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

AMALGAMATION OF NAVY, ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The house resumed consideration in committee of Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof.

The Chairman: The sitting is suspended from now until eight o'clock.

SITTING SUSPENDED

SITTING RESUMED

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Forrestall: When the committee rose for dinner, Mr. Chairman, I had been setting forth a number of advantages to be gained through shelving the unification bill we are now considering. I pointed out that a delay of three to five years, if the bill could not be removed entirely from consideration—this would be the best choice, and of course must be the first one—should be brought about. If the bill could not be dropped, then the good advice of the senior officers who appeared before us should be accepted, namely that the bill should be delayed for a period of from three to five years.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret).]

I pointed out that such a delay would permit time to examine the full effects of integration. It would permit time to foster a better understanding than is possible now of what is taking place at the moment. It would permit an opportunity to review our roles, as set out in the white paper, by the standing committee on external affairs or, better still, by a joint committee of defence and external affairs. It would permit time to assess fully the economic factors involved. It would give time, as I have mentioned, to consider the roles of our country and the production of a new or changed white paper. Finally, Mr. Chairman, it would provide a cooling off period during which time there could be a healing process of the many ruptures that now exist to the good will between the government and the serving officers in our defence forces.

For all of these reasons, as well as many others, Mr. Chairman, that have been dealt with in the last few hours by previous speakers, or will be dealt with by speakers who will take part in the debate as time goes on, there are marked advantages to be gained in delaying the passage of this bill. On the other hand, sir, to proceed now can only add substantially to our present difficulties. We were warned by a number of military witnesses, who came before the committee, that proceeding now might well bring about a situation where a substantial number of good officres and men would consider leaving the forces.

These men might consider this course, notwithstanding the loss of pension and other benefits which might result. There seems to be, as I mentioned earlier, a false assumption on the part of the minister's supporters on the other side, namely that the passage of this bill as the final step toward unification, would resolve the type of problem that is going to be created by this bill. A prime example of this situation was given to the committee by Admiral Landymore. He pointed out the tremendous losses that could accrue to a member of the armed forces in terms of pension benefits, if he were to retire. I will not put all this information on the record, but it is available in the evidence of the committee if any interested parties care to look it up. It is problems of this type, pension problems, morale problems, rank structure problems, materiel and logistics problems, that are going to create in the minds of members of our armed forces a situation that will lead to the most serious possible consequences to our ability to meet our defence commitments.

• (8:10 p.m.)

On this basis the best course of action now is to throw the bill out altogether. I suggest to the minister that, in the minds of the serving members of the armed forces today, unification is so vague and undefined that the only moral course the minister and the government can adopt is to make certain that the men are given freedom of choice as to whether they wish to transfer to this new force. They must be given an opportunity to resign, to retire honourably without any pension penalty or loss of benefit, medically or otherwise, accruing to members who retire.

If the government fail to do this but proceed in the way General Allard, as I mentioned before supper would wish us to proceed—that is to say, to pass quickly this unification bill—then the minister must accept full responsibility for this course. I suggest to him that the success of the final implementation of such a far reaching measure as this is to be found in the willingness, loyalty and desire of those affected by the measure to bring about that success.

If the minister fails to recognize the necessity for this type of approach, then indeed it will be much longer than the half generation suggested before the bill and its implications finally become workable, not only in terms of the force itself but in terms of our foreign commitments. Perhaps it would take 20 years. We will have to pass through not one but two whole decades before we find a group which will willingly implement what the minister wants. To this end, Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate stage of the consideration of this bill amendments will be introduced dealing with pension rights, and so on. For the time being I thank the members of the committee for their indulgence.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Chairman, according to yesterday's *Hansard* General Allard, our present chief of the general staff, was reported to have made some very startling statements in a speech to the International Relations Club, and I believe these statements deserve some comment. Indeed, they were the subject of some proceedings in this house today on motions. I wish to make some comment because I do not believe that the people to whom General Allard referred—former ministers of national defence—would feel they should explain the matter to this house; but as a member of the standing committee I wish to devote my time this evening to replying to one part of that speech.

In the course of his speech, the general asked a question which I believe should be answered as forcefully as possible, and I intend to so answer it. The question was:

> I should like to ask the former cabinet ministers why they are clinging to the name of the navy, the army and the air force?

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, as a member of the defence committee, and being present when the three former ministers questioned General Allard at the hearings, I would say that perhaps one of the main answers to the general's question was his own inability to give intelligent answers to the questions put to him by the former ministers concerned—and I say that with all due respect to the chief of the general staff.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, in his speech to which I have referred he said:

> I have attempted to explain my views on unification of the armed forces before a parliamentary committee. I was obliged to say to a member of parliament: "Sir, if you do not understand, there is nothing that I can do".

I say that that is a ridiculous statement on the part of someone holding the position of chief of the general staff. If the members of this house would review General Allard's evidence they would find that his admitted attempt to explain unification could be classified, in my opinion, as a very poor and disappointing attempt, for one holding the position of chief of the general staff.

When asked to substantiate some of his statements with facts he was unable to do so, except to say that he had strong convictions that everything would be all right. I submit that strong convictions are not sufficient or satisfactory answers to questions. The chief of the general staff should have been able to give answers based on facts and figures. We have the right to expect more convincing evidence from a person holding such high office in our armed forces.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I repeat to the general that perhaps his own inability to produce facts and figures, in view of the position he now holds, could be the main reason why the former cabinet ministers clung to the names of the navy, army and air force. They are concerned about the security of our country under the present administration. I submit they have a right to be concerned about the security of our country, in view of what has developed over the past two or three years since the present minister has been head of the Department of National Defence.

I also submit that strong conviction is not a satisfactory answer to the question: How will unification or the single service concept save the Canadian taxpayers money? Strong conviction is not a satisfactory answer to the question: How will the single service concept improve the effective efficiency of our combat troops? They are the troops with which we are concerned, and I will refer to them later in my remarks.

Again I submit that strong conviction is not a satisfactory answer to the question: How will unification improve the morale of our combat troops? Strong conviction is not a satisfactory answer to the question: Can Canada fulfil her present defence commitments and take on the additional role of restoring peace, which to my mind is a very dangerous role for Canada even to attempt? Strong conviction will not replace forward planning of manpower and financial requirements.

General Allard admitted that in this regard he had made no studies. I would ask why this was not done. Strong convictions on the part of General Allard, that unification will not destroy the effectiveness of our combat troops, are not easy to accept in view of the testimony of his former colleagues in the same branch of the service. They are, I suggest, men of long military experience and of recognized stature in military life.

I am only sorry, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for Lapointe is not in the chamber tonight, because I understand that this afternoon he suggested that two former ministers, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre and the hon. member for Calgary North, were raising the question of racism. I want to refer the hon. member for Lapointe to the fact that there were two former generals in our armed forces—they were in the army—with French Canadian names, and to draw to his attention their idea of what is unification and what it will do to our country and to our forces.

I should like to refer the members of the committee to minutes of committee proceedings No. 22. If I may paraphrase what General Moncel said, he was of the opinion that unification may be the "kiss of death" for Canada's defence forces. He also said that unification will work only if our defence commitments are reduced or changed because unification was an uncharted course with a dim destination.

• (8:20 p.m.)

I believe the hon. member for Greenwood will agree with that. He says he agrees in principle with the idea of unification though he did not really know what the term means. That I can understand. The hon. member indicates he did not say that; perhaps it was some other member in that quarter of the house. Again, he and his hon. friends wish to support the government. But they are sitting on the fence, leaving themselves an opening.

General Fleury says this with regard to his opposition to unification:

> I honestly feel that not one word I said here yesterday or today will have the slightest effect on what is ultimately carried out, because so many people have taken up such entrenched positions on the subject that it is very difficult for anyone to back away.

General Simonds said in part:

> My own view ... is that this unification having regard to all the implications of what defence policy should be, is not in the national interest.

He also said:

> If we are called upon to meet our obligations we could not do it. It could not be done with the manpower we have today.

This is a most revealing statement for one of our generals to make. I suggest that General Allard should review the evidence given by his former colleagues. I say that the chief of the general staff, together with the minister have, so far, accomplished six things in connection with this question of unification, and I propose to list them: 1. They have confused administrative tidiness with operational efficiency. 2. The have tried experiments when they should have prepared plans. 3. They have increased the defence budget and reduced the public understanding of it. 4. In themselves they have taken stubbornness for insight. In others, they have mistaken disagreement for stupidity or even disloyalty. 5. They have discouraged the prospective recruit and dismissed the seasoned officer. 6. They have jeopardized our national security. Perhaps these observations will make it clear to the general why former defence ministers still cling to the conception of a separate navy, army and air force.

I should like now to refer to a speech which was made in this house yesterday by the hon. member for Roberval. He said he was representing small business and would like to say a few words on behalf of the small business people of our country. It was a very confusing speech but I do not blame the hon. member for Roberval on that account; I blame the minister for the confusion which

has been created. This hon. member said, in part:

> I fail to see why in the military field as in all other fields, expenditures should not be reduced as much as possible.

With this, we agree. Then he said, as will be found on page 14451 of *Hansard;*

> Therefore, I am rising this evening in order to express the views of our group concerning the unification of the three armed services, because we consider primarily the savings to be made.

Here again, with regard to this question of possible savings, the minister has misinformed the members of this house. In fact, there are no savings to be made as a result of unification. Anyone who undertakes a serious review of the evidence given before the committee, especially of the testimony given by those who have been involved in planning for the extension of the services, will agree that this is the case. I refer again to the testimony given by General Moncel, that if we were to carry out the commitments we have already made plus an additional role as a peace keeper or peace restorer, our requirement in manpower would be 150,000 men and the cost would be close to $2.6 billion. This is as close as he could estimate, and he had studied this situation.

Another point was made by the former minister of national defence, my hon. friend from Calgary North. He went back over the estimates and put it on record that since the present minister had taken over the department there had been less capital expenditure than ever before. He proved this contention to the satisfaction of most members of the committee. Yet the minister still says his program will save money for the people of Canada.

The only way in which the department has saved any money, and kept within its budget, has been through a reduction in manpower. Nor has this reduction been the result of anything proposed by the minister. It has come about simply because recruits are not forthcoming. The minister told us he wanted to reduce recruitment by 10 per cent. Well, he now has the figure down by 23 per cent —down below what I believe to be a safe figure.

The hon. member for Roberval went on to say:

> According to military technicians it would also be beneficial to the unity of the army itself on the economic level, which would necessarily reduce administrative costs.

Here again, the minister has created confusion in the minds of members because administrative costs have absolutely nothing to do with unification. Here, the confusion between the terms integration and unification goes too far. Any reduction in administrative costs is entirely due to integration, not to unification at all. The bill before us tonight was not necessary in order to obtain any reduction in administrative costs. Integration itself could have done that, and could have taken place without this bill being passed.

The hon. member for Roberval has apparently swallowed what the minister has been trying to put across, and to this extent he is like many of the Canadian people. He tells us he has great admiration for the minister. He feels the minister is doing a good job. But then he contradicts himself and says:

> Let me speak as I did at the beginning, as a simple civilian. As civilians we notice mainly the military budget. I said earlier that we were expecting a reduction in the expenditures, but when we look at the military budget we notice that this year, in spite of all the minister's predictions, it is yet much higher than last year.

A little later the same hon. member said:

> We had hoped that the budget would be reduced by at least one third, but it is not the case and I want to point out to the minister that we are a little disappointed in that respect.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Well, I want to point out to this committee that they will be a lot more disappointed if they swallow what the minister and the chief of the general staff are trying to push down their throats. Unification will accomplish nothing which the minister has told us will be accomplished. Proof of that was evident in the meetings of the defence committee, and anyone who wishes to study that evidence will realize this fact. The testimony given by men who formerly held high positions in the forces has warned us that it will not work. Men who have spent all their lives in this business have told us unification will not work. But what has happened? We have this minister who took office with new ideas, who said, "Yes, it will work. Anybody who disagrees—out they go." Finally he got somebody who did agree with him, a yes man, and the minister is pulling this thing through with the support of the majority of the members of the House of Commons. But still the members will not take time to read these minutes where the evidence has been put before them, will not take time to digest that evidence, and so we get speeches like the one I referred to a few moments ago, which to me mean nothing.

These members agree in principle but they do not know what unification means.

In his speech last night the hon. member whom I have quoted also referred to the party to which I belong and said in part, as recorded at page 14,451 of *Hansard*:

I am therefore mildly surprised that the Conservatives, as a whole, should so oppose the bill.

All kinds of excuses will be given for holding up the business of the house—

We are not holding up the business of the house, Mr. Chairman. We are carrying out our responsibilities in the manner in which the people of Canada expect us to do. We object to this bill in principle. We have reasons for objecting and we are trying to document those reasons so that the members will understand, if they can understand.

Before this debate is finished all kinds of accusations will be made against us. It seems remarkable that the critics of unification have been categorized as emotional, unprogressive, unreasonable, disloyal, obstructionist, destructive, politically motivated, and without responsibility. I imagine those terms will be repeated time and again as we hear hon. members from the other side get up to make their speeches. But surely members opposite have not been so thoroughly brainwashed, or taken in by the defence minister's misstatements, to believe that because Conservative opposition members, as well as witnesses of stature, hold opinions contrary to those of the minister that they do not do so by reason of knowledge, capability, experience, conviction, concern and sincerity. I hope they will give us credit for that.

I now wish to refer to some statements made by government supporters, which have been reported in the press. I refer in particular to the chairman of the Liberal caucus, the hon. member for Durham, who has said that the government may have to use closure. We heard these rumours and I say to hon. members opposite, go ahead and use closure. We expect that from the Liberal party. It has been done before and it will be done again. But in this connection I wish to quote from an editiorial which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* on March 28. The minister knows that the *Globe and Mail* is no supporter of the Conservative party, but this editorial referred to a letter sent by the hon. member for Durham to his constituents. It quotes his letter as follows:

The Conservative party will undoubtedly launch a filibuster to prevent a decision being taken.

[Mr. McIntosh.]

The editorial comments:

Now, now, Mr. Honey, don't blame the Conservatives. The hearings before the Commons defence committee made it pretty clear, especially to the New Democrats who had been disposed to support the government on unification, that what the government was actually trying to do was to create a force for the implementation of a policy about which it had neglected to inform the country.

This is what we have been saying ever since this bill came before us. You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that on second reading we pleaded with the government, and with the minister in particular, to let us hear witnesses before asking us to agree to the bill in principle. But our plea was not met by the minister, and the Prime Minister was just as bad. He forced the house to agree in principle, before we heard the witnesses. I do not want to read the whole of this editorial but parts of it are very interesting. It says:

Unification only makes sense (unless there is to be a huge increase in the defence budget, and few Canadians would consider that made sense) if Canada is going to abandon many of its NATO and NORAD and sundry other defence commitments, and concentrate almost wholly on a peacekeeping role.

This is what we said in the defence committee, and this is the stumbling block with which the N.D.P. are now confronted. They agree that the single service concept makes sense only if Canada is going to opt out of its other commitments. If we do that I say, and I shall go on to prove, that we will lose our national pride, we will lose our sovereignty, we will have to rely on our big neighbour to the south to protect us, and as a Canadian I would not have much pride left if we did that. If we can do only one tenth of the job, because we have only one tenth of the population of the United States, then we should take pride in doing that in defending the North American continent.

I think all of us will agree that the only defence for Canada is on a continental basis. That is generally accepted. But let us not opt out or phase out of any commitment we have at the present time, until there is agreement among our allies as to that course.

The editorial goes on to say:

That may be a good idea or it may be a bad idea, or it may be partly good and partly bad. But the point is, it hasn't been discussed. Parliament has been given no opportunity for a full debate on what commitments this country should keep, what changes in its policies toward its allies and the world it should make, what new commitments it should undertake. Instead the government has been trying to rush Canada into a new vehicle —unification—without explaining that the reason for it is a change in destination.

The opposition would be less than responsible if it bought the new vehicle—

I shall not quote further from that editorial.

Even if this debate goes on for weeks and weeks we would not fulfil our responsibility if we let the minister and the government get away with unification until we know what it is, what it does to the security of our country, and what it does to our allies. Do we let them down? We should not pass the unification bill until we know what it is going to lead us into. This peace restoring role can be very dangerous. This experiment that the minister, because of political expediency, is trying to rush through is not for the good of Canada but for his own personal political advancement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with the crux of the bill, namely unification. It is not my intention to deal with the subject of integration because I do not accept the suggestion that integration and unification are one and the same thing,—although the minister has tried time and time again to confuse hon. members and the Canadian public that integration and unification are good for Canada.

Certainly we agree that integration is good for our forces. The minister wasted a lot of time in the defence committee bringing in certain of his staff who dealt with nothing but integration. I say again that if we want to integrate our forces we do not need this bill. Integration has been worked on for years and years. Maybe it has not taken place as quickly as it should. I believe we would have given credit to the minister if he had insisted that integration be completed within a certain length of time. A certain amount of integration is O.K., but someone has said that the minister is putting the cart before the horse, and when integration starts to interfere with the effectiveness of our combat troops we say it is going too far.

Again we say that integration and unification are two entirely different subjects, regardless of the fact that the minister has tried to confuse us. Yesterday he spent 50 minutes of the time of his speech talking about integration, although we have told him time and again that we agree with it and have no objection to it. Perhaps we could criticize parts of what he is trying to do in integration, but integration has nothing to do with unification.

The minister spent only ten minutes of his speech yesterday dealing with unification, and the whole confusion is in the difference between unification and integration. It is on this confusion that the minister is playing, and this is why he is going to ask hon. members to vote for the bill, knowing full well it is the first step towards conscription, towards compulsory military service in Canada. Other hon. members will deal with that phase of unification.

I would say integration deals with and concerns the supply and administration of our forces and does not touch or interfere with our combat troops. For simplicity's sake I can say to those hon. members who have not had military experience that we can break our forces down into two elements with different training and different supply problems, the administrative element of all three services and the combat element of all three services.

• (8:40 p.m.)

I say again that if you put the cart before the horse for the sake of the administrative and supply element at the expense of the combat units, it does not matter how good your supply, administration and transport is if your combat troops cannot fight. This is what we are trying to impress upon this house. The minister is destroying the combat troops and making them useless so that they will not even fit into the commitments we have today. They will not fit into the NATO alliance. The NATO commander has made his plans. He knows what he wants. If he is given a force of people equipped with bows and arrows he will say that he cannot fit them into what he has planned. It is the NATO commander, and not the government of Canada, who is responsible for the NATO plan. The government of Canada cannot go to the NATO commander and tell him the way to run NATO. This is what the N.D.P. party has been trying to impress upon this house.

Mr. Brewin: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. McIntosh: Yes.

Mr. Brewin: Does the hon. member not know that the commander has indicated very clearly the need for a mobile reserve force to which Canada indeed is contributing, and to which it could contribute even more.

Mr. McIntosh: Well, these terms, such as "mobile reserve" could mean several things, just like "integration and unification". One would have to ascertain from the NATO commander in detail what he means by mobile

reserve. One could have a mobile command of cavalry, with horses, but it would be no good in the operations the commander has planned. As I say, when we give our troops to that commander we are giving them to him to use in the manner in which he sees fit, and therefore he should know what he is getting from each country. He should know the type of reserves and force he will have, so that he can plan the defence of what he has to defend. If Canada should come along with a force which will not fit into any of his plans, then he will say that Canada might as well keep that force at home. Possibly that is what the minister wants.

We do not oppose the bill as it refers to the dental personnel or logistics. We said this before. The minister has wasted our time in bringing such officers before the committee. Any criticism we have in respect of integration has to do with its being carried on to the extent of interfering with the effectiveness of the combat elements of our forces. On the other hand, we believe the intention of unification is to change the structure of our combat troops, and with this intention we violently disagree. We have put before this house our reasons for disagreeing with this.

Most of the controversy over unification has arisen because of the mystery which has developed over the meaning of the term "unification". I say the minister is directly responsible for this mystery. We attempted to find out from him what he meant by the term "unification". Time and time again we asked him what this meant. He gave us some high-falutin reason, but during the committee hearings he stated that he wished he had never used that expression. He said that he wished he had used the expression "single service concept". Had he done that in the beginning there would not have been the confusion which there has been in respect of the word today, and I do not think the detrimental press reports which there have been in respect of the minister would have been made.

Had the minister conveyed the idea to the members of this house that he had in mind the best interests of the force, rather than political expediency, I think he would have been a big man today, rather than a "has-been" next leader of the Liberal party. What should have been purely a military problem now has become intensely political, because of the manner in which the minister has handled this matter. The question in the minds of members of the opposition was whether or not this was an attempt on the part of the government to direct our attention from a contemplated change in foreign policy. This is what we wonder about. Over the past couple of years events show that the politicians have been deciding military matters with little regard for the views of the military experts. The Canadian public was confronted with such statements and headlines from the minister as, first: Unification is probably the boldest plan of military reorganization ever tried by a modern nation. He received headlines all across the country as a result of that statement. Then he said that we are now becoming a leader in defence organization, and thinkers, not just followers. He said that this is something new for Canada and new for the whole world. The third headline was that Canada will have indelibly etched her name as a world leader in military organization.

[Mr. McIntosh.]

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek, but I must advise him that the time allotted for his speech has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

The Deputy Chairman: Is there unanimous consent that the hon. member may continue his speech?

Some hon. Members: No.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

The Deputy Chairman: I regret to say that the hon. member has not obtained the unanimous consent of the house to continue with his speech.

Mr. Hellyer: We should let him continue. His speech is getting better all the time.

Mr. McIntosh: Thank you. I will remember this, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Foy: Mr. Chairman, many times members of the official opposition have said that more witnesses should have been called and heard before the standing committee. I would have had no objection to the calling of more witnesses before the committee, had it not become apparent that the members of the official opposition were dedicated to kill this bill. I stated this in the committee.

Mr. Churchill: You have been listening to the minister.

Mr. Foy: At the time when the hon. member for Cape Breton South and the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona joined the

committee as replacement members—to replace members who had seemed to have a reasonable attitude—the committee then became clearly a partisan exercise. As I have said, official opposition members were dedicated to killing the bill. In the committee we heard many statements, such as we have heard from the member who just sat down. These were statements which were insulting to the minister, insulting to the serving officers and to many others. I should like to refer to that old war horse from Winnipeg South Centre. I use this phrase with the greatest respect because I have respect for this gentleman.

Mr. Hellyer: Hear, hear.

Mr. Ricard: He has a funny way of showing his respect.

Mr. Foy: Mr. Chairman, may I continue. My time is limited. The hon. member I have just mentioned delights in stirring things up.

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. We have an expression of opinion from the hon. member that he should be given an opportunity to continue his speech without interruptions.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. It arises out of the statement made by the hon. member to the effect that I had joined the committee and then had proceeded to insult serving officers. My one simple question to him is, how many serving officers appeared before the committee as witnesses after I joined the committee?

Mr. Foy: I will answer that question later.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Answer it now.

Mr. Foy: I would have to look up the records.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Chairman, further on the question of privilege—

The Deputy Chairman: I do not think there is a question of privilege. Therefore, I think we should allow the hon. member for Lambton West to continue his speech.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has made an accusation against me and I rely on the privileges of this house in asking him to either back up that accusation or withdraw it. He has indicated that I insulted serving officers. When I asked him how many serving officers were called as witnesses before that committee after I became a member of it, he said he would have to consult the record, because he does not know. If he does not know that answer, he should not make such a statement. He should now withdraw it, and will do so if he is any kind of man.

Mr. Foy: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is doing exactly what he was doing during committee meetings.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): What you are talking about is a lot of lies. You are trying to put across lies. Stick that down your throat.

Mr. Foy: The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre took great delight in stirring things up. He does the same thing in this house. He often says terrible things and demands resignations. After really stirring things up he takes his seat and conceals his laughter. Mr. Chairman, very often the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre and others sit in their places grinning from ear to ear, after causing a great disturbance.

Mr. MacEwan: Surely that is terrible.

Mr. Foy: The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre loves to play the game of party politics. He loves that kind of action. I suspect that the hon. member agrees with the principle of this bill. He cannot convince me that with his vast experience in parliament and in military matters he is against it.

Mr. MacEwan: Would the hon. member throw away his notes and make a speech.

An hon. Member: Who wrote it for you?

Mr. Foy: Mr. Chairman, I hope the time being consumed by these ridiculous remarks is not considered as part of my allotted time. Whenever a member tries to make some reasonable comments this is the kind of thing we hear from hon. members such as the hon. member for Cape Breton South.

One of the most oft-repeated criticisms of the unification program is that the government is moving too hastily, or that it somehow plans to invoke instant unification. While I am sure that some of the critics who make this charge are sincere and I suppose well-intentioned, my membership on the standing committee on national defence has made me equally sure that they could not be more wrong in this regard.

During the course of the last few months, the hon. member for Northumberland has been travelling throughout the country making incorrect statements, one of which is to

the effect that our servicemen will be transferred from ships to the air force, or to the infantry. This is a ridiculous statement. Perhaps, like Diogenes seeking an honest man, he is seeking the leadership of Her Majesty's loyal opposition. We all know he aspires to this position. If he is successful, by some fluke he could become prime minister of this country. That hon. member should take the time to learn the true facts about unification, before expounding on this subject about which he does not seem to know anything.

What this government is asking for is not permission to complete unification within a few days, a few months, or even a year. If anyone is labouring under the impression, he is mistaken and has not bothered to follow the evidence heard by the standing and special committees on defence. This would also obviously indicate that he has not followed the statements made by many serving senior officers and by the minister himself. I think we should examine some of the testimony given by these men.

Let me quote the vice-chief of the defence staff, Air Marshal Sharp, who gave this evidence before the committee on February 7 of this year:

> Because this is a very complex job, very thorough and careful planning is required. The department has, on the one hand, been accused of acting too quickly, i.e., not doing sufficient planning, and on the other hand, accused of not deciding sooner the details of what is involved in unification. Since planning takes time and since the details cannot be decided and divulged until the planning has been completed, it is obvious that the department cannot satisfy both of these criticisms. To take time for adequate planning means that there will be some delay before the details of unification can be announced. To quickly announce the details implies inadequate planning. However, to postpone the decision to unify until all the details have been worked out is contrary to common sense. It is tantamount to saying that the decision to build the trans-Canada Highway should not have been made until all the details of construction had been completed.

Air Marshal Sharp is an intelligent and distinguished officer who has been deeply involved in this program since its beginning and he knows what he is talking about. I am sure that the air marshal does not believe we are going to instantly unify our forces. Obviously he does see the logic in obtaining permissive legislation so that he and his colleagues in the Canadian armed forces can get on with the job.

[Mr. Foy.]

On February 23 the minister made the following statement before the standing committee regarding the timing of unification:

> It is an continuing evolution that will not be completed until 1970-72, as has been stated by many serving officers, including the heads of training command, materiel command, the vice-chief and myself.
>
> There is no way you can bring about 'instant unification'. Nor is there any intention to do so. It will all be done in a step-by-step, carefully calculated manner, with full regard for our operational effectiveness and the best interests of our servicemen.

Why do official opposition members continually say here in Ottawa and elsewhere that unification is to be completed immediately? Because they do so I suggest there is a lot of partisan politics being played as there was at the meetings of the standing committee. This type of thing is continually practised by hon. members opposite. They know very well that instant unification is impossible.

If we followed the advice of stand pat reactionaries every time we sought to enact important legislation for the benefit of Canadians, we would never get anywhere. It is only by realizing problems and acting on solutions that we are ever going to progress; that we are going to develop this great nation's full potential.

During this session the government has set a record by passing more important and long overdue legislation than at any other time in history. Such vital appendages to our prosperity as a guaranteed annual income for old age pensioners, medicare, the Canada Assistance Plan, manpower programs, a new transportation program, Bank Act revisions and such things as a Science Council and a health resources fund cover the broad spectrum of human need in Canada. I suggest to hon. members that this is accomplished because we are willing to progress and not stagnate.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Clearly, any delay in obtaining parliamentary approval for the unification of our armed forces would have a most serious effect on the morale of our great servicemen. They are, I am sure, anxious to get going on this imaginative program, but uncertainty is their biggest enemy—uncertainty as to when they will be allowed, as General Allard has said, to get off the front pages of the press and back to the job of running the forces. In fact, the general in his brief to the committee on February 28 outlined very lucidly the rationale for obtaining approval from parliament to enact the legislation and, of course, he too

dispelled any fears we might have about instand unification. I should like to quote General Allard in this connection:

> Finally, I would refer to the question regarding any suspension or delay in proceeding with the final stage of the reorganization, and that is unification. I sincerely believe a postponement or delay in starting—and I insist on this word—starting this final stage would have a most serious effect on all of us now serving and on our recruiting prospects. What the serviceman is saying to us today is, "Get on with it." And in my opinion any delay—one year, two years, five years, or even a few months —would seriously impair morale.

Then further on he concludes:

> In summary, then, gentlemen, the situation is this: The idea of a single force, in a single, distinctively Canadian uniform, working, living, training, and—most important—thinking together as one entity is an exciting and challenging idea. After all it is designed to meet the problems of a modern world —a scientific world—which is growing away beyond the barriers of the past at a speed that cannot stand the slow pace of yesterday. For all this, you know that we do not intend to proceed in haste—I said it was a starting point—but rather in a carefully planned manner which will extend over a number of years. All that is required now is the authority to do so.

I should like to follow up on this eloquent plea by Canada's top serving military officer by saying this: The integration-to-unification program for the Canadian armed forces has been exhaustively scrutinized and debated since the white paper was issued early in 1964. Evidence given to the committee and to parliament during interim supply alone amounts to more than 4,000 pages of standing committee minutes and *Hansard*. To put these figures into plainer terms, the number of pages represents about a dozen comprehensive text books of information. So far we have talked about defence matters more than 114 days and have heard from over 130 different committee witnesses, many of whom have appeared two or more times. Any attempt by hon. members of the house to defeat this bill by a talkathon could only be regarded by the men and women of the forces, and the public alike, to be a ridiculous procedure, wholly infringing on parliament's responsibility to act.

It is said by hon. members on the other side of the chamber that there has been an undue rush toward unification. I say this is not so, Mr. Chairman, not at all. Having exhausted everything that can be said about the unification legislation, it is now our responsibility to turn the program over to our servicemen, let them implement it, let them get on with the job, and let them confirm our conviction that this is the right policy for our servicemen, for Canada and for our allies.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, the fact that the last speaker and some of those who preceded him have been so worried about the length of time this debate is going to take and have started to talk about closure, when we are not quite through the second day of discussion of the bill in committee, makes me wonder what they are trying to conceal. It seems a shame that so much of the debate and so many of the pages to which the hon. member who preceded me referred have been filled with irrelevancies, in so far as the problem of unification is concerned. Indeed, the professional staff, Air Marshal Miller and others who gave evidence and helped fill up the record, confronted us with a great many irrelevancies. For example, in a list in one of the briefs submitted to the committee there was included as one of the benefits of integration and unification the acquisition of the fan jet Falcon, that nice little, executive jet that cabinet ministers are getting to whizz them around the country. That aircraft was listed as one of the pieces of equipment we were acquiring because of the savings from unification.

A great deal of the argument put forward in support of unification has had nothing at all to do with unification; it has dealt with integration and the benefits of integration. Indeed, most of the witnesses who appeared before us, and I think most of the committee members, realize that there is a great deal of good to come from the integration of command, of certain supply services, and so on. But that is irrelevant in so far as this bill is concerned.

My friend the hon. member for Greenwood, with whom I often find myself in agreement, has also introduced irrelevancies into this discussion. He talked about unification in the light of a new role for the Canadian forces. I should like to suggest that while it may be very desirable that we increase our intervention role and build up our mobile force, whether or not our forces are unified will not make that intervention force or peacekeeping force any more or less efficient. In so far as this bill is concerned, that is an irrelevant argument.

However, I do agree with the hon. member for Greenwood that what we need is a new statement of defence policy, a statement indicating the priorities that we are attaching to our defence roles; because unless you know what you are doing or why you are doing it,

you cannot organize your forces to meet those commitments.

I do not propose to quote at great length any of the witnesses who appeared before the committee. I should like to read two or three passages from the evidence of Air Marshal Miller, and for a particular reason. The reason is that he is the serving officer who very strongly supported integration; he had more to do than anyone else with the initial planning of integration, and until just six months ago he was the chief of staff. His definitions of integration and unification impressed me very much.

• (9:10 p.m.)

I think it would not be a bad idea if we had them in the record in close proximity. His definition of integration appears at page 2290 of his evidence, as follows:

By that I mean the operating of the three services under a single—what I would call—management. A single defence staff, a single planning organization, an d single budgeting arrangement.

That I think, sir, is a fine definition of integration.

His definition of unification appears at page 2311 of the committee's proceedings, where he said the following:

Unification is the formation of a single force, single rank structure, single administrative chain, the wearing of a common uniform and calling trades and ranks by common names. In other words, a single force instead of three forces.

What does Air Chief Marshal Miller say about the advantages and disadvantages of unification, always bearing in mind that he is a very strong supporter of integration? At page 2291 he said:

The area of unification is a very sensitive one, as you well know. It strikes at the traditions and the feelings of a lot of people. I did not see, up until the time I left, that the return from pressing the unification sign was commensurate with the disruption and the great concern to the man in uniform that would result from it.

The following exchange appears at page 2297 of the proceedings:

Mr. Harkness: Do you, yourself, see any financial advantage accruing from the proposed scheme of unification?

Air Marshal Miller: There are no significant financial advantages whatsoever as far as I can see.

Mr. Harkness: Do you see any military advantages flowing from it?

Air Chief Marshal Miller: Again, there are no significant military advantages.

Mr. Harkness: Do you see any military disadvantages coming out of it?

[Mr. Smith.]

Air Chief Marshal Miller: The disruption is an unknown factor, and one which I have always rated rather highly. I did not want to have anything occur that would cause disruption in the services. I felt a lot of careful planning was necessary, and that probably time to educate people was required before the next step of unification was taken.

There is one more quotation of Air Chief Marshal Miller which I should like to read. It appears at page 2298. He was speaking about the loss of efficiency, and he said this:

I think it is a very bad thing for the forces. Many of the people who had left had a great deal to contribute to the forces organization in the future if they had stayed on. There were some key men who left.

Mr. Harkness: Would you consider then that the loss of considerable numbers of highly trained personnel extending right down into N.C.O's and so on, and technical trades, has impaired the effectiveness of the forces?

Air Chief Marshal Miller: Yes. With the loss of skill and talent from our pool, the pool is bound to be poor thereby.

Now I would like to turn to General Allard's evidence. Lately General Allard has been making some speeches. I found that his statements to the committee were most unsatisfactory. They were unsatisfactory in many ways. They were tinged with political overtones, they were irrelevant and in some instances they were misleading. If lately he has brought a certain amount of political fire about his head, he has no one to thank for it but himself. When in the committee we pressed him for details on his planning, his attitude was: you are just a civilian; you would not understand; this is a professional matter. In looking through his statement one can find many instances where he seems to have taken that attitude.

Some of the people who were questioning him, myself included, are of course very ignorant in military matters and have not had much experience. However, I still think that we are entitled to better answers than those which General Allard gave us in his rather haughty and arrogant manner. It was the only time when Rear Admiral Landymore made the statement about a military commander taking over. I agreed with many people that Rear Admiral Landymore had gone too far, but some of General Allard's statements to the committee made me wonder whether Rear Admiral Landymore's fears did not have some basis.

Mr. Hellyer: You should be ashamed of yourself.

Mr. Smith: There is nothing to be ashamed of. Anyone can read the evidence. Let me

give examples of some of the misleading statements made by General Allard. For example, at page 1764 of the committee's proceedings he drags in the ill-fated Bobcat, which was a military weapon with the development of which governments struggled for some time. I do not know how he could relate that to the benefits of unification or integration, but he did. The same reference on the same page relates to the Arrow program. On the following page he speaks about the national survival system as being something that would not be carried out because of integration or unification, but really it seems to me that this is completely irrelevant.

At page 1821 he made the following statement:

> Now, I have made a very careful study of the committee system, in which the army alone spent 50,000 hours—man hours—per year on co-ordination between the three services; this was the committee system.
>
> Therefore, when I finished my study, I was convinced that we had to have an organization that would deal with this centrally.

Again this is a matter of integration, not unification, but he has confused the two. He said, 50,000 man hours. In those terms it sounds rather like a lot. On page 1824 he is questioned about this statement. I asked him:

> General Allard, you mentioned in answer to Mr. Churchill a few minutes ago that 50,000 man hours were spent in the army on co-ordination. I have never been noted for my mathematics, but that would indicate to me some 25 or 30 men per year.
>
> Mr. Allard: It is much more than that.
>
> Mr. Smith: At 2000 hours per man per year?
>
> Mr. Allard: It is much more than that. If you wish, I will read this to you:
>
> Project ORA which was completed in June, 1964 showed that for army headquarters alone there were 702 memberships in 440 committees, subcommittees, working groups and similar bodies. The total army workload involved in participation in these committees was 52,205 man hours in 1963, equivalent to about the full time employment of 26 persons.

This was the great saving about which he had spoken in his evidence a few moments earlier. This is not the only place where the committee was confused by General Allard's evidence. One of the alleged benefits of unification is the so-called interchangeability of manpower, that it will be possible to take men serving in one trade and in one environment and transfer them easily and quickly to another environment, thereby effecting a great saving.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Many of the witnesses who were experienced commanders at sea pointed out that interchangeability is not always as easy as that. They pointed out that a signaler at sea has other trades to learn, and a signaler in a tank has other trades to learn. There would be a great deal of time wasted in retraining.

This was one of the strong points that General Allard made and there is this reference to it on page 1786 of the committee evidence:

> Mr. Lambert: And the man who is a soldier communicator, or a ground environment communicator, will also be a fit man at sea?
>
> Mr. Allard: Yes, Mr. Lambert. Already we have two airmen and two soldiers at sea as a test, and they went quite voluntarily.
>
> Mr. Smith: What are they doing at sea?
>
> Mr. Allard: —

This is very interesting.

> —At the moment they happen to be in a trade which is quite compatible with their ability.
>
> Mr. Smith: Which trade?
>
> Mr. Allard: Two of them are stewards.
>
> Mr. Lambert: Well, stewards at sea are ammunition detail, are they not?
>
> Mr. Allard: Yes, they could be trained.
>
> Mr. Lambert: This is the usual purpose, I think, for a steward at sea?
>
> Mr. Allard: It could be.

Now, that is the type of misleading evidence that we have obtained. This is the sort of thing which makes everyone doubtful having regard to Air Chief Marshal Miller's evidence concerning the lack of planning and the general lack of knowledge, as well as his strong plea for time to get the maximum benefits from integration. When the chief of the general staff is so uncertain about what is happening, it makes one very doubtful whether we should not at this time give credence to Air Chief Marshal Miller's plea for a delay.

You know, one thing about this debate on integration and unification is that the earliest estimate concerning the maximum benefit of integration is from three to five years. Unification will start to become effective at the end of that time, perhaps by 1970 according to an optimistic guess, or 1972 according to a pessimistic one. Of course, not many of the present generation of politicians and very few of the present generation of chiefs of staff will be around to see the horror we have committed by attempting to unify our forces, without any planning whatever.

Mr. McIntosh: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for Lambton West has left the house because he made a few remarks to which I think I should reply. I think for

his edification he should be told a few of the responsibilities of the opposition in this house. In his absence, I will state what I have in mind concerning our reason for opposing this bill. I will put my remarks on the record and the hon. member will be able to read them in *Hansard* tomorrow.

First of all, I want to refer to a few of the other remarks he made. Oh, I see he is here now. He said that the government was not proceeding in haste with this unification program. Well, I would remind the hon. member for Lambton West that every move in connection with this whole program has been made in haste, regardless of the promises given to members by the minister during his second reading speech, when he said we would be given ample opportunity in committee to question all the witnesses we wanted after the bill had been given second reading. This was one of the carrots he held out to members of the house. In addition, the Prime Minister gave the people of Canada the assurance that the critics of this unification program would be given ample opportunity to question any witnesses that they wished.

The minister stated the government was in a hurry to get this bill into committee after second reading. We pleaded with them at that time not to make us agree to the principle of the bill before we understood what it meant. I am surprised that some members in this house have made the remark that they agreed with the principle, but they did not understand what it meant. How could a person agree with a principle without understanding what it means? We would be delighted if we could agree with the principle and if we could believe it would be good for Canada. However, we do not understand what unification means, and I do not believe the minister understands what unification means. If I were to ask the hon. member for Lambton West what unification meant, he would not be able to give an answer. We proved this in the committee.

Mr. Hellyer: I gave an answer.

Mr. McIntosh: Even the minister could not give us a definition of unification.

Mr. Hellyer: I gave you one.

Mr. McIntosh: But did you try to interpret it? You stated in the committee that you wished you had used the term "single service concept" instead of unification. We wished that also, because you have tried to confuse us with this term "unification". I agree with one of the writers in the press who said he thought the minister had used the word "unification" and then dreamed up a force afterwards to fit. It appears to us that unification is bad for Canada. Certainly, we are going to object to this bill as long as we can or until the government can convince us it is good for Canada. All the evidence we have gathered so far proves the opposite.

Unification will not save the taxpayers money. It will not improve the effectiveness of our armed forces. Unification will disrupt and destroy the alliances to which we are now committed. It will destroy our national sovereignty and destroy our national pride. It will get us into many situations that will be dangerous for us.

Before I go into that, I want to indicate to the hon. member for Lambton West that we are opposing this bill because we feel it is our responsibility to do so. In order to refresh his memory, and in case he does not know that an opposition is an essential part of parliamentary democracy, I should like to remind him of the nineteenth century dictum of Lord Acton that power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely. This dictum remains as true today as when it was laid down. There is no protection for liberty simply in the word "democracy". Unchecked, the best of rulers become autocratic. This is the nature of man. We have seen evidence of this in the present minister.

Autocracy, tyranny and dictatorship are shadows that ever stand in the wings of the freest of parliaments. In the absence of a strong opposition, a cabinet with a commanding position in the house could and would rule without regard to individual or minority rights. The hon. member for Lambton West was alleging that we had no rights here, that we had no right to oppose this bill. We certainly have a right to oppose it, indeed it is our responsibility to oppose it until we know what it means.

The need of a strong opposition is supported by almost every political writer. Among these is Professor Basset who in his "Essentials of Parliamentary Democracy" has stated that the opposition is not merely tolerated but treated as indispensable. He emphasizes the existence of an opposition as an example of the difference between democracy and autocracy. As I said before, an opposition is as

necessary to the parliamentary system as is the cabinet. The two are inseparable. One without the other would mean tyranny or chaos.

One of the most important functions of the opposition is to constructively criticize the executive. This is what we are doing and this is what we intend to do, regardless of the remarks from members on the other side and regardless of the press. We are carrying out our responsibility to the Canadian people. An opposition that discharges its parliamentary responsibilities properly is bound to appear as obstructionist to those opposed. We are bound to appear to be filibustering. But it is the very essence of our system that if the opposition party feels strongly on a matter of principle it must carry its opposition to the utmost extent allowed by parliamentary usage, and that is what we intend to do. Parliament is a place for responsible discussion. The weapons of the opposition are discussion and argument, and we intend to use those weapons.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Unfortunately, this opposition in parliament has been misrepresented by the hon. member for Lambton West to be obstructionist and time wasting, and uninformed critics cry for action. I wish they would become informed. Parliament will only remain the guardian of freedom and the custodian of our free institutions as long as Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition is fully responsible—as we intend to be—and effective in the discharge of its functions.

When I spoke a few moments ago, Mr. Chairman, I referred to the minister glorying in some press coverage he had received across the country.

Mr. Foy: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. McIntosh: Certainly.

Mr. Foy: I understood the hon. member to say that he did not know what unification meant. Is that what he said?

Mr. McIntosh: I said I did not understand what it meant.

Mr. Foy: Then on that basis the question I want to ask is this. If the hon. member does not understand what unification means, how can he state that unification is going to destroy the armed services?

Mr. McIntosh: I am opposed to any experiment with our armed forces, and I think this is an experiment. I do not know whether it is good or bad until some explanation is given. May I ask the hon. member for Lambton West what unification means? Would he care to answer that question?

During the committee hearings we asked many experienced officers for a definition of unification, and as the hon. member knows —he was there and heard them—most of them said that they did not know what it meant. Those who made the attempt to give a definition gave one which had no relationship to any of the previous definitions, and I might say that this includes both the minister and the chief of the general staff.

Mr. Pugh: They were just as muddled as the minister.

Mr. McIntosh: Perhaps more so, and the minister made them that way.

I should like to refer quickly to certain headlines across the country for which the minister took credit. One of these was: "Unification is probably the boldest plan of military reorganization ever tried by a modern nation".

Mr. Hellyer: Hear, hear.

Mr. McIntosh: The minister says "hear, hear". He still thinks this is a good headline. Another one read: "We are now becoming leaders in defence organization, and thinkers, not just followers". That one was flashed all across the world to our allies. We all know what General Simonds said when we asked him what our allies thought about this unification program for Canada. He said that they thought we were all nuts, as Canadians, and the minister is responsible for our allies thinking in this way. They are not my words; they are the general's words.

Mr. Hellyer: He was thinking of the opposition.

Mr. McIntosh: He could have been thinking of the opposition, but time will tell us who are the nuts.

Another headline read: "Canada will have indelibly etched her name as the world leader in military organization".

Mr. Hellyer: Hear, hear.

Mr. McIntosh: The minister's definition that unification means only a single service concept does not support or fit into these earlier statements, statements to which he just now responded "hear, hear". He still endorses them. The single service concept is certainly not the boldest plan of military reorganization ever tried by a modern nation—definitely not. Whom was the minister trying to fool when he made that statement? He has made us the laughingstock of other nations. I remember saying that of the minister in a speech in January, and this is what he is likely to do. He will likely make the Canadian troops embarrassed. He will embarrass our sailors at any port they visit. The minister has not heard the last of this, even if he is fortunate enough to shove the bill through the house; and with the support of the splinter parties he will be able to do this.

Nor does its implementation in any way make Canada a leader in defence organization. It has been pointed out to us several times in the committee that the United States has been following the single service concept in its marine force for years. I also say at this point that it is used chiefly in an offensive rather than in a defensive role. This is where this program might be very dangerous to us as Canadians.

In Canada the single service concept only makes sense if it is the intention of the government to opt out of our collective defence role and adapt our entire military efforts to the role of peace keeping and peace restoring. Here we enter the field of a change in foreing policy which may be the key to what the government is getting at. This may be the reason that there has been no forward planning in the Department of National Defence. When we ask how many men will be required to take on the extra role of peace keeping and how much money will be required for this purpose, it may be the reason that the minister and the chief of the general staff said that they had made no studies in this regard whatever, which to me is a very amazing statement on the part of the minister and the chief of the general staff.

Mr. Forrestall: A very revealing one.

Mr. McIntosh: Yes, very revealing. Again I state that the only answer we could get from the chief of the general staff was that he said he was strongly convinced that unification will work out this way. I contend that is not good enough for the members of the House of Commons. We want better answers than that. We are entitled to facts and figures. We cannot understand why this planning has not taken place. That is the duty of these people. That is why the taxpayers pay them. They are paid to plan and to provide these figures, to let us know what our role will be.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, this problem has now resolved itself into two major issues. As I listen to the speeches in this house made by those who are present, it seems these members have also come to this conclusion. The problem now involves our external affairs policy as well as our defence policy.

If this premise is correct, Mr. Chairman, then we have put the cart before the horse in dealing with our defence policy. At present we are dealing with defence policy before we have a clear understanding of what is our foreign policy. The members of this house have asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs to produce a white paper on foreign policy. If our foreign policy has changed, then perhaps this single service concept might be all right for the provision of a peacekeeping force. But I would suggest to the government that it is not Canada's duty to go alone into this peace keeping peace restoring role. Other countries as well as Canada should participate. We are not the guardian of the United Nations, and we are not the people who should restore peace in these brush-fire wars which are started from time to time in various parts of the world. That is not our responsibility. We are willing to help, and we in the opposition would support such a measure; but I do not think that we should be expected to perform this role alone.

Mr. Pugh: Nor pay for it.

Mr. McIntosh: Nor pay for it, as an hon. member says, as we are doing at the present time. The cost should be spread over all of those countries in favour of peace keeping and peace restoring.

If our foreign policy is to remain unchanged, then there is no need for a drastic change in our defence structure. I think that was amply borne out by expert witnesses before the committee. There is certainly no need for unification of our combat troops or forces. This is why we object to unification, because it disrupts our combat troops. We

should keep those combat troops foremost in mind at all times. Their efficiency is most essential to the defence needs of this country. Perhaps we can have poor supply and administration elements, but we cannot have poor combat troops, which is what is likely to happen if we concentrate on the system that the minister is trying to enforce at the present time. We do not want tidy administration at the cost of our combat troops.

On the other hand, if the government's intention is to change our role in foreign affairs and to adopt a "go it alone" foreign policy —which is what some of us think it is— I suggest that as a small nation we cannot afford to contemplate such action, because it touches on such subjects as our sovereignty and our national pride. Some hon. members will no doubt be thinking that the suggestion that it is Canada's intention to opt out of its collective defence role is a ridiculous idea. It is not so ridiculous. I suggest there is foundation for such a thought. Some will say that government spokesmen have time after time given assurances to our allies and to the Canadian people that they have no intention of opting out of our collective defence commitments. Let us consider the facts and determine whether there is any ground for our concern.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Military experts have told us it is impossible in terms of available manpower at present budgetary figures for Canada to continue both her collective defence role and the proposed peace keeping peace restoring role. Remember the figures General Moncel gave us. We cannot continue to fulfil our commitments to NORAD and SACEUR while taking on another role as peacekeeper. Military expert witnesses have maintained that to fulfil both roles our manpower figures would have to be increased from 104,000—the lowest it has been for years—to approximately 150,000. Where are the recruits coming from?

Our defence budget of $1.5 billion would have to be increased to approximately $2.6 billion to cover a dual role status. This is almost double last year's defence budget. When government witnesses, including the minister, are questioned on cost and manpower requirements they freely state that no study of estimates has been made by the department in connection with increased requirements in either manpower or dollars. This is a strange admission, particularly when it comes from those in the department who should be planning this sort of thing. If we embark on a venture of any kind we need to know how many men are required. The Canadian taxpayer has a right to know how much the cost will be. The minister says he cannot tell us. But he intends to go into this venture regardless of the cost. These are facts which must be put across to the Canadian taxpayer.

The obvious conclusion to be drawn is that it is not the government's intention to continue both the collective defence role and the peace keeping role. It is parliament's responsibility to determine just what the government's intentions are. This should have been done before we agreed to this bill in principle, but the circumstances were such that we were forced to agree in principle before we understood what was meant. We still do not understand what this bill will mean. Although every member of this party voted against second reading of the unification bill, the government had sufficient support to force it down our throats.

The military expert witnesses testified that the task requirement of our alliances could not be carried out by a single service force. Statements were made that the single service proposed in Bill C-243 would be less effective in defending our country and in co-operating with our allies than the three services we have today. If this is so, why break up the present system? The three services were designed and evolved to operate and fight in three totally distinct environments—land, sea and air. Bill C-243 as written indicates that the single unified service would be basically "army" in character, and indicates a shifting in our defence policy.

I would say that our four brigade groups would in themselves call for most of the limited manpower available today and that there would be little left to fulfil the obligations to which we are being committed. This government, and particularly the minister, is steering us away from the natural modern concept of interdependence and leading us back to the antiquated role of maintaining a national force. In this day and age we are bound to take account of our interdependence vis-à-vis other nations. This is vital to the defence of our country. If the minister does

not agree, why does he not abolish the defence force altogether? If he intends to let the United States protect Canada, why not save to the taxpayer the entire budget of this department? If he does not agree, let him tell this house what he is actually proposing. What is going to happen? Maybe this is not his responsibility. Maybe it is the responsibility of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. There seems to be confusion between the two policies of this government. Possibly the Prime Minister should straighten this out before we proceed further with the bill before us.

Many Canadians are asking in what circumstances the proposed mobile force will be used. It is generally accepted that at present Canada has no enemies. Are we now, under the guise of peace restoring, intending to become an aggressor nation? God forbid. I submit that such a switch in policy as the minister now proposes means looking for trouble instead of avoiding it.

What will happen to the economy of this country if we undertake such a role as that of peace restoring? The discharge of an independent role in which we are prepared to meet a wide variety of conflicts short of all out war would mean warfare regardless of what it was called and would be carried out at the risk of the lives of Canadian servicemen. In the course of peace restoring we might suffer a military disaster; or we might become heavily involved. The United States started in Viet Nam with 24,000 men. They now have over 400,000 in that theatre and they are engaged in a major war. Let us not be lulled into thinking that there are no risks involved in a peace restoring role. We have a terrible example before us today in Viet Nam.

Military experts have stated it would be foolhardy in the extreme to assume that recruiting, poor as it is at present, would not deteriorate disastrously after the unification of the regular services. I am sure the minister is afraid of this, because he intends to force those who have joined the army, the navy and the air force to be integrated compulsorily in the single Canadian armed force.

Mr. Hellyer: Would the hon. member like to hear a definition of an expert?

An hon. Member: Who is an expert?

Mr. Hellyer: Some of the people he has been referring to.

[Mr. McIntosh.]

Mr. McIntosh: The hon. gentleman is not an expert. If he were, I would listen to him.

Mr. Hellyer: Would the hon. member not like to hear this? It might amuse him. The definition goes like this:

> Experts have their expert fun
> Ex cathedra telling one
> Just how nothing can be done.

An hon. Member: Who said that?

Mr. Hellyer: The author is a philosopher —Piet Hein.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I always thought an expert was a man from out of town.

Mr. McIntosh: I am sure the house was pleased to hear advice from the expert. I am not sure all members of this house would agree with the interpretation the minister seems to place on the words he read. It seems to me that it is facetious for a minister to get up in a debate such as this and quote a passage of that sort. I suggest the minister should take the discussion more seriously.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Representing a great number of naval people as we do, we have to go back to our constituencies and tell them what this unification problem is all about and how it is going to work out. Although I do not give my support to the minister, and am not a supporter of his leader, the Prime Minister, I am very proud when the Prime Minister appears anywhere I am. All Canadian people take pride in his appearance in their midst. We are in a democracy and we in this parliament are in opposition. We are embarassed by the things the government does. We are embarrassed by the comments from other countries saying what they think about unification, but also we are very proud when Canada does something that is notable throughout the world.

We are always very proud of our armed forces, no matter what their role. They have always conducted themselves in a proper manner. We have made friends through the armed forces that we have in Europe, and when we go over there as tourists we are proud of the behaviour of our troops.

We do not want to let our troops become the laughingstock of all the ports of the world. Our sailors say this is what will happen. If the minister continues his determination to rush this bill through, then any effort

we make is well worth while if we can delay its passage until possibly the government is defeated and another government takes over. It will take a long time to repair the destruction created by the minister. I hope we do not live to see the day that we regret what will take place because of the passage of this bill.

Military experts have stated on numerous occasions that it would be foolhardy in the extreme to assume that recruiting, poor as it already is, will not drastically deteriorate further under unification of the regular services. They maintain that if this bill is passed, then within the next few years Canada will probably find herself facing again the unhappy and politically dangerous question of compulsory national service because of manpower requirements. Under unification this conscription issue is almost inevitable.

I would caution some of my hon. friends on the other side of the chamber, who in the past have violently opposed compulsory military service, violently opposed conscription, to remember that when they get up and vote for this bill the result of its passage is likely to be conscription. This consideration alone should give parliament serious reason to pause and consider, before blindly endorsing this military fantasy.

Equally important, Canadian unification may place unlooked for commitments on our present allies, and in particular on the United States navy in meeting the Soviet submarine threat. I submit that present conditions do warrant further reflection on this defence issue, and I request the minister to pay heed to some of the pleas from this side of the chamber and withdraw the bill for further consideration. Some of the damage that has been done to him may be undone if he would be big enough to accede to this request.

I am sure that after listening to all the witnesses before the defence committee the minister must feel he is taking a serious risk. I do not want to say anything about his military experience, but I suggest that the number of people he has had to deal with since taking office, experienced military career officers, men of stature, should have had some effect on him through their advice.

This brings up the question that has been asked about the minister's treatment of Admiral Landymore. When the minister made a statement on the reason Admiral Landymore was fired, and then found out his discharge was not warranted, I cannot understand why he does not reinstate him once again so that Canada may again be served by this man of experience.

The Chairman: Order. I must advise the hon. member that the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Starr: Carry on.

The Chairman: Does the committee give unanimous consent for the hon. member to continue?

Mr. McIntosh: I have expired, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, there is hardly time tonight for me to do justice to a topic as interesting, engaging and serious as the unification bill in the two minutes that are left, so may I just make a comment with regard to the hon. member for Lambton West who contributed some semi-complimentary remarks about me.

The hon. member for Lambton West is a genial member of the house. He was a good attender at the meetings of the defence committee. He is what I call an anchor man in a committee, a man who is always there and who can be relied upon to do whatever he is told. He is the type of committee member that a minister likes to have, and his attendance at the defence committee should put him in line for promotion of some sort or another.

He gave unthinking obedience to the minister and to the minister's very active assistant during the course of committee meetings, and without any great thought to the bill he responded to all the suggestions made to him by the minister or the minister's assistant. In fact he reminded me of a Colonel Blimp in civilian clothes, and his genial attitude made it possible for us to put up with him and rather enjoy his company from time to time, but his contribution to the committee proceedings was not any greater than his contribution to the debate tonight. I was sorry that the hon. member stumbled a bit tonight when he was reading some of that Lee stuff that had been placed in front of him. He should have had a little more time to study it and get the sentences straightened out.

Tomorrow, Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with the basic feature of the bill which is touched upon in clause 2. This clause modifies the present statute which, if I may paraphrase it, says that the Canadian forces shall consist of the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air

Force. The amendment in this bill strikes out Royal Canadian Navy, Canadian Army and Royal Canadian Air Force. In other words it eliminates the three services that we have known in the past. It destroys their identity and it is that subject which I wish to deal with tomorrow. May I now call it ten o'clock?

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, if I could ask whoever is leading the house what business do we switch to tomorrow?

Mr. Pickersgill: I did not realize I was leading the house, but since the hon. gentleman—

Mr. Churchill: You are not doing it very well.

Mr. Pickersgill: I think I am doing as well leading the house, in my absent minded way, as hon. gentlemen opposite are in carrying on the debate. We will go on with the unification bill and give them more scope for tomorrow.

• (10:00 p.m.)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

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

INDIAN AFFAIRS—INQUIRY AS TO PAYMENT OF KINDERGARTEN TEACHERS

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I know the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Laing) feels proud of the increasing expenditure that the Indian Affairs branch has made over the past few years in respect of education. I know he appreciates, perhaps to a greater extent than do some of his colleagues, the necessity to concentrate efforts in the field of education for our native people.

With the increasing population of native Indian people, consequently there are more younger people involved and this is part of the reason for the increased expenditure on education. Many, in fact most, native Indian parents did not, on balance, have the same educational opportunities that the non-Indian people have. In many instances there was a denial of educational opportunities. As a consequence of that and as a consequence of the fact that some of the Indian communities

are relatively isolated and have been for some years, Indian children in some cases have a more difficult time developing their learning ability, and the speed with which they grasp things in school.

This situation is more difficult in isolated communities. It is the isolated communities, the Indian communities wherein there are day schools as distinct from the integrated schools, about which I should like to speak this evening. I should like to make special reference to kindergarten classes. I think we must concentrate on bending over backwards in an effort to assist in placing more emphasis on kindergarten classes, and that age group of children, so they will have a better opportunity to proceed through school at a pace comparable to that at which non-Indian children proceed through school. This is recognized by the department.

I should like to make reference to a form letter which was sent to the principals and chief councillors from the district superintendent of Indian schools at Prince Rupert. The subject is kindergarten classes, and the letter reads as follows:

> The branch is willing to provide books for teachers and supplies for a village kindergarten operated by a kindergarten committee.

That certainly is a recognition of the necessity to place some emphasis on kindergarten classes. The letter goes on to say that classes can be held at certain times and then makes reference to the age of the pupils who would attend in the 1967-68 year. Here are two other sentences which I should like to quote in their entirety:

> We are unable, at this time, to provide wages for those in charge, and so they must be voluntary workers.
>
> It is suggested that, if the people of the village are interested, the principal of the school and the council discuss this matter, and advise me of their plans.

The letter is signed by Dr. C. E. Johnson.

I would urge the minister to expand what is already a policy of recognition of the necessity to extend kindergarten classes, and to expand the policy which now offers books and supplies from the branch for kindergarten classes. I would hope that this would be expanded into a recognition that it may be necessary to employ teachers to teach in kindergartens in order to ensure that there is some continuity of approach in kindergarten classes for the native children, and so that the native children will have that much more opportunity to proceed through school and make the most use of our educational system.

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, when I first heard this question I did not know whether the hon. member was attempting to be critical of the department or whether his well-known kindness toward me activated him into giving me an opportunity of telling him what a whale of a job the department was doing. He has now read a letter which purportedly was sent to a reserve, indicating that they would have to use their own money to pay their own teacher. He will have to give me more particulars in this regard, because this is something about which I know nothing.

At the present time we have 159 classes of children of this age group in federal and provincial schools receiving kindergarten instruction. Indeed, we have 3,000 Indian children attending these schools in Canada. That represents about 35 per cent of Indian children of five years of age. I have little knowledge of the number of kindergarten classes for the white population in Canada but I question whether 35 per cent would be attending kindergarten.

We have been pressing this policy as rapidly as we can because we want to telescope the opportunity for those children coming from Indian parentage, with little knowledge of the English language in some cases, by providing comparable classes and conditions to those the white children have. We are endeavouring to do this by offering this instruction. Within the next five-year period, by 1972, we expect to have 80 per cent of all five-year-old Indian children attending kindergarten classes. If we are successful this will be a magnificent record.

Not very long ago I had the opportunity of observing one of these classes in operation at the Cowichan reserve. This was a remarkable experience because there was evidence in these five-year-old children of some of the artistic qualities that Indians possess. I was very much impressed.

We pay regular salaries commensurate with the schedule applied to all teachers. Indeed in some instances at the present time, when these teachers have special qualifications, we pay additional salaries over and above the present scale. I am of the opinion that the letter which precipitated the hon. member's question was addressed to a remote or very small reserve. All reserves of sufficient size to accommodate a teacher and a classroom, and I was given this information when I was in British Columbia, has a kindergarten class paid for entirely by the department.

There is one exception. The Vancouver schoolboard is making a contribution toward the teacher's salary at the Musqueam reserve. In addition, one of the service clubs in Vancouver wanted to contribute $10,000 toward the accommodation of such a school and we gladly accepted that offer. If we are able to persuade other organizations of this kind to participate I think we will obtain the best advantages of the world in which we live.

I certainly will make inquiries in respect of the hon. member's question, but I think it must relate to a reserve where the number of children of this age group is not adequate to constitute a class. If that is not so, as the hon. member indicates now by shaking his head, we will attempt to rectify the situation as soon as possible.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—INQUIRY AS TO EXTENSION OF REPRESENTATION IN PACIFIC AREA

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) today whether or not the government, having completed arrangements for additional representation with Roumania, would be giving consideration to increasing its representation in the Pacific region. That is a question which seems to me to be of immediate significance to this country. As authority for its significance to Canada today, I should like to quote the remarks of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) as reported in the Vancouver *Sunday Sun* of April 1. I trust that the date of the report is no commentary on its significance. The Prime Minister is quoted as saying:

• (10:10 p.m.)

We know in Ottawa that Canada needs British Columbia.

The article goes on to say:

He said—

Referring to the Prime Minister.

—he is very much aware of the importance of export markets to B.C. industry.

He said B.C. interests in the export markets can be negotiated more successfully by the federal government "than if this province (B.C.) had to face the world alone."

Finally, the Prime Minister referred to British Columbia's interest in expanded trade with Japan and other Pacific countries. We in British Columbia appreciate those remarks,

but there is a world of difference between going out to British Columbia and making a speech and seeing it translated into action here in Ottawa. This is the problem that was inherent in the question I asked this afternoon.

Certainly the completion of the exchange of representatives with Roumania does not have much to do with trade. I have before me the figures for exports from Canada to that country and three Pacific countries. In 1965, for the total year, Canadian exports to Roumania were $641,202; to Korea, $822,564; to Taiwan, $6,577,329, and to Thailand, $5,620,820. For the first six months of 1966 our exports to Roumania amounted to $672,610; to Korea, $13,015,792; to Taiwan, $5,162,889, and to Thailand, $4,937,854.

We know that we do not have representation in Thailand or Taiwan and that our ambassador to Korea is actually our ambassador to Japan. The interests that our country has with Japan constitute a full-time job for anyone in that position. So when the Prime Minister is quoted as having said that the federal government could do better than British Columbia facing the world alone, one wonders how, when its representation in the area is as inadequate as it has been for a very long time. We in British Columbia are interested in developing trade throughout the Pacific rim. We are interested in Canada taking its place as a Pacific nation. This has been advocated not only by people from this party but by people from the government benches.

I have here a copy of an address given by Robert L. Houston, executive director of the Canada-Japan Trade Council, to a luncheon of the Vancouver Board of Trade on February 13 last. I shall quote very briefly from it. Mr. Houston mentions Canadian business visitors to Japan in 1965 and says:

> Compare the 264 Canadian business visitors to Japan in 1965 with the much higher numbers of 1,150 Australian, and 16,000 American business travellers during the same year.

Later in the address he said:

> I feel that Canada could take a lead in exploring the setting up of an economic association between the U.S.A., Japan and Canada—

He goes on to elaborate on that idea. In this one address enough ideas are presented to keep the Canadian ambassador to Japan an extremely busy person, without having him also concerned about the neighbouring country of Korea. I know that the Asian nations I have mentioned are three of the strongest bulwarks against communism but I would hope that would not be a factor in the reluctance or slowness of Canada to move to increasing its representation there. I realize that Roumania is one of the communist nations of Europe and we have representation already in several of these countries. Roumania is not a nation with a large ethnic group in Canada to be concerned about.

I would hope that perhaps some of the reasons for the exchange are ones that will be of benefit to this country. I am sure we could benefit from immigration from that country, particularly from its province of Transylvania which compares somewhat to my own constituency. I know that criticism in my constituency has been expressed to the effect that the province of British Columbia does not put forward sufficiently in eastern Canada, the opportunities for industrial development in British Columbia but I feel that one of the difficulties it faces is that it must go out into the Pacific and do some of the representation there which is not being done by the federal government at this time.

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, my first words must be to point out to the hon. member that in directing his questions to the Secretary of State for External Affairs he was somewhat misinformed. It is clear from his remarks that he is primarily interested in the question of trade. He will probably recall on reflection that the expansion of Canada's trade contacts is not primarily the responsibility of this department but of the Department of Trade and Commerce and the trade commissioners service. Therefore I am not able to give him information on whether or not we have trade commissioners in the post which he has named. However, I would point out to him—

Mr. Thompson: No, it has not.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): If the hon. member for Red Deer would contain himself I would be able to answer the question put by his colleague. We have a farflung trade commissioner service and I do not doubt that we are represented in those posts.

Mr. Thompson: No, we are not.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Subject to those considerations I wish to point out that the expansion of Canada's external affairs department and the expansion of Canadian activities has brought with it great pressure to

expand our diplomatic missions not only in eastern Europe but also in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

I would also point out that this pressure, along with the already heavy obligations that the department has, has brought a great pressure on the number of officers we have and on the number of missions which we are able to open at any one time. Therefore, while I can assure the hon. member that the opening of further missions is continually being directed to the attention of the government, and the government does intend to open missions not only in Asia but on the other continents, I cannot at the moment give him a specific assurance that the particular missions to which he has referred will be opened. I will point out to him, however, that the question of trade is the responsibility of the Department of Trade and Commerce, and I am sure his remarks will be of great interest to the minister of that department.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

23033—920

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, April 5, 1967

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

PUBLIC SERVICE

TABLING OF ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF ROYAL COMMISSION ADOPTED BY GOVERNMENT

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue and President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table, in English and in French, copies of 29 additional recommendations of the royal commission on government organization which have been adopted by the government.

Mr. Speaker: Does the minister have leave to table the documents?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

• (2:40 p.m.)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE, WITH REPORTS OF AUDITOR GENERAL AND CANADA COUNCIL

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works) moved:

That the Public Accounts volumes I, II and III for the fiscal years ended March 31, 1966, and the report of the Auditor General thereon, tabled on January 9, 1967 and February 20, 1967, respectively, together with the report and financial statement of the Canada Council for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1966, and the report of the Auditor General thereon tabled on August 30, 1966 be referred to the standing committee on public accounts.

Motion agreed to.

COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS

TABLING OF CONTRACT BETWEEN CANADA AND LIATS OF ANTIGUA

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the supplementary estimates the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) raised some question about a contract between the government and Leeward Island Air Transport, Antigua. I promised to table the document, and I would be glad to do so now.

Mr. Speaker: Has the minister leave to table the document?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

BROADCASTING ACT

AMENDMENT RESPECTING CONTROL OF CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-287, to amend the Broadcasting Act (cigarette advertising).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Mather: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to extend the present powers of the Board of Broadcast Governors to regulate or prohibit certain liquor, food and drug advertising so that in future these powers will also govern cigarette advertising.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

AIR CANADA MAINTENANCE BASE, DORVAL, QUE.

Question No. 2,720—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. On how many shifts per day is the Air Canada maintenance and overhaul base at Dorval being operated?

2. Can the maintenance and overhaul base as it is now constituted at Dorval handle all the work which Air Canada requires it to do at the present time?

3. Is Air Canada planning to expand the maintenance and overhaul base and/or its facilities at Dorval in the next three years and, if so, what is the cost of the planned expansion of the base or facilities at Dorval?

Questions

4. Is Air Canada giving consideration to shifting part of the work now being done at Dorval to its maintenance and overhaul base at Winnipeg?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Air Canada advises as follows: 1. Three.

2. Yes.

3. Expansion is expected but extent and cost has not been forecast at this time.

4. No.

C.M.H.C. LOANS IN LEBEL-SUR-QUEVILLON, QUE.

Question No. 2,721—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. How many loans has Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation approved since its inception for Lebel-sur-Quevillon, Chapleau county?

2. How many of these loans required the services of Mr. Réal Caron of Senneterre, Quebec?

3. How many of these loans have required the services of Mr. Joseph Morin?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): 1. Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation has approved 335 loans for 378 units for an amount of $5.8 million in Lebel-sur-Quevillon to December 31, 1966. Of these, 92 loans have been cancelled, leaving 243 active loans for 286 units in an amount of $4.4 million.

2. None.

3. The 243 active loans have required the services of Mr. Joseph Morin.

FERRY TRAFFIC TO AND FROM PORT AUX BASQUES, NFLD.

Question No. 2,722—**Mr. Tucker:**

1. What was the total number of passenger vehicles carried by the C.N.R. carriers to and from Port aux Basques, Newfoundland, in each year from 1960 to 1966, both years inclusive?

2. What was the total number of trailer trucks and other commercial vehicles carried by the C.N.R. carriers to and from Port aux Basques, Newfoundland, in each year from 1960 to 1966, both years inclusive?

3. What was the total number carried by other carriers to and from Port aux Basques, Newfoundland, in each year from 1960 to 1966, with respect to parts 1 and 2 above?

4. What was the total number of passengers carried in each year from 1960 to 1966 by (a) the coastal ferry *William Carson* (b) other ferries during the same period?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows: 1. Passenger vehicles: 1960, 15804; 1961, 16219; 1962, 19172; 1963, 22209; 1964, 26507; 1965, 28684; 1966, 35101.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

2. Trailer trucks and other commercial vehicles: 1960, 2277; 1961, 2886; 1962, 3572; 1963, 4139; 1964, 4592; 1965, 4533; 1966, 5025.

3. Other carriers:

	Autos	Trucks
1960	28	—
1961	332	—
1962	517	—
1963	535	—
1964	41	9
1965	134	36
1966	86	3

4. Passengers

	William Carson	Other
1960	62366	5327
1961	62566	6597
1962	70193	7125
1963	77408	14896
1964	103473	3605
1965	120108	7652
1966	99518	58696

C.M.H.C. LOAN APPLICATIONS, QUEBEC AND ONTARIO

Question No. 2,732—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. How many requests for loans were made to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation each year from 1962 to 1967 (a) in Quebec (b) in Ontario?

2. In 1962-63-64-65-66, how many loans were approved by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation (a) in Quebec (b) in Ontario?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): 1. (a) and (b)

Applications for direct C.M.H.C. loans for new housing under section 40 of the National Housing Act (dwelling units)

Period	Quebec	Ontario
1962	6,120	4,389
1963	8,718	7,645
1964	10,282	8,741
1965	12,560	7,820
1966	11,219	9,646

The foregoing data, which are available in terms of dwelling units only, relate to formal applications, where application fees were received, for direct C.M.H.C. loans under section 40 of the National Housing Act. Data relating to the discussions and negotiations preceding loan approval for direct C.M.H.C. loans under other sections of the act, are not available.

2. (a) and (b). *Questions*

DIRECT C.M.H.C. LOANS APPROVED FOR NEW HOUSING UNDER THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Year	Quebec				Ontario			
		Dwelling units		Amount ($000)		Dwelling units		Amount ($000)
	Loans	Sect. 40(1)	Other(2)		Loans	Sect. 40(1)	Other(2)	
1962.....	4,258	4,321	—	48,010	3,304	3,329	718	44,144
1963.....	7,340	7,625	—	92,461	6,188	6,253	1,106	91,633
1964.....	8,653	9,228	—	117,238	7,407	7,601	1,118	111,437
1965.....	10,291	11,353	41	151,707	7,144	7,201	1,800	129,799
1966.....	9,697	10,572	36	153,514	8,820	8,814	4,193	193,701

(1)The data for dwelling units approved under section 40 are comparable to the data on dwelling units for which applications were received, given in table I above. Differences between the number of loan applications and the number of loans approved, in terms of dwelling units, arise not only because of applications rejected by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, but also because of withdrawals and cancellations by prospective borrowers prior to approval.

(2)Self contained units in projects financed under sections 16, 16A and 35D, N.H.A.

*REDUCED PAYMENT TO NATIONAL CAPITAL FUND

Question No. 2,751—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

Why has the government reduced the payment to the national capital fund from $25,000,000 in the fiscal year 1966-67 to $14,650,000 in 1967-68?

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the difference between the sum of $25 million paid to the national capital fund in 1966-67 and the sum of $14,650,000 to be paid in 1967-68 is more than accounted for by the reduction in the amount required for the railway relocation project and for the construction of the Ottawa river parkway, which was well advanced toward completion on March 31, 1967.

ARDA GRANTS TO CO-OPERATIVE ENTERPRISES

Question No. 2,766—**Mr. Horner (Acadia):**

1. How many direct grants have been made under ARDA to co-operative enterprises?

2. To whom were these grants made and in what provinces?

3. What was the basic purpose towards which each of the grants contributed—employment, the eradication of poverty, land development, etc.?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry and Rural Development): 1. None. The federal ARDA program does not provide for grants of this nature. It is possible through the provincial program.

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

USE OF WELLAND CANAL

Question No. 2,784—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. In the last three years, how many ships used the Welland canal?

2. How many of these ships were loaded with grain when using the canal?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The St. Lawrence seaway authority advises as follows: 1. 25,402.

2. 4,416.

REPOSITIONING OF MENTAL HEALTH DIVISION IN DEPARTMENT

Question No. 2,787—**Mr. Brand:**

1. Has the mental health division of the Department of National Health and Welfare been repositioned to a lower position in the departmental structure?

2. If so, does this mean that the chief of the mental health division no longer reports to the deputy minister?

3. If so, does this indicate a decline in the incidence or importance of mental disease in Canada?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. No.

2 and 3. See answer 1. above.

COST OF ARDA PROJECT 7030

Question No. 2,789—**Mr. Schreyer:**

1. What was the total cost of ARDA project No. 7030?

2. Of that amount, what percentage constituted the federal share of the cost?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry and Rural Development): 1. The total approved cost was $20,000.

2. The federal share amounts to 50 per cent, $10,000.

BILINGUAL EMPLOYEES, MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION DEPARTMENT

Question No. 2,795—**Mr. Allard:**

1. Of the 68 bilingual civil servants working in Department of Manpower and Immigration offices abroad, did any claim to be bilingual on their job application forms and speak no French but simply read it and, if so, how many?

2. Do civil servants who are hired locally abroad, by the department for work in its offices, including those who speak and write French, in contact with the public and do they perform confidential work and, if not, for what reason?

3. Do civil servants hired locally abroad by the department for work in its offices communicate with the local public in English only and, if so, for what reason?

[*Translation*]

Mr. J. C. Munro (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. Yes, two.

2. Yes.

3. No.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I ask that notices of motions Nos. 205, 209, 212, 214, 215, 220, 221 and 222, that is all notices of motions appearing in today's order paper, be allowed to stand.

[*English*]

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

REQUEST FOR CALLING OF NATIONAL CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if the house will allow me to preface the question I am about to ask, I should like first to offer my most sincere congratulations to the new Minister of Justice, for whom I have the highest admiration, and also to the new Minister without Portfolio. The same applies to the others who have already entered the sacred precincts of the privy council.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Schreyer.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Now I direct my question to the Minister of Justice. It is a matter about which I am endeavouring to get information. Now that the new minister has taken office, would he give early consideration to the convening of a national constitutional conference—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —to which in days past he has given his allegiance? I hope he will give consideration to this question and will be able to use the powers of advocacy in support of this conference now that he has the responsibility of office.

Hon. P.-E. Trudeau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the right hon. Leader of the Opposition for the occasion he has given me to thank hon. members of this house from both sides for the friendly way in which they have congratulated me on my appointment. I want to thank the Leader of the Opposition particularly for starting off gently by asking me a difficult question.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Trudeau: Of course I will give consideration to the matter which the right hon. Leader of the Opposition has raised. I would always give consideration to a matter the right hon. Leader of the Opposition might raise. On the issue itself, I must say that I have not been in cabinet long enough yet to change my mind.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacEwan: Later this day.

Mr. Churchill: Twenty four hours.

Mr. Trudeau: Perhaps at ten o'clock. My opinion, as I have expressed it a few times in the past, is that I did not feel it was good policy for the government to be overanxious about the convening of a constitutional conference, for the simple reason that some of the other ministers and myself feel there is perhaps not yet the measure of consensus existing in the country which would permit—

Mr. Starr: You have already changed your mind.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Trudeau: No; that will have to be shown. I would say that I am optimistic about the future of this country, as are hon. members on both sides of the house, and I

think some day or other we will have that measure of consensus which will permit us to look at various forms of constitutional change.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In asking the Minister of Justice a supplementary question I should like to join in the general congratulations of the house and express especially the pleasure of this party in the minister's appointment, particularly as I heard on the radio this morning that he was a member of this party at heart.

My question to him is this. In order to try to establish the consensus across Canada that he thinks is necessary in order to deal with the constitutional issues raised by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition, will the minister direct his attention to the suggestion that has been made on a number of occasions by various members of the house, that a committee of this parliament be established to look into this matter?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, my feeling is that the history of the past few years has indicated that the opposite course is precisely the one that should be followed. I feel there is progress toward the establishment of a consensus, and this has happened as a result of sensible politicians in all provinces and in the central government looking at the difficulty of establishing agreement.

We did have the example of an amending procedure, which was discussed very largely across the country and which just did not arrive at any concrete conclusion because the country was not then ready. I feel that precisely because we have avoided such confrontations we are permitting responsible politicians everywhere to arrive at the conclusion which we on this side of the house have reached, namely that time is on our side.

COAL

BRITISH COLUMBIA—REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE FOR VICTIMS OF MINE DISASTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the right hon. Prime Minister regarding the unfortunate mining disaster in Natal, British Columbia. All of us share the sentiments of sympathy which he expressed yesterday for the families of the victims. I want to ask the Prime Minister whether the government is now prepared to announce something fairly concrete. Press reports have indicated that the government of British Columbia is making a cash contribution to a fund to provide for the widows and dependants of the victims. Is the Canadian government prepared to make a contribution to such a fund as a first step in helping those affected by this mining disaster?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday this matter is under consideration. I am not yet in a position to make any announcement with regard to what we can do to help the victims of this terrible disaster, except to say that one decision has been made, namely that all contributions will be tax deductible. However, I hope to be able to make a statement shortly.

Mr. Douglas: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Prime Minister give early consideration, while this fund is being collected, to the federal government making a substantial contribution as a first step, which would not prevent the government from doing other things which it might be necessary to do?

Mr. Pearson: That is what I said is under consideration.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR DISCUSSION OF NEW DAIRY POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

As a result of the new dairy policy of the government, has the minister received representations from the various agricultural organizations of the C.F.U. of Quebec with a view to resuming discussions between the farmers and the Department of Agriculture specifically with regard to that new dairy policy.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I do not recall any such communication, but I shall take the question of the hon. member as notice.

Mr. Caouette: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister be willing to resume the dialogue with the farmers of Canada in connection with the dairy policy? And is it not true that the minister is to meet

the farmers on Friday, April 7, that is the day after tomorrow, about this matter?

Mr. Greene: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I shall see the farmers, on Thursday and Friday, and I shall be very happy to meet the members of the C.F.U. as well, if they wish to see me about the new dairy policy.

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

INQUIRY AS TO ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION OF OMBUDSMAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of the fact that R.C.M.P. Commissioner George McClellan is reportedly resigning his position to accept the post of ombudsman for Alberta, the first such office to be established in Canada, I would again ask the Prime Minister whether the government intends to introduce legislation during this centennial year which would establish an ombudsman or parliamentary commissioner for Canada at the federal level.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I would ask my hon. friend to allow me not to answer his question now, as I will be making a statement on this in a few days' time. We have been giving consideration to this very complicated matter and we have not yet come to a final conclusion, but I hope to be able to make a report in a few days.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Solicitor General and ask him whether he can confirm the fact that Commissioner McClellan is leaving the R.C.M.P. to become ombudsman for the province of Alberta.

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should point out that in the normal course of events the commissioner will reach retirement age as of August 15 of this year. Although he is under no obligation to discuss his future plans with me, we have discussed them at some length. Of course any announcement as to his future after his retirement from the force will have to come either from the commissioner or from his employer at that time.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the minister whether it is his practice to let his officials reach retirement age, or is he going to adopt the practice of the Minister of National Defence?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

FINANCE

REQUEST FOR STUDY OF CORPORATION LAW REFORM

On the orders of the day:

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the success of the committee established by the government of Ontario in outlining the reforms needed in Ontario corporation law to provide better protection for the public in that province, does the government intend to initiate a similar study at the federal level with a view to providing better protection for the public in all parts of the country?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): We have already done that, Mr. Speaker, as the result of a decision to hold a meeting to consider this matter I believe next Monday.

INDUSTRY

REPORTED DECREASE IN CANADIAN AUTOMOBILE PRODUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): I should like to direct a question to the Acting Minister of Industry. In view of the fact that Canadian automobile output decreased by 11.4 per cent during the first quarter of this year as compared to the same period last year, will the minister immediately consult with his officials and his colleagues in order to determine to what extent this decrease was caused by the Canada-United States auto pact?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Without admitting the premise on which the question is based, I should like to take the question as notice.

GRAIN

OATS AND BARLEY—REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO SHIP INTO MANITOBA

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): My question concerns the western provinces, and particularly Saskatchewan and Manitoba. I have to preface it by stating that today in Saskatchewan farmers are selling their oats on the farm at 70 cents

to 80 cents a bushel, barley at $1.10 to $1.26 and feed wheat at $1.70 per bushel. There are ample supplies of the first two grains in that province. In Manitoba there is a very serious shortage of feed grain for those who feed cattle. The wheat board, of course, will not allow the transport of oats or barley from one province to another.

In view of the serious situation resulting from the shortage of these two grains in Manitoba, will the minister communicate with the wheat board to ascertain whether some temporary moratorium might be applied that would permit shipments to be made, thereby meeting the serious demands of Manitoba feeders?

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I would be glad to discuss this important matter with the wheat board and endeavour to give a report to the house tomorrow.

MANITOU SEED WHEAT—REQUEST FOR REMOVAL OF EXPORT EMBARGO

On the orders of the day:

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): May I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the minister had any recent requests to remove the embargo on shipments of Manitou seed wheat to the United States? If so, what action if any does he contemplate taking with regard to this matter?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, we have had no recent requests, though prior to the recess there were some communications in this regard. Our investigations indicated that there were two sides to the story, two views held by different groups of farmers. Having considered both sides of the story, no change in the government's policy has been made to date.

REQUEST FOR INCREASED MOVEMENT OF TOUGH AND DAMP GRADES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): Mr. Speaker, I also have a question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce and it has to do with tough and damp grain still on the farm. Would the minister inquire of the Canadian Wheat Board whether they will be in a position to allot more cars to remove this grain or to increase the quota?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is making a representation, which I assume has been noted by the minister.

Inquiries of the Ministry

PUBLIC WORKS

PORT McNEILL, B.C.—REQUEST FOR BREAKWATER CONSTRUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): I should like to direct to the Minister of Public Works a question which, to borrow a phrase from my colleague from Kootenay West, is of great national importance. I should like to ask the minister whether he will endeavour to prevail upon his colleagues in the cabinet to provide a supplementary estimate for the construction of a breakwater at Port McNeill on Vancouver island?

Mr. Speaker: I have to tell the hon. member what I sometimes have had to tell the hon. member for Kootenay West, that the question should be placed on the order paper.

Mr. Barnett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ten o'clock.

TRADE

COPPER—REQUEST FOR REMOVAL OF EXPORT RESTRICTIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In view of the steady decline in the international price of primary and scrap copper, and the general improvement in the whole situation, is the minister considering rescinding any of the restrictions the government has imposed on copper?

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the situation has eased somewhat in recent months. The 50 per cent quota that applied to copper scrap and copper alloy scrap has been increased to the point where, effective in April, it will be 100 per cent. Permits are now let freely for the sale of scrap not now normally consumed by refineries. There are no restrictions on exports to the United States.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—REQUEST FOR AID TO WAR VICTIMS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs of which there is no doubt as to its national importance. In view of the concern of many Canadians with the failure of the Canadian

government to respond to Dr. Gustave Gingras' plea to provide a medical aid program to the children of South Viet Nam, is the government now prepared to give consideration to this plea and to the advice of the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Pelletier) who, when addressing the Montreal Reform Club on Monday, said "We could show where our heart truly lies by sending massive medical aid to both North and South Vietnamese war victims"?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the first part of the question, of which I have received notice, I can definitely state that the delay in bringing this project in South Viet Nam into being has not been for want of a strong indication from the Canadian government of support for the idea of helping the children of South Viet Nam. Dr. Gingras himself went to South Viet Nam at the government's suggestion and request, and he made a report on his visit. We are still hopeful that something will come out of the work which he did and the work which has been done since. As soon as the results of our latest efforts are known, I will report them to the house.

With regard to the second part of the question, I have already indicated that Canadian aid is granted on the basis of government requests. If such request is made by the government in North Viet Nam the Canadian government will give it the consideration it would want to give.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask the minister of external affairs why the project sponsored by Dr. Gingras has been delayed for so long?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The reason, Mr. Speaker, which I have explained in this house already, is that the facilities where the rehabilitation project was to be established were not made available to the government of Canada. Facilities have to be established, including a site. We are still working on this, and if the site and those facilities are provided, the work of rehabilitation, as recommended by Dr. Gingras, will be commenced.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Was the minister correctly reported in the press as having stated that if a request was made by North Viet Nam for material aid—and I speak of other than medical aid—the government of Canada would grant it?

[Mr. Herridge.]

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, what I said was what I have said in this house on many occasions—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Did the minister say that?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I am now answering. If such a request were made, the government would give consideration to a request for medical supplies for the civilian population. I cannot be responsible if my right hon. friend had a report which he does not think is consistent with my reply. Certainly I do not believe his report is consistent with what I said.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, if anything the hon. gentleman says is consistent I have yet to find it. In the meantime I would ask the minister whether he said that material aid other than medical supplies would be granted if requested by the government of North Viet Nam.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I have just said that my right hon. friend has read his report incorrectly.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Not at all.

Mr. David MacDonald (Prince): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the minister of external affairs relating to an answer given in this house some weeks ago. I wonder if the minister can now tell us when action might be taken on a proposed plan to bring Vietnamese children to Canada for rehabilitation.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No, Mr. Speaker, I have no report to make on that at the moment.

[*Later:*]

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the minister of external affairs. May I ask him whether any request has been made to the Canadian government for medical supplies to be administered to civilians wounded as a result of the conflict in Viet Nam. If there was, what would be the attitude of the government to this request?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): As my hon. friend knows, all external aid is on a government to government basis, though I have had a letter from some correspondent suggesting that this government might not wait for a request from the government of North Viet Nam to give such assistance.

UNITED NATIONS

CANADIAN PROPOSAL RESPECTING TRAINING OF PEACE KEEPING UNITS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have an easy question for the perturbed minister for external affairs. Is the report in the press correct that Canada's permanent representative at the United Nations has proposed that the United Nations set up uniform standards of special training for military units to be earmarked for United Nations peace keeping work, with special emphasis on police training?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I always find my hon. friend's questions easy to answer. Yes, that is a correct statement. At the present time the committee of 33 on peace keeping is considering what the United Nations might do in this matter. This is one of the proposals Canada has put forward on this occasion, as it has on others. It does not in any way limit the kind of peace keeping operations in which Canada has participated on so many occasions.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think I owe it to the house to remind hon. members that it is not according to the rules to ask whether a statement which appears in the press is or is not correct. I have been perhaps a little lenient with regard to the questions which have been asked during the last few minutes.

FISHERIES

REQUEST FOR ACTION ON FRAUDULENT FILM ON SEALING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries but in his absence I would direct it to the Prime Minister. In view of the damage being caused to the sealing industry in Canada and to the marketing of furs in Europe by the showing of a film prepared by Artek Film Productions Limited, Montreal, in which scenes of cruelty were deliberately staged, will the Prime Minister indicate what action his government is contemplating against the perpetrators of this international libel?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): The Acting Minister knows all about this, Mr. Speaker.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Acting Minister of Fisheries): I do not know, sir, that I know all about it. However, I understand that the Minister of Fisheries has already said in the house that this film was a fraud, and if there was any way of taking legal action to prove it was a fraud I would be in favour of doing this. I cannot understand why so much fuss is being made about seals when nothing is said about cruelty in catching salmon.

Mr. Crouse: I have a supplementary question for the acting minister. It is true that the minister has stated—I am quoting from his own statement in the house—that it has been determined, for example, that films shown on television here and abroad include lurid scenes staged for the purpose. I should like to ask the acting minister, in view of the fact that the sealing industry, which is an important primary industry, is being strangled by harsh regulations on the one hand and by the loss of its markets due to the showing of this film on the other, whether the government will take every action possible to limit the further showing of this particular film.

[*Translation*]

COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS

INQUIRY AS TO LEGISLATION RESPECTING EXTRADITION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the new Minister of Justice.

I wonder if he could inquire and tell us whether the government has under consideration legislation to empower the Canadian government to refuse extradition of Commonwealth citizens prosecuted in the independent countries of the Commonwealth for offences of a political character?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the minister that he could inquire after the question has been placed on the order paper.

[*English*]

SPORTS

HOCKEY—WINNING GOAL BY RUSSIA AGAINST CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have been attempting since Monday to ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare this question. May I ask the minister whether in his opinion the second goal scored by the Russian hockey team

against Canada's national hockey team was offside.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is asking for an expression of opinion.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): A supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member might like to ask another question rather than a supplementary.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I ask this question of the minister since this parliament voted funds to assist the Canadian national team to go overseas, and this parliament also voted the funds to make his trip possible. We are at least entitled to an opinion from the minister, or to an eyewitness account, as to whether the Canadian hockey team was bilked.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am sure this question would be very interesting at ten o'clock.

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

OTTAWA—PAYMENT OF SALARIES OF TRAVEL BUREAU EMPLOYEES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, my question should be directed to the Minister of Industry and Defence Production but, in his absence, I will put it to the Minister of Public Works in his capacity as house leader.

Following complaints by employees of the Canadian Government Travel Bureau to the effect that they have been paid one and two weeks late for quite some time now, is the minister in a position or willing to take the necessary steps so that the employees of the Travel Bureau will receive their pay cheques regularly and will not have to go from the Baseline Road to 150 Kent Street, in Ottawa, to get them?

Mr. Speaker: Order. That question is out of order.

[*English*]

EXPO '67

REPORTED AGREEMENT RESPECTING VISITORS FROM IRON CURTAIN COUNTRIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. The question, Mr. Speaker, is based on a newspaper story appearing in Monday's New York *World-Journal-Tribune*. Will the minister say whether, as the result of a top level secret agreement between himself and the Czech foreign minister last winter, Canada has given assurance that any visitors from Czechoslovakia to Expo who might defect to Canada will be sent home and that Canada has agreed to waive the $1,000 security bond required from people coming from behind the iron curtain?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this government does not enter into agreements of that kind, and certainly no such agreement was entered into.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

REQUEST THAT RED ENSIGN BE DISPLAYED AT VIMY CELEBRATION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): I have a question for the Associate Minister of National Defence, who I understand is to lead the party to the Vimy recognition ceremonies at the end of this week. Would the minister make provision for displaying the Canadian red ensign in addition to our present flag at the Vimy site, so the veterans of that period may see the flag they were so familiar with during the 1914-18 war?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows very well this Vimy ceremony is organized by the Department of Veterans Affairs. I shall be leading the Canadian delegation there, but I am not the organizer. I think this matter would come under the responsibility of the Minister of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Churchill: Then may I direct my question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs.

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as I understand the arrangements for this ceremony for which I and my department are responsible, the Canadian flag will be the dominant flag at Vimy.

Mr. Churchill: A supplementary question. It is not a question of a dominant flag. I was simply asking whether, in addition to the Canadian flag, the minister could consider displaying the Canadian red ensign with which the veterans were so familiar in their war years.

Mr. Teillet: Mr. Speaker, in view of the hoped for presence of the Duke of Edinburgh, Prince Philip, at Vimy representing the Queen of Canada there unquestionably will be a display of the royal flag, the union jack, as well as the Canadian ensign.

Mr. Churchill: Refusal.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

REPORTED INFILTRATION INTO CANADA OF INTERNATIONAL MAFIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): I have a question for the Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker. In view of the reports published today in a prominent Toronto newspaper to the effect that the international mafia is infiltrating into Canada, and that the officials from Montreal are presently meeting with the federal bureau of investigation of the United States, could the minister give us any information on these serious allegations. If they are true, what action is his department taking to deal with the situation?

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the R.C.M.P. are maintaining constant vigilance over the situation. As the newspaper reports, we have been in close contact with opposite numbers in the United States.

Mr. Scott (Danforth): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister tell the house what liaison he has developed with his deskmate the Minister of Manpower and Immigration to avoid a repetition of incidents of the past, where these gangsters have been able to move with considerable ease back and forth across the border.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is asking for a statement on a hypothetical situation.

PRIVILEGE

MR. KNOWLES—CORRECTION OF PERSONAL REFERENCE IN NEWSPAPER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Speaker: I understand, from a note I have received, that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre would like permission to revert to motions for the purpose of correcting *Hansard*. Is this correct?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, it is a correction, but not a correction in *Hansard*. On page 7 of this morning's Toronto *Globe and Mail*, where there is a report of the proceedings of parliament for yesterday, I am referred to as "Stanley Knowles, P.C."

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Ricard: The hon. member would never be accepted.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I would not want the Progressive Conservative leadership candidates to waste their time lobbying for my vote. I am a confirmed and inveterate New Democrat.

• (3:20 p.m.)

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

AMALGAMATION OF NAVY, ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The house resumed, from Tuesday, April 4, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof—Mr. Hellyer —Mr. Batten in the chair.

The Chairman: When the committee rose last evening clause 2 was being considered. Shall clause 2 carry?

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I am entering into this debate because of my conviction that the proposal placed before us by the government is unsound and should be resisted.

I begin by expressing my regret that in our centennial year we should be involved in a debate such as this. During centennial year we are emphasizing the history and traditions of our country in every hamlet, community and city of Canada. We are drawing attention to a glorious past; we are recognizing the activities of our forefathers and paying tribute to their work in developing this country.

During centennial year we are also recognizing the devotion to duty and the sacrifices of generations of military people who have contributed over the years to the defence of this country. During that historical survey attention will be drawn to the early conflicts in the early settlement of this country. Attention will be drawn to the difficulties with the native population, to the struggle with the United States in 1812-14, to the Fenian raids which caused loss of life and disturbance on our borders, to the 1885 rebellion in western Canada, to Canadian participation in the South African war, the first world war, the

second world war and in Korea; and yet during this year when these things are going on, and when this recognition is being given to those who devoted their lives to the service of their country, we are caught in a conflict instituted by the Minister of National Defence, and supported by the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Prime Minister, with regard to the military services of our country. And if the government's proposal is carried, the traditions of these fighting services will be wiped out.

I say, Mr. Chairman, it is with regret that in this centennial year we have to have a debate of this nature. I do not normally shrink too rapidly from mild controversy in the House of Commons, but I do confess it is with great reluctance that in this particular year, at this particular time, I find myself involved in opposition to the government on an issue such as this. Just this coming week end, sir, there will be a celebration here in Ottawa, and one in France at Vimy Ridge, recognizing the activities of Canadian military people in the first world war. It is proper that this should be done.

The Vimy Ridge ceremony will bring back to the knowledge of Canadians who lived in that period, and to the attention of the younger generation, the sacrifices and endeavour of people in the first world war. Their attention will be drawn to the battle of Vimy Ridge, which was not more severe than other battles in that war, and did not occasion greater proportionate loss of life than some of the other battles in that war. It was not greater in importance than, say, the gas attack at Saint Julien, or the battle of the Somme, or the Passchendaele struggle in the fall of 1917, or the 100 days of victorious advance in 1918; but the capture of Vimy Ridge, one of the strongest points on the western front in 1914 to 1918, marked a change in the difficulties of the allied armies on that front, and was about the only optimistic note struck in the year 1917, during which we almost lost the war. It was the good fortune of the Canadian corps, working together, to be the spearhead of that attack, and Canada on that occasion found her national identity. For 50 years I have been wondering at people who are bemoaning the fact that we are striving to discover our national identity. It was discovered then, on April 9, 1917—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Churchill: —when between 80,000 and 90,000 young Canadians played their part in that struggle, and when in the space of three days over 3,000 of them were killed and over 7,000 were wounded. Sir, with these ceremonies so close to us I say again it is with regret I have to engage in a debate on the situation concerning the services for which I have such a high regard, the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force.

It has been my good fortune to see these forces in action or to be assisted by them somewhere along the line in the course of such military experience as I have had, and I have nothing but admiration for the two forces with which I did not serve, the Royal Canadian Navy and the Royal Canadian Air Force. I have the greatest respect for the fighting men in those services, as well as for those in the army, and the greatest regret that they are facing this crisis at this period of our history when the government is attempting to wipe out their great past and launch out on an uncharted future without placing reliance on the experience gained by the fighting men of Canada over the last 100 years.

Sir, this is exactly what is going to happen. Section 15 of the present statute, which is called the National Defence Act, reads as follows:

> The Canadian Forces are the naval, army and air forces of Her Majesty raised by Canada and consist of three services, namely, the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force.

We are being asked in this parliament to strike out that section and substitute the following for it:

> The Canadian Forces are the armed forces of Her Majesty raised by Canada and consist of one service called the Canadian Armed Forces.

We are being asked to strike out the three services, the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force and substitute for them the Canadian Armed Forces. The identity of the three well known services will be destroyed. We will have one single force and, if the minister has his way, dressed in the same uniform with a common rank structure.

That is what is facing us in this debate and that is what we are objecting to, among other things that are in the proposed amendments. I certainly lodge my objection to the formation of a single force to be simply called the Canadian Armed Forces, and to the destruction of the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force.

Yesterday, sir, attention was drawn once again to the lack of confidence that we have in the Minister of National Defence. The hon. member for Calgary North indicated, with several examples tied down to evidence given, that the minister is an unreliable purveyor of information to the House of Commons, and I raised a question of privilege on that occasion in order to underline the seriousness of the situation. I do not propose to spend all my time on that aspect of the subject today, but I do intend to draw attention to the credibility gap which has developed between the minister and the House of Commons, and between the minister and the Canadian people, and to point out that that gap has become a yawning gulf separating us, because we can no longer rely on the Minister of National Defence.

I think it is destructive of the parliamentary system that we are not able to rely upon statements by ministers of the crown. If we cannot rely upon their statements, what type of government have we in this democracy? It is no longer a democracy if ministers of the crown fail to give us the facts and fail to give us the absolute truth.

I drew attention to this difficulty on November 4 last in a speech which was not widely reported. In fact I do not think it was reported at all, but I make no complaint. I am not attacking the press of this country as the minister did. I think the press representatives of this country achieve miracles in interpreting some of the things we say here in the House of Commons, considering the restriction of space that they have in their newspapers and the, shall I say, domineering attitude taken by their editors, as a result of which some of their best copy ends up in the waste paper basket instead of in the columns of the newspapers. I am sure that is where most of the reports of my speeches end up. I do not blame the reporters at all. I find no fault with them for that. They really do a good job of summarizing in a short space what perhaps takes several hours to say here in the House of Commons or in committee. However, my speech of November 4 was a speech which showed that the Minister of National Defence was misleading the house and the country.

• (3:30 p.m.)

I should like to draw attention to two examples from that speech, and then I will take a third example from the committee proceedings. The first example appears at page 9577 of *Hansard*, where I was drawing attention to the one uniform idea:

> On October 27, as reported at page 9165 of *Hansard*, I asked this question of the minister: "Has the minister authorized one walking-out uniform similar in pattern, style and colour for all members of the armed forces?"
>
> The minister replied: "Not yet, Mr. Speaker." Then we went on to talk about the walking-out uniform, and I asked:
>
> "Will the minister give a clear indication of what is government policy in this respect—" I was referring to a single walking-out uniform for the armed forces. The minister replied: "It was set out in the white paper in 1964."

Of course, I immediately said that it was not set out in the white paper. I rose on a question of privilege and challenged the minister to substantiate his statement, which he failed to do. That is only one of a whole series of misleading statements to which I drew attention on November 4.

The second one to which I again draw the attention of the house appears at page 9576. I was drawing attention to certain things I had found in the *Globe and Mail* of Saturday, July 16. These are the words I used:

> In the same issue of the same paper I should like to read the following words of the minister.

These are the minister's words as they appeared in that paper:

> Long ago I called my commanders together and asked them if they could support my policies. They were given the opportunity of dissenting. I told them I respected their rights to disagree and I made it clear that they could leave with full honours. None did.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at that time we had evidence galore of the retiring or firing of members of the armed forces. Yet the minister said that after this caution to them none took any action.

Mr. Hellyer: That is true.

Mr. Churchill: He now says it is true. I find a little difficulty, as did the hon. member for Calgary North, in dealing with this minister because he keeps repeating the same falsehoods time and again. The only other example we have of that is Goebbels in the second world war. I do not know whether or not the minister is a faithful follower of that man, but he is using the same tactics.

We had given to us, as appears at page 8560 of *Hansard* for October 12, a list of the senior officers who either retired because of completing their term or were fired or resigned voluntarily. That list amounted to 79 officers for the period January 1, 1965 to August 30,

1966. These all are senior officers—commodores, rear admirals and vice admirals in the navy; brigadiers, major generals and lieutenant generals in the army, and air commodores, air vice marshals and air marshals in the air force. Of a total of 79 officers, 21 were from the navy, 28 from the army and 30 from the air force. Of the total, 38 were normal retirements by reason of age and 41 were either compulsorily retired or submitted their resignations before their term was up. The outstanding example was Lieutenant General Moncel who had between five and six years remaining before he would reach normal retirement age. Yet, the minister had told us away back in July 1966 that the officers did not leave. He said:

I told them I respected their rights to disagree and I made it clear that they could leave with full honours. None did.

We do not know whether that means that none did leave or that none left with full honours. I suppose there is something extra in that to consider. These were not the only officers who left. On February 13 of this year, at page 12938 of *Hansard*, a return was given with regard to a question asked by the hon. member for Halifax concerning resignations of serving officers of the Canadian forces at national defence headquarters. It is an astonishing list. It shows that 264 officers left national defence headquarters, 56 of them because of age and 208 because of retirement, voluntary or compulsory. These are officers most of whom are below the ranks I mentioned a little while ago.

So, what credibility can one place in this minister? Those two examples are not anything like as serious as the third example I now present to the house. This will be found in No. 16 of the proceedings of the committee on national defence for Thursday, February 9, at pages 651 and 652. I asked the minister certain questions, and I should like to read what I said:

I would like to have it proved to this committee that unification will provide the necessary reduction in overhead personnel operating and maintenance costs so that that will come down to 75 per cent and that there will be 25 per cent available for capital expenditures. The reason for my wanting proof of it is that we have been hearing for three years that great savings will be made by unification. What is the evidence? I am not talking about integration; I am talking about unification.

Then Mr. Hellyer replied:

I do not think anyone has made the statement—certainly I have not—that the financial savings from unification itself would be very great, or that they would be easy to document.

[Mr. Churchill.]

Well, I looked back at the white paper. I submit to you, sir, that the centennial celebrations in the year 2067, in addition to Magna Carta, the British North America Act and the Canadian Bill of Rights, there will also be on display for the people of that time the white paper of 1964, one of the great historic documents in Canadian history. I keep reading this document—the white paper —almost every week; it is becoming very worn. At page 19 of that white paper this is what the minister wrote:

Sufficient savings should accrue from unification to permit a goal of 25 per cent of the budget to be devoted to capital equipment being realized in the years ahead.

During the committee hearings the minister told me that no such statement ever had been made.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, would my friend permit a question. Is he now admitting from the time the white paper was written in 1964, that integration and unification are part of the same cycle and cannot be separated easily, as he and members of his party have been trying to do in the last few days?

• (3:40 p.m.)

Mr. Churchill: It was brought out during the committee meetings that when the minister wrote the white paper in 1964 he was even more confused than he is at the present time. He used the phrase "unified defence forces" but the word "unification" only once. The word "integration" was used elsewhere He did not know what he was talking about. I believe he meant to say "integration", but he used the word "unification" in the white paper. That fact was brought out in evidence and I will find the page reference later.

In the same evidence to which I have referred, I am reported as having said, at page 652 of the proceedings:

Why I stress this question of unification is that through very active publicity campaigns the general impression abroad has been given that the whole program will effect great savings. The minister has now admitted that the savings on unification itself are hard to segregate, and I judge that they are minimal. What, then, is the value of unification?

Mr. Hellyer: This was explained in second reading, Mr. Churchill. It provides better career opportunities—

Mr. Churchill: I am talking about the saving of money, not these other things.

Mr. Hellyer: If you relate it specifically to saving money, as I have just told you, the savings that can be documented are marginal.

For almost four years now we have been told that there will be a great saving of money as a result of this program, yet the minister admitted before the committee under questioning that the saving in respect of unification would be marginal. In other words, it could not be discovered. Other witnesses gave the same information. Let us not talk about a credibility gap, because this is a gulf. Who can believe this minister? I do not know of anyone in this party who places any confidence whatsoever in his statements.

I have other things I want to talk about and my time is beginning to run out. In addition to the white paper, the minister made a speech on December 7 when introducing second reading of the bill. That can be considered the second major document of the defence department. No one is competent to discuss this matter in respect of the armed services or sit here in the House of Commons taking part in this debate unless he has read the white paper and the speech of December 7.

One can obtain a copy of the speech of December 7, with a red cover. It was a special publication which cost over $5,000 and was distributed widely across the country. It is a historical document which will be worth a lot of money 100 years from now. In that speech the minister gave four fundamental reasons for the importance of a single unified force. I had occasion to deal with those four reasons during discussions of the defence committee. I felt that the best person to deal with them would be Lieut. Gen. Guy Simonds. I think most military men in the country will agree that he is the outstanding officer from the army during our period who is now living.

Mr. Hellyer: During your period.

Mr. Churchill: I said during our period. The minister was alive and kicking during the second world war, and he might have had the same opportunity I had of serving under General Simonds. General Simonds belongs to our period. He enjoyed a good career and gained very wide experience during the second world war. He continued with the forces after, and became chief of the general staff. I do not know of anybody who has greater knowledge of actual warfare than General Simonds, particularly in respect of the combined operations of the navy, army and air force.

General Simonds has wider experience than anyone I know with staff colleges, and in respect of the theoretical side of warfare. He also has a great deal of managerial experience which he gained while here at Ottawa and as chief of the general staff. It was my feeling that he was the best person to answer questions in respect of the four fundamental reasons for having a single unified service. I put questions to him and he supplied answers.

The first fundamental reason the minister gave us in that celebrated speech is this:

> With the establishment of a common identity; sailors, soldiers, and airmen, although loyal to their ships, regiments and squadrons, will have an overriding loyalty to the whole force and its total objectives on behalf of Canada.

Those are the minister's words and that is the first argument. I then asked General Simonds this question:

> Do you consider that under the triservice system there has been a lack of an overriding loyalty to Canada?

The general then replied:

> I most certainly was never conscious of any during my service. I think that going back to the war and after, the Canadian serviceman was very proud of his country and very loyal to it. I do not think you could have demanded a higher degree of loyalty.

The second fundamental reason advanced by the minister was under the heading, "Careers". The minister said:

> For able and highly-motivated individuals, both officers and other ranks, wider, more challenging and rewarding carreer opportunities will be available.
>
> Unification will provide better and fairer employment prospects for service personnel. Under a system of separate services, opportunities are naturally limited to the scope, tasks and requirements of the individual service.

I then asked the general:

> Do you see a substantial improvement in career opportunities that could result only from unification?

The general then replied:

> I personally cannot.

This man has as wide experience as anyone in Canada. The third fundamental reason the minister advanced is this:

> The unified force will provide much greater flexibility to meet changing requirements in defence organization made necessary by advances in military technology and changes in the international situation.

I then asked the general:

> Do you consider that a unified force is essential to make it adaptable to changes in military technology and in the international situation?

He replied:

One of our problems, certainly in the army, and I think it affected people in the other services, was as the services tend to become more and more technical, getting a man of the necessary basic foundation of education to make him even good at one thing, and getting really thoroughly trained in one field.

The fourth basic fundamental reason the minister gave is this:

The nature of modern warfare has resulted in a compaction of time and distance to the point where decision making and reaction time must be much swifter than ever before in history. A unified force best meets this demand.

The need for fast decision making and quick reaction is synonymous with modern warfare.

I then asked the general this question:

Now, I do not know of anyone who has greater experience than yourself in the demands of modern warfare, decision making, quick reaction and the co-ordination of combined operations. Do you consider that the demands of modern warfare require a single service concept or, in other words, unification?

Then general then said:

No, I do not believe it does.

The general then gave a lengthy explanation as to why he had come to that conclusion. Those are the four fundamental reasons given by the minister in support of unification.

The Chairman: Order, please. I must interrupt the hon. gentleman to inform him that his allotted time has now expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

The Chairman: Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the committee to continue his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Churchill: Thank you very much. I thank the minister for external affairs. I am glad that he is in his seat because I intend to say something about him very soon. I will also have something to say about the Prime Minister before I conclude, unless I am interrupted.

It was brought out time and time again in evidence before the committee that the reason for having a defence force was to train men to fight, in the event our country was attacked or our people were in danger. That is the fundamental reason and that is why they are combat forces. All the supply services, all the administrative services, all the command structure are designed in order that the combat forces may be able to play their part effectively in battle, whether it is on our own shores, which God forbid, or whether it is further abroad, in Europe or somewhere else in the world.

• (3:50 p.m.)

When our forces are fighting abroad, as they were in the two great wars and in Korea, they were protecting our way of life and protecting the people of Canada; but they were doing it miles distant from our country, and we were saved from the destruction of our country. I believe we are the most fortunate country in the world; we have been saved from awful destruction from artillery fire, missiles and bombing up to this point, and I hope we will be in the future. It pays dividends to conduct your battles far afield, whether it is with the navy thousands of miles from our shore or whether it is with the air force and army abroad fighting on some other continent.

Our defence forces—we call them defence forces—exist for that purpose, namely to have combat people ready for action. Canada takes second place to no country in the world when it comes to combat forces. This was proved in the first world war, in the second world war and in Korea. Let me remind the people of this country that following the assault on Vimy Ridge, which will be commemorated in just a few days now, the Canadian Corps was recognized by our opponents, the Germans, by General Ludendorf himself, as shock troops. Wherever Canadians appeared in the field of battle in 1917 and 1918 the Germans were alarmed, and with justification, because every time the Canadian Corps did appear in those last 18 months of the war, the Germans lost very, very heavily; they lost ground, they lost men, they lost artillery, they lost everything—and they finally lost the war. We were shock troops on a par with the best troops of England, the Guards, and on a par with the troops from Australia who fought side by side with us on some occasions.

An hon. Member: Why don't you write a book about it?

Mr. Churchill: I may write a book about it some day, and I will correct some of the fallacious information that has been spread out to our Canadian people. I say this is what our defence forces exist for—combat forces; and all these supply services assist. You do not put them all together, as the minister is attempting to do, and neglect, as he is doing, the combat forces. That is what he is doing; he is neglecting the combat forces. The minister has his mind centred on the administrative and supply services. Of course they are

vital in wartime; you have to have them. A great many people have to serve behind the lines, behind the front or in the factories at home to provide the fighting troops with the arms and ammunition that they need. I hold these people in respect. But you cannot win a war just with the administrative and supply services. It is the combat forces that win a war. The minister fails to see this and is attempting to change the role of our combat forces.

Let us go by experience, without living in the past. I am so far ahead of the minister in this regard that I had him admit in committee—I wish I had the reference here today and had the time to give it—that I was a great proponent, as I always have been, of mobility in our forces. As far back as 12 or 14 years ago, right in this House of Commons, I demanded the mobility for our army which the minister is only now getting around to supplying; and he still has not completed it. He is so slow in this regard.

We were told that the minister discovered the armoured personnel carrier. I had the interesting experience of pointing out to him in the committee that the armoured personnel carrier was used in the second world war. The idea originated with General Simonds, and I, along with a few hundred other people, had the job of working out the tactics for it and using it on the battlefield. The minister thinks that he discovered the armoured personnel carrier. This is a Canadian "first" in the methods of dealing with infantry forces on the field of battle. We were the discoverers of the armoured personnel carrier. I am glad that the minister is gradually catching up with the second part of the twentieth century.

In our war experience we have operated, not independently but in support. This was brought out very, very carefully by the distinguished witnesses who appeared before our committee. Canada cannot act independently in wartime. We have acted in support. So long as our major allies, Britain and the United States, continue to have navy, army and air forces as separate identities, so Canada should have those separate identities in order that we may co-operate with them in wartime. We did it in the first war, in the second war and in Korea. In Korea our forces were brigaded with the Commonwealth division. That is quite proper; you do not operate alone. We operated with British troops in the first and second world wars, and on some occasions with American troops. But you do not operate alone.

These distinct forces should be maintained. I think this is an argument that you cannot get around, and it comes from the experience of our most distinguished service officers who gave evidence before the defence committee. What have we reached with regard to the utilization of our forces? This is where the Secretary of State for External Affairs enters upon the stage, because here is where the responsibility now rests. The Minister of National Defence has been going on his own, unchecked, untrammelled, and it is now time to rein him in and teach him some of the facts of life. The Secretary of State for External Affairs must give to this house, exactly and without his orotund phrases, a clear picture of what is Canada's external policy for the future.

Mr. Nesbitt: That'll be the day.

Mr. Churchill: Is the minister intending that we shall withdraw our troops from NATO? Is he intending that we shall just provide troops on demand from Canada by means of an airlift, if needed? Is he intending to discontinue the anti-submarine activities of our navy?

The Secretary of State for External Affairs knows better than the Minister of National Defence that there is still a threat from Russia. Russia has the largest submarine fleet in the world, and perhaps the largest fishing fleet. There will be danger off our shores unless we are prepared to be on guard. In Canadian naval circles and in United States naval circles this problem of protection against submarine threat is considered in its proper light. Why are we withdrawing from an anti-submarine role? Obviously we are, because we have fewer ships in service; we have not the men to man the ships that we have in service. So we are failing to maintain our commitment to NATO, by default.

• (4:00 p.m.)

I want to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs what he intends to do with regard to the proposition put forward by the Minister of National Defence on December 7 in relation to peace restoring. This is a phrase that is now being commonly used by writers. My parliamentary friend, the hon. member for Greenwood, loves this expression "peace restoring." I told him at a conference at Scarborough that I was going to accuse him of being a warmonger. Let us have a definition from the Secretary of State for External Affairs of the expression "peace restoring". I asked some of the distinguished gentlemen

who appeared before us what they understood "peace restoring" to mean, and they said "We used to call that war". I think they are right because there is an implication in that phrase that there has been an engagement in war after which peace is restored. Therefore "peace restoring" is a very dangerous phrase to use.

At the time of the Korean war the then minister of national defence and the then secretary of state for external affairs, who is now the Prime Minister, spoke about aggression in Korea. I was only a backbencher at that time. Not much more attention has been paid to me up here in front than when I was sitting in the back benches, so I can alternate easily between the two. At that time I asked the government: Why do you not call it war rather than aggression? People were shooting at each other and being killed. Now we call it peace restoring.

I am all in favour of peace; I do not want to go to war again. But let us be clear as to what we are doing. Peace restoring means punitive action, it means fighting. If we are going to provide an armed force with sea transport, air transport, and all the offensive weapons for peace restoring, it means that we are providing a force for war. Is the United Nations going to ask us individually and alone to undertake a mission for them and engage in war? I do not think we would be so foolish as to do that; and yet this is the information that is spreading out across this country. This is what people are saying. I will paraphrase some of their statements, such as: Canada does not have to maintain a navy, an army and an air force; Canada does not have to support our allies in Europe or the United States; let us have a special mobile and well equipped force for peace restoring.

I submit that this is a force for war. The Secretary of State for External Affairs must be careful about this, because the Minister of National Defence is running away madly. He has the bit in his teeth and he does not know where he is going. Let us not desert our allies or get out of step with the rest of the world. I will ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs a question, which he does not have to answer now because if he starts to speak I will not get another chance. There is trouble in Aden. I suppose that people would call it a brushfire war. If the British withdraw, are we to send there a special Canadian force to put out that conflict? A large number of Canadian soldiers would be killed if we did so.

[Mr. Churchill.]

What is the situation in Somaliland? Is there a chance that a brushfire war may develop there? What about Nigeria, where some internal trouble is developing? We have to be careful about this. Putting out brushfire wars sounds simple, but it is not, really. If a war starts, is there not a danger of the larger nations intervening in some way? Are we to rush over like a fire brigade to put out a brushfire war? I cannot think of anything more dangerous. We might easily sacrifice the lives of 1,000 Canadians by getting involved in such a conflict. Surely our job is to work with the United Nations, in concert with our allies, as we did in Korea, but not separately and apart. If we are going to work in concert with our allies, we should have a force similar to theirs, a navy, an army and an air force. This is what I am suggesting.

On January 31 I held out an olive branch to the Minister of National Defence. Subsequently I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether he had read my speech, but he had not got around to it as he had been reading something else. In my speech I suggested that we should get the best of both worlds. There is a great division of opinion in this country. A great many people, more numerous than is imagined, want our defence forces to be maintained as they are now. They want the history and tradition of these forces sustained. They do not want the identity of the Royal Canadian Navy or the Royal Canadian Air Force wiped out. Let us get the best of both worlds. We want to continue to play our part in the activities of the United Nations in a peacekeeping role. I emphasize that it should be peacekeeping—not the warfare of peace restoring, but peacekeeping. I suggested in that speech that we should organize a special force for that purpose. We should enlist men specially, or draw them by secondment from the armed forces and let them serve overseas. We should dress them in a bottle green uniform and create an elite force to carry out police duties. This is exactly what our representative at the United Nations is advocating now.

I intended to ask the minister during the question period whether he has now accepted the suggestion which I put forward on January 31. Let us continue our peace keeping activities, such as we have been doing for years under UN auspices, and let us do it by means of a special force. We have about 2,000 men abroad performing this special task in

Cyprus and the Gaza Strip, men in the surveillance corps and in the minister's pet organization, the International Control Commission. All of this could be done by a special force, with special training in police and diplomatic activities, because their role would be different from that of the fighting forces. I will admit readily that a force of that nature would not be useful at the outbreak of a war because they would not be trained to fight. I submit that it should not be a large force. We could provide 3,000 to 5,000 young Canadian men for this task. Here would be a chance for young Canada to do something abroad under the auspices of the UN. This would not be a peace restoring mission, which means bloodshed and slaughter, but a peace keeping mission, which is being carried out at the present time by the armed forces of this country.

The peace keeping force which I am proposing should be enlisted, trained and disciplined under the direction of the Department of National Defence for this particular purpose. We would not then be involved in the affairs of some of the countries which do not want armed forces on their territory, and quite rightly so. Our armed forces would not be acting in such a capacity, but we would have a special force for peace keeping purposes. It would be lightly armed for protection, not aggressively armed as is the case in some countries now.

That is the suggestion I put forward on January 31. I said: Let us keep our defence forces as they are now, and let us create a special force for United Nations peace keeping purposes. Let us not break up our defence forces which are now being trained for a special purpose and let us not pretend that we will set them at the beck and call of the UN for peace restoring, which is war.

I suggest to the government that it should think this over. Let us not confuse the Canadian public. Let us not destroy our three fighting services and develop a special peace restoring force for the United Nations, and then fail to take any action. If we wish to get involved in war, we will have to take some specific action here in the House of Commons.

I will conclude with a plea to the Prime Minister. It is the Prime Minister who carries the greatest responsibility with regard to the defence of this country. He has people to assist him. He has the advice of the experienced Secretary of State for External Affairs, a man who has surveyed the world and who has been here a long time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Churchill: He has been here since 1935. He was here during the Munich crisis and the war with Italy. He was here at the outbreak of war in 1939 and participated in the discussions. He was here during the second world war when Canada made such great sacrifices. He was in office when we were engaged in war in Korea. He followed the course of the development of the United Nations. This man is a man of great experience and I pay my compliments to him. I hope he will continue to learn in the present, as he learned in the past, if he will listen today to the sound advice I am giving this afternoon. I hope he will not develop a closed mind, like the Minister of National Defence, but I do not think he will, because of his great experience. I suggest to him that I have given this government a way out with regard to this proposal.

Then, the Prime Minister has the advice and experience of a person like that available to him. He also has the advice of the Minister of National Defence, which he should reject at every opportunity. I was surprised to learn through Air Chief Marshal Miller, who was one of the best witnesses we had in front of the defence committee, that he had not discussed this question with the cabinet. Air Chief Marshal Miller has had a long service under both governments, the Conservative government and the Liberal government, and has dedicated his life to the service of his country. He served as deputy minister of the Department of National Defence and then chief of staff.

Finally, when the position of "Supremo" was created, he became the "Supremo" after 1964. Incidentally, I opposed that change. Air Chief Marshal Miller has had all this experience. He was one of the architects of integration, the right hand man of the Minister of National Defence, yet I take it he left the Department of National Defence in the summer of 1966 disappointed and disillusioned. I asked him, as I had asked others, if he had had any opportunity to discuss some of these problems with the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister of this country is superior in office to other cabinet ministers. He has a grave responsibility with regard to national defence. Consequently, I wanted to know if the Prime Minister was aware of what was happening.

I asked Air Chief Marshal Miller this question which is recorded at page 2328 of the committee evidence for March 21:

> Did you have an opportunity as chief of the defence staff to discuss with the defence committee of the cabinet or with the Prime Minister the proposal with regard to unification?

Now, the air chief marshal made an answer, but then he corrected it later because he thought he had been talking about integration and these two words, integration and unification, became confused. However, his corrected answer is as follows, as recorded on page 2342:

> It has been brought to my attention that there was a meeting of the cabinet defence committee on February 12 and March 24 to consider the white paper and integration. When I said I had not discussed this matter of reorganization I was referring specifically, I thought, to the question of unification.

This was in the year 1964. Now, March 24, 1964, when the white paper was being considered was the last time that Air Chief Marshal Miller, chief of the defence staff, had a conversation with the Prime Minister of this country with regard to the reorganization of the defence forces. This was the last time he met with the cabinet committee on defence, and subject to that time, over two years, he only talked with the Minister of National Defence on the subject of unification, a single unified force. This subject was never discussed by the chief of staff with the Prime Minister of his country.

What was the Prime Minister doing? Was he not interested?

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Mr. Churchill: Let me finish, I am just about finished.

Mr. Hellyer: I rise on a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman. The air chief marshal corrected this suggestion at the end of his testimony. It would be an injustice to him and to all the service officers, as well as to the government, to leave that statement on the record.

Mr. Churchill: I gave the correction. If I am given the time, I will go back to the question on page 2328 of the committee evidence. I asked this question:

> Did you have an opportunity as chief of the defence staff to discuss with the defence committee of the cabinet or with the Prime Minister the proposal with regard to unification?

[Mr. Churchill.]

> Air Chief Marshal Miller: As far as I am aware —and I would not absolutely swear to this without checking records—I never discussed the problem of integration with the cabinet defence committee or with the Prime Minister.
>
> Mr. Churchill: And unification? You say integration.

Now, later it was brought to the air marshal's attention that he had made a mistake. I read out his corrected answer which is recorded on page 2342 of the committee evidence. However, I will read it again:

> Air Chief Marshal Miller: ... It has been brought to my attention that there was a meeting of the cabinet defence committee on February 12 and March 24 to consider the white paper and integration. When I said I had not discussed this matter of reorganization I was referring specifically, I thought, to the question of unification.

Then, I asked:

> What year was that?
>
> Air Chief Marshal Miller: I think this would probably be quite early after the white paper was issued.
>
> Mr. Churchill: That would be in 1964.

The minister will not understand this, but I appeal to members in this house: Is that not clear? There is the correction by Air Chief Marshal Miller, and I have quite fairly given it. So I return to what I said. From March 24, 1964 until Air Chief Marshal Miller retired in the summer of 1966, he did not have a conversation with the defence committee of the cabinet or with the Prime Minister on the subject of unification. There is a gap. What was the Prime Minister doing all this time? I doubt very much if Air Chief Marshal Miller had any conversation with the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I wish I had asked that question. All this time one minister, the Minister of National Defence, has been running the show. I find fault that the senior members of the cabinet, the Secretary of State for External Affairs and more particularly the Prime Minister of this country, failed to grasp this nettle and deal with it. He has rejected it for over two years, and I am concerned. That is my case, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): My hon. friend, who has just taken his seat, Mr. Chairman, opened his remarks today by saying that he did not have confidence in the Minister of National Defence. He stated also that he felt justified in attacking his credibility and, by implication, his integrity. One might well have risen at once to object to these adjectives as being contrary to the rules of this house. I want to say now unreservedly that all of us in this house have every reason, even though all of us might not agree with

his views, to have confidence in the capacity of the Minister of National Defence, in his credibility and in his integrity.

The hon. member who has just spoken called on me as Secretary of State for External Affairs to indicate my views on the measure before the committee. This was a proper request in the light of the relationship between foreign policy and defence policy. I may say that the Department of External Affairs enjoys the greatest possible measure of collaboration with the Department of National Defence. As Secretary of State for External Affairs I have enjoyed and been the beneficiary of the confidence and collaboration of the Minister of National Defence. At all points and on all questions my colleagues and I have been kept informed of the minister's recommendations and policies.

• (4:20 p.m.)

This measure now before the house, let there be no mistake about it, represents the collective judgment of the government of this country and represents its policy. It is supported both by us on this side of the house, and I am sure, by others sitting to your left, Mr. Chairman.

In the white paper on defence of 1964, under the heading "Objectives", the following is stated:

> The objectives of Canadian defence policy, which cannot be dissociated from foreign policy, are to preserve the peace by supporting collective defence measures to deter military aggression; to support Canadian foreign policy including that arising out of our participation in international organizations, and to provide for the protection and surveillance of our territory, our air-space and our coastal waters.

With this statement the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre agrees; and I would add that of course defence policy must always be based on the foreign policy of our country.

Now, sir, a number of hon. members have questioned whether unification of the forces may not affect our defence commitments. The short answer is that unification will not affect these commitments themselves but is designed to increase our capacity to carry them out. First, I think it would be useful if I were to explain why the government considers that it is in Canada's interest to make military contributions, as we do, to continental defence, to NATO and to UN peace keeping. All of these forces contribute to the defence of Canada, directly or indirectly.

Given the state of the world at the present time, it is in the interests of this country to provide for its own direct defence. But because of the cost of modern weapons and the fact that we share the North American continent with the most powerful country in the world, the only sensible approach is the co-operative one. So we entered into the NORAD agreement for the joint air defence of Canada and the United States against the threat of Soviet bomber attack.

The Soviet union still possesses over 150 intercontinental bombers, all of which carry a substantially larger bomb load than most missiles, and are more accurate. It is expected that the Soviet union will retain a significant number of bombers into the 1970's. If there were no anti-bomber defence the Soviet bomber force would still be a major threat to the continent. It is of course true that the missile threat is growing in proportion to that of the bomber. One of the big issues, as the Minister of National Defence observed in answer to a question yesterday, is whether the United States should proceed with the anti-missile defence program.

In this connection, as the Minister of National Defence remarked yesterday, the United States has recently initiated discussions with the Soviet union on this general question. I express the hope that these discussions will lead to an agreement to avoid the huge expenditure that would result from the deployment of an anti-ballistic missile defence and a consequent increase in the arms race.

The NORAD agreement provides that the North American Air Defence Command shall be maintained in operation for a period of ten years. Since it was signed in May of 1958, it will lapse in May of 1968 unless it is extended or a new agreement negotiated. NORAD has provided an effective basis for the joint air defence of this continent, and through it Canada has shared in the air defence of this continent.

The world situation in 1968 will not, of course, be that which prevailed ten years ago. Changes in military technology will inevitably affect the tasks and requirements of North American defence. Prospective developments must be carefully studied and Canada's role in North American defence in the years to come. This is what the government is now carefully engaged in doing.

In addition to the bomber and the I.C.B.M.. threat there is a growing threat to this continent, which obviously we cannot ignore, from submarines. This was pointed out

by the hon. gentleman who spoke a few moments ago. In answer to what he said I would point out that we are co-operating with the United States to meet this threat, not only as a matter of continental defence but also within the NATO framework.

This leads me now to our commitments to NATO, which involve not only the anti-submarine warfare units, which I have just mentioned, but also ground and air forces in Europe. Why, Mr. Chairman, do we still consider it necessary to contribute forces in Europe? First, Europe, for historical and sentimental reasons, for reasons of security and for reasons of trade, is the primary focus of overseas interest for Canada. If it is true that we cannot live in isolation in a contracting and interdependent world, it is surely also true that we must continue to give a high priority to our general relationship with the continent from which we have sprung. To do otherwise would not be in accordance, as the government sees it, with the national interests of this country.

It has been NATO's combined military strength which has deterred possible Soviet military or political penetration of western Europe. This deterrence is as important for the defence of Canada as of Europe. Just at the time when relations with the communist countries in Europe are beginning to improve, it would be a mistake to take hasty steps to reduce the military force which has been responsible for the measure of stability now apparent in Europe.

Defence preparedness in Europe, which is part of the defence of Canada as well, does not preclude political change in Europe. Indeed it facilitates such change by peaceful and negotiated means. At the same time it provides insurance against a possible recurrence of danger.

A significant reduction of forces in an alliance such as NATO should properly be a matter of collective decision. Such a decision should clearly take account of Soviet power which, while at present politically muted, remains militarily substantial in eastern Europe. One way to reduce forces would be by mutual agreement between the Warsaw pact and NATO countries. That is something that we have been considering. This is a possibility which NATO has examined and will be examining.

But, Mr. Chairman, it takes two to strike a bargain. To those who advocate unilateral reductions, I would simply say that western—including Canadian—security interests demand a prudent assessment of the balance at any point in time between Soviet intentions and Soviet capability.

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

• (4:30 p.m.)

Now, sir, it is true that Canadian forces in Europe constitute only a small fraction of the total. Nevertheless they do contribute to the total NATO deterrent in Europe, and thus to the stability which now prevails on the continent, with all that that means for Europe's evolution both internally and as a constructive force and influence in the world. It also is a contribution, again I say, to the defence of Canada.

Furthermore, unilateral withdrawal by Canada could have significant political consequences. It could produce pressures in other countries to reduce or to withdraw their contributions. Indeed, an important aspect of maintaining the deterrent is the avoidance of the disruption of NATO at this time. Unilateral withdrawal by Canada would also have harmful effects on our bilateral relations not only with one country, our closest neighbour, but with other countries in western Europe. Of course these relations are important not only in terms of defence, but in terms of maintaining the concept of an alliance. This integrated force structure can bring very great opportunities if the necessary consultations are maintained and if the alliance itself is continued. A unilateral withdrawal would be notice on our part that we no longer believed in collective action for collective security through the Atlantic coalition.

Membership of an alliance carries with it not only benefits but obligations, both material and moral. It has cost this country as it has cost other countries in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization a great deal in terms of money and men. We have made this contribution because there was no other course open to us, in the light of the intransigent position taken by some countries earlier in the history of the United Nations, and the armed might that existed on the part of some countries, and particularly on the part of one country. While we have no desire to maintain a presence in Europe if it is not required for military or political reasons, the government considers now for the reasons I have given that the balance of advantage lies in continuing our contribution to this organization that has done so much to bring about or to assure peace in Europe.

I do not exclude the possibility that in the future it may become feasible, and indeed I hope it will, to withdraw our forces from Europe and to make our entire contribution from bases in Canada. But such a course of action is neither feasible nor desirable at this moment, and certainly not by unilateral decision. I ask this house to consider what would be the consequences on other countries, for example the smaller countries in Europe which are bound to us, in the NATO alliance, if we were to take a decision on our own to withdraw without the opportunity for collective consideration and judgment. Until we can be sure that we can make an appropriate and effective military contribution entirely from Canada, or until a Canadian contribution is no longer considered necessary, we should continue contributing forces in Europe as part of a collective defence, which remains necessary on a regional basis, because we have not yet been able to establish it universally through the United Nations.

My hon. friend from Winnipeg South Centre referred to peace keeping. I will not engage in a discussion about an expression which he said the hon. member for Greenwood used.

Mr. Churchill: And the Minister of National Defence.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The concept of peace keeping I think is now well accepted within the context of the charter; certainly no country knows more about peace keeping than Canada, a country that has participated in nearly every peace keeping project of the United Nations. We are currently contributing to United Nations peace forces in Cyprus and on the Israel-U.A.R. border. We also contribute to United Nations observer missions active on Israel's frontier with Syria, Jordan and Lebanon, and in Kashmir. We participate also in the international supervisory commissions in Indochina, the latter three of course not being creations of the United Nations but of the Geneva conference of 1954. Canada has contributed to all of the larger United Nations peace keeping efforts in the period since 1949, and indeed, as I said a moment ago, to almost all of the smaller missions as well.

We have found ourselves generally accepted in this role for many reasons—because, I suppose, we do not happen to be marked with old prejudices, because we have well trained and competent forces, and of course, because we have been willing participants. We have been willing because successive Canadian governments—the government of which my hon. friend was a member as well as this government and other preceding governments—and, indeed, most Canadians I think, believe that the United Nations has an important role in maintaining the peace. Despite halting progress in establishing the effective authority of the UN, I think we are all agreed that in the long run the world's best hope is to equip the United Nations to stand unchallenged as the keeper of the peace.

We must work to that end, however discouraging at times the result seems to be—and how discouraging it is, right today, in the United Nations for the Canadian delegation in respect of its initiative to try to bring about a greater acceptance of collective responsibility in the financing and in the operational responsibilities of United Nations peace keeping.

There are some who would prefer that we should now devote the bulk, or even all, of our military forces solely to UN peace keeping duties. I think this proposition deserves critical examination, attractive though it may appear in the light of our longer range goal of co-operative international security. The United Nations is working with gradually increasing effectiveness to surmount the immense problems inherent in national rivalries, and in the social and economic injustices which give rise to world tensions. But there is still basic disagreement on what that organization can do with regard to the authorization, control and financing of peace keeping operations.

In co-operation with others, Canada is striving to reach a generally acceptable basis on which future operations can be undertaken, so that we shall not have to carry the kind of load which we are carrying, for instance, in Cyprus. Even if these questions are resolved there can be no assurance that the political consensus in the United Nations necessary to establish an effective peace keeping operation will in each case be attainable. This is particularly true for situations involving the major powers, let alone those involving a confrontation between them.

In these circumstances, there is really no present substitute for defensive arrangements among groups of nations. While we search and work for the ideal, we cannot discard the practical foundations of security. It would therefore be unwise to limit our contribution to the maintenance of peace and security solely to participate in UN peace keeping operations. To discontinue our commitments to continental and NATO defence now would

imply that we denied a common responsibility with our allies to share in the defence of the North Atlantic area. It would suggest that we believe Canada should hold itself aloof from the basic differences of interest still inherent in east-west relations.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Now, sir, with this background the hon. member who has just taken his seat asks me as Secretary of State for External Affairs where I stand on the matter involved in this bill. There can be no doubt about that. The government's position is clear; it is unequivocal, this bill represents the policy of the government.

Mr. McIntosh: Before the minister leaves this one particular phase he is referring to now would he say a few words about government policy in regard to the peace restoring role? This is one thing that bothers us in the opposition.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): As the British government, through Lord Caradon at the United Nations General Assembly in 1965, clearly indicated, the question of peace keeping is only one side of the coin. There must also be the question of trying to bring about peace and the way to do that is through mediation and through the use of other peace making techniques, but not in the way suggested by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. He said that the only way a peace keeping force should properly be employed was by the use of police power. It is true that there are 50 Austrian police officers in the UN force in Cyprus. There are also a number of New Zealanders who are in there as policemen; but does anyone who has followed the events in Cyprus, who knows the situation attending the United Nations in the Congo, and the situation in the Gaza strip, for one moment believe that peace could successfully be maintained by the use of policemen only?

I am sure that the use of policemen as a factor in peace keeping is something that has to be more and more developed. This was something we proposed at the conference on peace keeping that we had in Ottawa in the fall of 1964, but I cannot agree with my hon. friend that the immense tasks and the complications of peace keeping can be met in the way he believes he has uniquely conceived, as a new way of maintaining peace.

Mr. Churchill: How would you do it?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I would do it in exactly the way that under the leadership of the present Prime Minister we first did it in Suez, and in the way we are now doing it in Cyprus, and in the way it is now being done in the Gaza strip where over 1,000 Canadian soldiers have been involved in an organization of some 5,000 men for 12 years, and by their very para-military presence have kept the peace between the U.A.R. and—

Mr. Churchill: It has been a police force.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): My hon. friend resorts to these metaphysical statements. He is such a practical man that I never thought he would put himself in a position of emphasizing something in his speech which gave me the impression we are yet to hear more substantial comments from him in the opposition he is levelling against this bill.

Mr. Churchill: I complimented you in my speech, and that was a mistake.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): This brings me now to the effects of unification of the three services on Canada's capability to meet our foreign policy commitments. I admit it is my responsibility to be able to answer that question. At the outset I should say I do not intend, of course, to cover the ground which my colleague the Minister of National Defence has covered, and which his senior officers and officials have covered in their statements. My concern is to state in general terms what the government's defence commitments are. These commitments arise out of the government's policies, all this in those areas of foreign affairs where our armed forces have the task of helping carry out the general objectives of the government of Canada.

Such important concepts as integration and unification are essentially means by which the armed forces are organized to fulfil these objectives. My hon. friend opposite may not agree, but that is the purpose of unification and integration. It is not, of course, in my purview to interpret the continuing process of armed forces re-organization. In undertaking and developing this process my colleague, the Minister of National Defence, and those responsible to him are fully aware of and responsive to the capability required of the armed forces to fulfil our foreign policy objectives. What they are doing is to put themselves in a progressively better position to ensure that the roles undertaken by the armed forces will be carried out with increasing flexibility and operational effectiveness.

It has been said that unification implies that the armed forces will be capable of only

one role, that of a mobile force. That is the thesis of my hon. friend, the gallant member for Winnipeg South Centre—

Mr. Churchill: It is not.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): —but this is a misconception. Unification is a concept whereby the armed forces of Canada will be organized as a single service rather than as three separate services. At the present time each of the three services carries out a variety of roles.

Unification will not mean that any of these roles will have to be altered, much less abandoned. Just as each of the services now perform a number of different roles, so a unified service will be capable of carrying out different roles. Indeed, it will be capable of performing the same variety of roles required now by our foreign policy commitments and, in my view, performing them much more effectively.

Thus Canada will continue to provide air force units to participate in the air defence of the continent. We shall continue to provide air and sea force units for anti-submarine defence. We shall continue to provide air and land force units in Europe for NATO defence, and indeed we have even been able to offer a second mobile battalion in Canada to add to the battalion already committed to NATO's mobile force. We shall continue to provide contingents on land, sea and in the air as required for the various peace keeping commitments which we now have or may assume from time to time throughout the world.

Finally, we shall have the capacity to take an appropriate part in an international enforcement action, as distinct from peace keeping, should one be internationally agreed and the government decide to participate.

If unification is permitted to develop as planned it should in no way hinder our ability to fulfil our foreign policy commitments. My hon. friend asks for that statement and he has got it. It will not in any way interfere with our foreign policy commitments. Indeed, by increasing our general military effectiveness—

Mr. Churchill: In what way?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): —and by consequent economy of operation, the government will be able to fulfil present and future commitments with progressively improving efficiency. I accept the responsibility of saying that in my judgment the policy embedded in this bill is one that is capable of meeting the foreign policy obligations of this country, and it is—

Mr. Harkness: Would the minister allow a question? Is he aware of the fact that all of the senior retired officers who were questioned on this very point gave it as their opinion and judgment that with the single unified force which is proposed in this bill Canada would be unable to meet the commitments which the minister has just outlined, and which are laid down in the white papter?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Yes, Mr. Chairman. In answer to the former minister of national defence I am aware of that, and I am also aware that all our leading—

Mr. Harkness: Then do you think your judgment on the ability of this force to do so is better than theirs?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I was going to make the observation that it is also a fact that all of the leading officers in the department now—

Mr. Churchill: The survivors.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): —take a different view.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I do not offer this as technical evidence or judgment, but the other night I flew back from London with 100 men who had served Canada for a period of months with the Cyprus United Nation force. While, as I say, their technical judgment should not be expected to be that of more highly trained and superior officers, it is a fact that I found great unanimity among these men, who are helping to maintain the peace in Cyprus, in giving strong support for the policy embedded in the bill which is now being discussed.

We should, in a matter of this importance, be able to recognize that there are strong differences between us. These differences, however, in a matter of as great importance as this, should not warrant the kind of attack that was made today by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre on the Minister of National Defence. We can have differences, but surely we can discuss a matter of vital importance like this without seeking to gain political advantage or without making personal attacks on those who are carrying out a policy in which they believe.

Hon. gentlemen say that this policy may be wrong. This government believes it is an initiative which will be followed by other countries. This government believes it is an initiative which will enable us to fulfil our role in NATO, to fulfil our obligations toward continental defence and toward our obligations in support of the charter of the United Nations. It is on this basis and on the basis of the analysis I have given that I, as Secretary of State for External Affairs, support this bill.

The Chairman: Is the hon. member for Oxford rising to ask a question?

Mr. Nesbitt: Yes, Mr. Chairman. In view of the fact that the minister has told us at very considerable length and in great detail that in his view our existing commitments to NATO, NORAD and the United Nations will be maintained, and he hopes improved, no doubt he will have discussed these matters with his opposite numbers among the NATO allies, in the United States, and so on. Can the minister tell us whether it is the intention of any of these other countries to alter their armed forces in the way in which we are attempting to alter ours?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend knows that the policies of other governments can be announced only by those governments. I would have thought that my hon. friend, who has had experience in respect of external affairs, would have been the last one to put that question.

Mr. Nesbitt: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman. As we all know, the minister is an expert in avoiding questions. As the Secretary of State for External Affairs perhaps will recall, I did not ask him to name any of the countries. I just asked him whether any allied countries in NATO had informed him that they intended to alter their forces in a manner similar to the way in which we are attempting to alter ours. I am not asking him to identify any country.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): My hon. friend has the answer. He knows I cannot go beyond what I have said. However, since he has asked this question again I might say that, because of his experience over a period of four years as parliamentary secretary to a former secretary of state for external affairs, he should know that the force goals of the countries in NATO are determined as a result of discussion in the defence planning committee of NATO, and with the approbation of SACEUR, the supreme allied commander.

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

There is nothing which is being done in this bill to which any exception has been taken in NATO. It is up to each country to organize its forces according to its policies, according to its standards, and according to the policies of its government and its parliament. The interest of the collective organization of NATO is that whatever system of military organization is employed is one which will permit the contributing country to fulfil its commitments in NATO. That is being done by Canada.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, may I ask one question of the minister. In the course of his remarks he said that Canada should not unilaterally withdraw forces from NATO. If he should argue that we should not do so without notice to or discussion with our allies, I do not think he would find much disagreement; but I should like to ask him whether there is any inconsistency in the suggestion that our officials at NATO could give notice to our allies that we wish to change the nature or form of our contribution and provide an increased contribution to a mobile reserve for NATO, a course which was approved by SACEUR and the military authorities as long ago as 1960. Is there any reason we should not do that, rather than continue with a militarily obsolete form of contribution such as we now are carrying through?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I am glad the hon. member for Greenwood has asked me this question, because I had something I wished to say about some comments he made the other night. I did not wish to overreach my time, but I might take a minute or two now to deal with what I thought was the brunt of his speech the night before last, which is involved with the question he has asked now.

Of course there is nothing to prevent Canada doing this. As a result of a Canadian-Belgian initiative, there now is under way an examination into the state of the alliance. This examination will give all countries an opportunity to assess the present force levels to determine whether they have overreached themselves, whether it is possible to make reductions, and to what extent it is possible to encourage a program of mutual disengagement in Europe, which certainly must come if we are to see conditions of stability established in that continent.

The other night the hon. gentleman from Greenwood used, surprisingly for him I thought, such adjectives as "useless" and

"absurd" in characterizing our military contribution in Europe. He buttressed his assertion—

Mr. Brewin: The present alliance.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): —with quotations from a recent article by Mr. Gellner. I am not competent to enter into a discussion on strategy. That is something for the military people, including the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. My responsibility is a political one to determine whether or not the military establishment proposed is one which will enable Canada to fulfil its commitments in the field of foreign policy. However, the questions raised by my hon. friend in his speech and again today are being considered as one element, as I said, in the NATO review of strategy which is under way.

The essential consideration when a nation participates in an alliance is that questions of strategy and the role of forces must be worked out jointly. There is no other way to have an alliance. My hon. friend nods his head; he agrees with that. The matters are discussed in the defence planning committee, in the NATO council, by the military committee and with SACEUR.

• (5:00 p.m.)

I want to suggest that our allies, and particularly those in Europe, do not belittle, as I think some hon. members of this house in their speeches implied, the military significance of Canada's contribution to the combined NATO deterrent forces. I thought that my hon. friend, who approaches this question with care and responsibility, perhaps failed to appreciate the extent of our contribution, a contribution that is recognized by SACEUR. In his speech the other night the hon. member also quoted from a statement that I made before the external affairs committee of the other place, but he omitted the essential argument of what I said in the other place. I had this to say, in addition to the quotation from my statement that appears in *Hansard* for the day before yesterday:

> It will be apparent that changes of weapons of the kind I have listed are of necessity gradual... each national contribution represents only a part of the total forces available to the NATO commanders and adjustments in these contributions must be phased into the over-all plan.

There could be no other way, if an alliance is to function with any measure of efficiency. So, while changes in the alliance, in strategy and in the forces of our allies, may mean there may no longer be a requirement in the years ahead for Canadian strike aircraft, the fact is that NATO strategy now requires their presence. SACEUR counts on their contribution, and the plans of our allies are based on their continued existence and presence. So in these circumstances I ask my friend, the hon. member for Greenwood: Would it not be irresponsible for Canada unilaterally to withdraw its aircraft from Europe?

I finally say this. I agree with what my hon. friend said the other night. We must envisage the stage when we achieve the collective security which in 1945 we thought was implicit in the United Nations charter. It is not there now, not because of any fault of ours, but because of a failure to implement the articles of the United Nations charter, because of the failure to provide a pooling of UN member military forces, as was done when NATO was established as an organization for the purpose of providing for the defence of the western powers. But there is a great improvement in east-west relations. There is a detente under way between east and west, particularly since the nuclear missile crisis involving Cuba in 1962. Since that time undoubtedly there has been a great improvement. I saw it myself when I went to Poland and to the Soviet Union in November last year. This is recognized in the NATO council. These days we discuss in the NATO council the possibility of extending this detente almost as much as we discuss problems that have to do with military arrangement.

We must work in that direction, in a direction that will ultimately permit the Warsaw pact powers and the NATO powers to disengage on a mutual basis, thereby encouraging increasing stability and security in Europe. That is the objective. If today we affirm our faith in NATO and in the necessity of continuing to support it, it is because present circumstances demand this. There can be no doubt of what our objective is, the objective of being able to reduce our commitments in Europe just as quickly as the political problems of Europe are resolved in a way which would justify that course being taken, without any prejudice to security and peace.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, would the minister like to answer another question? He seems to be in good form. Would he explain what he meant when he said I was advocating only police forces for United Nations purposes, because it seemed to me that I did not say just that. I said that the type of work we

were doing just now could be done by police forces. Would the minister care to elaborate?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I said that the impression my hon. friend left today was that he was suggesting that the peace keeping program outlined by the Minister of National Defence was one that could be simplified. He gave the impression in the statement he made today—I know this is not what he intended, because of his well known military views—that all that was needed for an efficient peace keeping operation was for Canada and other countries to promote the establishment of police forces as a means of keeping the peace between dissident parties, for instance such as in Cyprus. I told my hon. friend that this was not a new concept. I was unwilling to take away my hon. friend's pride of authorship in that idea—I regret to say it is now in existence in some of the peace keeping forces—but it is not sufficient to make an effective peace keeping force operate. If that had been all that had been done in Cyprus, we would not have been able to keep the peace, as the United Nations force has done so successfully for three years. That is what I was trying to emphasize, and to indicate that this was the impression I drew from my hon. friend's interesting, but I thought—and I hope he will not mind my saying this—surprisingly nonproductive speech today.

Mr. Churchill: The minister sometimes draws incorrect impressions. He does not follow debate as closely as he used to in years gone by.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, would the minister permit me to ask a question? I want to ask the honourable and gallant colonel, the Secretary of State for External Affairs—and I ask this question because the policy of our party is to withdraw from NATO when it becomes a nuclear alliance; our party is opposed to nuclear weapons in the hands of Canadian troops at home and abroad, under any circumstances—whether he considers NATO to be a nuclear alliance, and whether he is in favour of nuclear weapons being used by Canadian troops at home or abroad.

Mr. Churchill: He is going to negotiate out of them.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): My hon. friend knows that there are three NATO nuclear powers. There are two nuclear powers in the organization, and an additional nuclear power in the alliance. Canada is not one of these. No other NATO country has an independent nuclear capacity. Consequently, in that sense there are no other countries in NATO that can be categorized as nuclear powers.

Mr. Herridge: Perhaps my question was not quite clear, Mr. Chairman. Would the minister say whether Canadian troops in NATO are provided with weapons of nuclear capacity?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I have told my hon. friend that there are two nuclear powers in the organization, and another in the alliance. France does not share in the integrated command structure. There are no other NATO countries that have independent nuclear control. Canada did sign an agreement for the storage of nuclear weapons. Canada does have an arrangement with the United States, in NATO; but this does not give Canada independent national control. Consequently we would not be considered a nuclear power, for instance, under the non-proliferation treaty.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Chairman, now that all the questions have been asked and the answers given I have to figure out just how to rearrange my speech. May I say that I can appreciate the eloquence of the minister who has just resumed his seat, but I cannot accept the reasoning he set forth. I hope that in the time allowed to me I can make clear why I cannot accept the propositions he has just set forth.

• (5:10 p.m.)

When Bill C-243 was first introduced in the house, spokesmen on behalf of this party made it abundantly clear that we thought the bill was of such importance and so complex it should be referred to the committee on national defence for clarification and for the hearing of witnesses, before this house was asked to register an opinion in principle on second reading. That proposal, recommended by spokesmen other than those from this party, was not acceptable to the government. Therefore the bill proceeded through second reading.

Again at that time we made it clear that, while we were prepared to vote on second reading, we would do so with the understanding that the bill would be referred in its entirety to the committee on national defence so it could be studied in detail, so that witnesses could be heard, so that officials of the armed forces could give their views and, in particular, in order that we might obtain a

clear enunciation from the minister and the government as to what is to be the future role of the Canadian armed forces. That meant, of necessity, an understanding from the external affairs department, because defence and foreign policy are closely interrelated.

The bill went to the committee and during a period of approximately six weeks 55 meetings were held, many witnesses were heard, and the bill was then returned to the House of Commons. Following that the first statement made in the house in this regard was made by the Minister of National Defence. I should like to quote the minister's opening remarks, which are to be found in *Hansard* of April 3 at page 14429:

> During the last few months the subject matter of the bill now before us has been extensively examined and debated in this chamber, in the standing committee on national defence and throughout the news media. Every opportunity has been afforded those who are opposed to this concept to make their views known.

We heard witnesses both in opposition and in support of this bill. We did not receive a clear indication as to the future role of the Canadian armed forces. We have yet to be informed of any consideration, deliberation or action in respect of the evidence before that committee. With the exception of some technical and legalistic amendments the bill has been returned in principle and basic fundamentals in exactly the same form it was referred to the committee.

Why has this bill involving such a controversial and important matter been returned to the house in basically its original form? In my estimation the answer is related to the arrogant and irresponsible position taken by the minister and the government. The minister has failed to accept even a compromise position or even to give a reasonable and factual explanation why he would not accept a compromise. Because of that failure we today, and for days ahead, will again have to repeat all the arguments.

So far as I am personally concerned, the major aspect of this bill involves the future role of the Canadian armed forces. I do not know how we can accept this bill, which lays down the principle of the reorganization of the Canadian armed forces—the army, navy and air force—until we know what the future role of this reorganized force is to be. I say without fear of honest contradiction that no one in this house, including those on the government side, knows what the future role is, or what our foreign policy in respect of defence will be. How can we decide whether we are opposed to or in favour of this bill?

I can prove what I say out of the mouths of the government members. Time after time the Minister of National Defence has said that whether we have a triservice, an integrated service or a single unified service we are going to meet our commitments. A few moments ago the Secretary of State for External Affairs backed up that statement. He said that unification will not affect our commitments and that in fact it will make us more effective. It is obvious that others on that side of the house feel that unification will help us to meet our commitments.

Only a few moments ago the Secretary of State for External Affairs said our commitments were subject to change. He reminded us that negotiations are being carried on with two of our allies in NATO in respect of changing roles, and that in 1968 the ten year contract under NORAD will be concluded. This will necessitate further negotiation.

If this house is to vote in a reasonable, understandable and conscientious manner on this bill, we must know what is in the mind of the government in respect of the future role of our armed forces, and we must know what we are prepared to commit to NATO, or NORAD peace keeping operations or peace restoring functions. That is the situation only in respect of the commitment aspect of our defence role.

The government then suggests, from the other side of its mouth, what will be the function of the defence forces of Canada. Let us go back to 1963 and see what the Prime Minister said at that time about the role or function of our armed forces. He is reported at page 784 of *Hansard* for June 7, 1963 as follows—and he was quoting his own speech:

> The government should re-examine at once the whole basis of Canadian defence policy. In particular, it should discuss with the United States and with NATO a role for Canada in continental and collective defence which would be more realistic and effective for Canada than the present one. This examination would be concerned, among other things, with the necessity of building up NATO's conventional forces and the part Canada could play in this.

During the same speech on the same date at page 791 the Prime Minister is reported as having said:

> I would hope that in a re-examination of defence policy we will be able to find a more effective form of defence in coalition than that which has been undertaken by the previous government.

Those were the words of the Prime Minister on June 7, 1963. We have heard today that we will maintain our commitments without any readjustment.

The government now talks about change. The government spoke about change in 1963 but there was no change. Without going back as far as 1963, let me refer to what the Minister of National Defence had to say in this regard. What did the minister say in this house last Monday? I will quote what he said, as reported at page 14430 of *Hansard*:

• (5:20 p.m.)

Cardinal to the plan as set out in the white paper was the strategic situation as it existed at that time. On this question there was no difference of opinion whatsoever. The unanimous decision by the chiefs of staff and all the staff members who considered it was that in the world today the least likely kind of war is an all out thermonuclear war. At the other end of the spectrum, the most likely kind of war is a continuation of small wars, riots, insurrections, the overthrow of civil government, namely, the kind of conflict that has been going on almost continuously throughout history and certainly continuously during the 20 years since world war II.

Each side in the cold war, the United States and the U.S.S.R., has sufficient thermonuclear striking power that even after one side had commenced a sneak attack the other would be able to retaliate, from hardened and dispersed bases, with sufficient power to wipe out the agressor's industrialized areas. Therefore this kind of attack would be irrational.

Then on the next page he continues his speech as follows:

Our problem in Canada was to devise and develop a defence policy sufficiently broad and with sufficient flexibility that our forces could contribute to the deterrence of a major war at one end of the scale and through to these peacekeeping activities at the other end of the scale or assist in putting out a small conflagration before it escalated into all-out thermonuclear war.

Let us consider the statement made by the Prime Minister on June 7, 1963 when he spoke about our new defence policy, the conventional role, and a new approach for Canada in collective alliances. Let us consider the words of the Minister of National Defence uttered here last Monday when he spoke about the best that Canada can supply, and when he said that it is irrational to think of a thermonuclear war because if one side starts it the other will be wiped out. In addition let us look at the statements made today, that we should meet our commitments with a new force. I ask the minister: What is the role of the Canadian armed forces? What was it, not only in the past, but what is it now when we are considering this bill and, in particular, what will it be in the future?—because now we are being faced with a complete reorganization of the Canadian armed forces.

I find the stand taken by both the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence to be completely irrational. A few moments ago the Secretary of State for External Affairs said that we should keep our brigade and our air division in Europe, and yet the Minister of National Defence has stated previously that any sneak attack might develop into a thermonuclear war. Even if there is a conventional sneak attack, how will our brigade meet it? Will it meet it with the Honest John rocket with a nuclear warhead? How will our air division fly to meet it? Will it do so equipped with nuclear warheads? I am not one who says we should pull out of NATO completely, but in my own view I do not see any purpose in maintaining in Europe our brigade and our air division. If they are going to stay there, then we should think about it in the light of the reorganization of our forces. If they are not going to be kept there, then that might change our thinking on Bill C-243. I believe we should be equipped for anti-submarine warfare, and I believe that this is a vital role which we can play in NATO. That is my own personal view.

I believe we should reconsider our position in NORAD, when the new agreement comes up in 1968. We must adjust to what our position will be in ten years. Are we going to maintain our present commitments with Bomarcs, with nuclear warheads on our Canadian soil, with Voodoos with nuclear war-heads? If so, why? Let the minister state, as he has done so often, that in the case of a war it is not Canada which will be attacked but the United States, and that it will not be an all-out nuclear conflict. What is Canada doing to prepare for such an eventuality? I say, Mr. Chairman, that we should have some knowledge of the future role of the Canadian armed forces. Knowing that, we can then give proper consideration to this bill.

However, I should like to go beyond that. I cannot remember any witness who gave evidence before the committee, whether in the service or retired, who has opposed the policy of integration. I do not believe there is any member in the house who would basically oppose integration. The question is, where do we go from there? Also I cannot think of one witness who gave evidence before the committee who did not say that it would take from four to six years to implement integration, to test it and then to adjust it according to problems which cannot be foreseen now.

In view of this it is my own personal opinion that we could have avoided this discourse, and these arguments pro and con a single service, if the government had adopted a more sensible approach to this entire question, if it had emphasized the fact that it would take five to six years to put integration into effect, and if it had not insisted on the legalistic bill now before us authorizing the government to promulgate integration inside of four months.

The minister put himself in a poor position when he announced it will take five years to accomplish the first stage, and now wishes authorization for the next five or ten years. Surely we should go step by step, because if we try to jump all the way we might fall and break our necks. This would mean the disorganization and disruption of the Canadian armed forces. Ultimately our forces may become a single service, but why does the government have to ram it down the throats of members of parliament, of members of the armed services and of the people of Canada? The minister speaks of the single service concept and of full integration, but there will still have to be an army, a navy and an air force; there is no question about it.

If we accept full integration, what is wrong with letting those who honour the traditions of the service they joined to be known as members of the R.C.N., the R.C.A.F. or the army, in the integrated service? The government can have its integration, its command, its control, but what is so wrong with letting the services maintain their units and their designations within the integrated service? Surely that is not a fundamental change, and the government and the minister could have acceded to it, for psychological reasons if for no others.

• (5:30 p.m.)

The same thing applies to the common uniform. It applies also to the one-rank structure. Why should we be the only country in the world—at least of which I know—among our allies, where an admiral has to be a general or an air chief marshal has to be a general? Why should this be so? Perhaps this situation will evolve eventually, yes, but why bring it about now to cause confusion and heartbreak?

It is not good enough to say that the minister is taking the power under which he may make these designations, but that the government may hold it in abeyance. Once you have the power, God knows how it is going to be used. Why is it necessary to bring in this sort of thing? I am convinced that a little bit of reason and compromise by the minister would have enabled us to go a long way toward meeting what he has in mind. I do want to reiterate that there is bound to be opposition when the minister says "This is it", and especially when we are not clear as to what the future role of our armed forces is to be. The government has placed many of us in a difficult position. We believe in progress; we believe in integration and we sincerely hope it can be made to work. Ultimately, it may lead to unification, a single service.

Then, we are led to ask, which comes first? From our point of view the policy and the rules come before the structure. If we can get the policy and the rules before the structure, then there might not be any question at all, beyond perhaps an odd change in a clause, and we could go right through this bill. If the minister and the government remain arrogant and say, "Play ball our way, or else," then in the last analysis we will have to decide on our course of action. If you cannot get a policy before a structure, then you must be getting a structure first, because the structure will force you to get a policy and an objective. It has to be one way or the other.

This is the position in which the government is placing the members of this house. We will have to make our decision according to what we believe is best for the armed forces and for Canada. From now until this bill is completed, the members of this party will maintain the principle that was enunciated by the hon. member for Greenwood, and which I have tried to enunciate, that no matter what happens we will vote on each clause according to whether we think it is good, bad or, indifferent in the over-all legislative picture. In the final analysis, we will search our consciences and vote in the way we think is right for the future of Canada.

Mr. Macaluso: I was a member, Mr. Chairman, of the defence committee and heard the testimony on this bill. The committee heard testimony on all sides of this particular question. I feel it is important to realize that, at least where the opposition is concerned, there are as many sides as there are witnesses opposed to this legislation. When dealing with this legislation and the testimony relating to it, it is necessary I believe to judge the merits of the evidence and the credibility of the individual witnesses who appeared. In so far as this bill is concerned, the committee could group those gentlemen who appeared before us into three categories. The first would be political, the second the

serving officers and the third the retired officers.

Now, the individuals in each of these three categories have limitations in their ability to present evidence. The first group, the minister and associate minister, are obviously the most qualified in all areas, except perhaps expertise on specific points. The second group, service officers, complement the minister and associate minister by providing the expertise and opinions on military considerations, but must refrain from making statements on policy.

The testimony of the third group, the retired officers, is possibly the most difficult to weigh. In the committee, Mr. Chairman, we were faced with a very real dilemma, the credibility of this group of witnesses. The minister and the defence staff all gave comprehensive and corroborative testimony. Nowhere, I suggest, was there a contradiction, as will be indicated by the minutes of evidence. However, on the other side one finds it difficult to choose whom to believe, particularly when the conflict arises over what I suggest are the gut issues.

The relevance, credibility and merit of their evidence—I am speaking of the retired officers—is directly related to the positions they had while in the service, the length of time they have been out of the service and any bias that has resulted from their manner of leaving, their present political affiliations and their membership in or association with interested organizations. For the most part, these are men who have high rank and have given long and loyal service to their country.

However, Mr. Chairman, I ask, are they still in touch? We are all agreed that the study of defence matters is exceedingly difficult because of the pace of development and change, particularly in our Canadian setting, as a result of the present reorganization. I submit that these men no longer have available to them the plans, documents and sources of information that they had at one time. The new information they receive after leaving the service—and this came from the witnesses themselves—comes from news reports, which are not exactly the best source, and second or third hand from friends, who are presently serving officers. I might say that these are hardly adequate bases for judgment.

It is significant that many of them had not read the present bill but had prepared briefs on unification, and were quite willing and ready to answer questions on unification. This was their right, of course, and was what they were there to do. Many admitted however they had not read the bill. The many briefs presented, and the supporting evidence, produced certain contradictions which I should like to put forward, Mr. Chairman. General Moncel stated that he wrote four plans for unification, and the one the minister selected was the one he rejected out of hand. This statement appears on page 1212 of the committee evidence.

Later, Air Chief Marshal Miller, then chief of defence staff and General Moncel's direct superior, through whom these plans would have been forwarded stated, in answer to a question I asked, that he had seen no such plans. General Allard, present chief of staff, stated that in so far as he knew, these plans never existed. He had made a search of the department. Significantly General Moncel, referring to his retirement later stated, "I left because I could not write such a plan."

Admiral Brock, speaking about the lack of knowledge on the part of serving officers in 1964 as to what was going on, said as recorded on page 959 of the evidence:

> No one seemed for a single moment to believe that the one reference in the white paper could be anything but an odd expression.

Admiral Rayner put it quite succinctly when he said, as recorded on page 2011 of the evidence:

> I had no doubts of what a single unified service meant; I had always assumed it would be one service, with one uniform and a loss of identity to the three services we have now.

General Fleury, however, seemed to agree with Admiral Brock when he stated, as recorded on page 1315:

> It was not clear to me and it was not clear to the vast majority of the people in the armed forces what was meant.

However, General Moncel stated—and I read from page 1310:

> I was well aware of the fact that the white paper said that unification was the ultimate end.

There you have it, Mr. Chairman. One admiral and one general say they did not know and one admiral and one general categorically state they they did know. It is difficult for me to conceive of a deficiency of knowledge in high ranking serving officers in an issue so fundamental as this. It is my submission they must have known. Regarding communications, General Fleury said:

• (5:40 p.m.)

> Communications were very bad within the headquarters and between the commanders in the field.

General Moncel countered by stating that communications could not be simpler, that it is straightforward.

Later on, referring to the testimony of previous witnesses on the proposed reorganization, the hon. member for Edmonton West made this statement, as reported at page 1314 of the committee proceedings:

> No serving officers at the time were asked to testify how they felt about this organization.

To this General Moncel replied:

> If they said this, it is quite wrong. I sat on defence council and we heard lots of "chaps" giving vent to their views on it.

Admiral Landymore said that the new reenlistment program contained in the bill would be an invitation to trade unions in the armed forces. Again, General Moncel disagreed, saying that he could not believe what Admiral Landymore said would come true. When questioned by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek about Admiral Landymore's suggestion that, under provisions of the bill, the minister of defence could commit Canadian forces anywhere without consulting parliament, General Moncel said, as reported at page 1306:

> I cannot believe it.

Many of the witnesses that appeared expressed the view that the troops were opposed to unification. As reported at page 1379, Air Marshal Annis said:

> I believe our minister may be correct when he suggested that unification had large popularity within the Canadian armed forces.

To be fair to him, Mr. Chairman, he went on to characterize how this support was divided.

The list of contradictions goes on and on, Mr. Chairman. I have quoted these few examples to demonstrate the degree of the problem. On the one hand, we have the members of the present defence staff who agree to a man on all points in their testimony, including the opinion that unification is the right organization for the Canadian armed forces.

On the other hand, we have some retired officers, whose testimony is fraught with contradiction, who in the main agree on the principle of unification, but who disagree on different specific aspects with either the minister, the defence staff, other opposition witnesses, or in some cases even themselves. The important element in all their testimony is whether or not they agree with unification, regardless of the manner of implementation, and the consensus is a resounding vote in favour of unification. But, Mr. Chairman, as I have stated, some of them had not read the bill, nor had they heard or read the briefs of the defence staff. It is also significant that most of the discussion centred on the success of integration. of which of course they were all in favour, as that was the stage in which they were involved. If they were speaking of some of the difficulties which were being experienced with integration, they had solutions to offer.

The world is following our lead in integrating the armed services—

An hon. Member: Oh?

Mr. Macaluso: —but what of unification? Somebody says "oh", but it is a fact that this is so. We hear comments like: "We should not do it until somebody else does". "It has not been tried and it is not proven". "We are too small to try something like this". "Let the United States or Britain try it first. If it works—and I am certain it would—let us jump on the band wagon and follow their lead".

Most of these witnesses, Mr. Chairman, with one or two significant exceptions, were not opposed to the principle of unification. They were, however, opposed to doing it now, and for the most part their testimony was directed to that end. In effect, they said: Let us wait a few years and then we will go ahead.

General Foulkes, who was, in effect, an opposition witness, pretty well summed up this attitude when he said, as reported at page 1228:

> In 1963 when I was here I think I remarked that the attitude of the chiefs was "Yes, we believe in integration but please do not do it while I am here."

He is speaking of integration, not unification. He went on:

> "I do not want to be known as the chief of staff who ruined these services". This was the natural attitude of an officer who had come all the way up through the service, who was responsible for the welfare of the service and not only to those in the service, but to the institutions which supported it. Although they all supported it, they were not so keen to go ahead with it during their tenure of office.

Perhaps these men are not so keen now to go ahead with it during their term of retirement, and I suggest probably for the same reason as that referred to by General Foulkes. But the members of the present defence staff are prepared to go ahead.

General Allard stated to the committee, during his appearance before them on February 28 last, that in making his presentation he did so as the man responsible for carrying out the policy of the government, through the Minister of National Defence, for ensuring that the defence forces that we have today are organized, equipped, trained and possess the morale to accept any task they have or are likely to be given. He said he felt absolutely confident that this task can be carried out best by the reorganization of the forces as set out in Bill No. C-243.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that a man with the background, experience and service record of General Allard could make such a statement if he did not believe in it.

I would now like to deal with the fallacious statement—and it is a fallacious statement—by some hon. gentlemen opposite and some witnesses that unification is proceeding ahead too fast. When making these completely inaccurate statements, it is obvious that they have not listened to the expert testimony of witnesses before the committee. On Tuesday, February 7, 1967, at our very first meeting, we heard a two-hour brief by Air Marshal F. R. Sharp, vice-chief of the defence staff, and a major portion of that brief was directed to the time schedule for unification. I know it has been quoted before, but I should like to quote one paragraph of the vice chief's brief:

> Because this is a very complex job, very thorough and careful planning is required. The department has, on the one hand, been accused of acting too quickly, that is, not doing sufficient planning, and, on the other hand, of not deciding sooner the details of what is involved in unification. Since planning takes time and since the details cannot be decided and divulged until the planning has been completed, it is obvious that the department cannot satisfy both of these criticisms. To take time for adequate planning means that there will be some delay before the details of unification can be announced. To quickly announce the details implies inadequate planning. However, to postpone the decision to unify until all the details have been worked out is contrary to common sense.

Here, Mr. Chairman, we are faced with the most challenging and exciting concept in modern military organization, and what do the opponents use as arguments? They engage in picayune discussion, based on unwillingness to accept the testimony of the only men—let me repeat, the only men—who are in a position to know what the proper time phase is, namely the present serving officers on the defence staff.

[Mr. Macaluso.]

Air Marshal Sharp told us that planning for unification has been going on since 1964 and that it will not be completed until 1971 at the earliest. That, Mr. Chairman, adds up to a seven year program. Certainly, in this day and age it is time we realized that we can no longer afford to "wait and see" indefinitely; that we cannot simply put off our decisions for three years or five years because of the outcry of a small nostalgic group fighting for the preservation of an expensive, outdated and inefficient system of military organization. They are not looking for a pause for three or five years; they are looking for a permanent halt to the modernization of Canada's military establishment.

The Air Marshal's presentation illustrated with charts the program planning and scheduling. He indicated that to accomplish the aims of unification involved about 500 complex, interlocking stages and that progress or delays in one program had consequent effects on several others.

The minister and the defence staff have continuously stressed one point in the discussions both in and out of the committee, and it is that Bill C-243 is the final phase of the integration-unification cycle. Integration and unification are not neatly defined packages—and this was a point made by many witnesses, even those in opposition. They are not independent entities. Rather they are interlocking and interdependent stages in an over-all scheme designed to give Canada the best fighting force per tax dollar the world has ever seen.

General Allard told the committee that he has had to stop many programs that were impinging on unification, as the armed forces do not yet have the authority to complete their programs without the passing of this bill. To me, and to many of us, this indicates that planning and execution are well on schedule, and that the only part of the program that is behind schedule is the passing of the necessary legislation.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Much ado has been made about something called "instant unification". Some people seem to think that a stroke of the pen proclaiming this legislation will declare the process complete. This utter nonsense, as is shown by the opening statement of the minister. When this bill has been passed and proclaimed, it will do one thing and one thing alone—it will give the men and women of our Canadian armed forces the legal right to continue with

the necessary final planning and to begin to implement the plan. Bill C-243 is simply permissive legislation—nothing more, nothing less.

General Allard, chief of the defence staff, said this:

> I would refer to the question regarding any suspension or delay in proceeding with the final stage of re-organization—unification. I sincerely believe a postponement or delay in starting this final stage would have a most serious effect on all of us now serving and on our recruiting prospects. What the serviceman is saying to us now is this, "Get on with it", and in my opinion any delay—one year, two years, five years or even a few months—would seriously impair morale.
>
> This proposal is not designed to cope with the past, it is for the present and the future.

It is warming to note that General Worthington in an article published in the Ottawa *Journal* of Tuesday, April 4, says the same thing. I continue quoting General Allard:

> I am convinced that not only is it right—but that it will appeal to the youth of today and tomorrow. The idea of a single force, in a single, distinctively Canadian uniform—working, living, training and, most important, thinking together as one entity—is an exciting and challenging idea. After all, it is designed to meet the problems of a modern world—a scientific world—which is growing away beyond the barriers of the past at a speed that cannot stand the slow pace of yesterday.

Now come these important words:

> For all this—you know that we do not intend to proceed in haste—but rather in a carefully planned manner which will extend over a number of years. All that is required now is the authority to do so.

Those are the words of General Allard. Air Marshall Annis agreed that he was not opposed to the end result, integration into one single force, one rank, one uniform. General Foulkes said:

> The problem can only be solved by complete unification of the three services with one Chief of Staff, one chain of command, one ladder of promotion and one uniform.

General Moncel said:

> I was well aware of the fact that the white paper said that unification was the ultimate end. Well, that was fine. There was nothing wrong with it as a name.

I ask you, are these the statements of men who are opponents of unification? Again I reiterate, the important element of all the testimony in opposition is whether or not they agree with unification, regardless of the manner of implementation; and as stated earlier, the consensus is a resounding vote in favour of unification.

When we look at the bill in this, its proper perspective, and examine the testimony of the witnesses who have seemingly opposed it, we find for the most part that there is really very little ground for contention. The major theme of these witnesses and of hon. gentlemen opposite has been "It's a good thing, but let's wait a few years before we do it."

Mr. Chairman, that is not a sound argument. The plan will not be implemented fully until 1972 at the earliest. Simple arithmetic shows that 1972 is five years away, and that we have already had three years of planning behind us. The minister and the defence staff are not rushing headlong into this, I submit. They are not moving at great speed as General Moncel said, "on an uncharted course toward a dim destination". I doubt whether he himself believes this. Rather, I submit they are moving at a controlled rate on a carefully planned program toward a concept necessitated by the technological revolution of the twentieth century and, perhaps more important, by the personal needs and welfare of Canada's serving men and women.

What is needed is enabling legislation now, so that they can get on with the planning and erase the uncertainty among our servicemen. It is now mainly the uncertainty concerning whether we are or are not going to unify that is bothering the servicemen, not the fact of unification itself.

We are here as parliamentarians, Mr. Chairman, to carry out the will of the Canadian people and to act in the best interests of our country. In so doing we are always faced with opposition viewpoints. We have long recognized that this is a good thing. Our parliamentary system is composed of two elements—Her Majesty's loyal government and Her Majesty's loyal opposition, and although there are times when members on this side of the house may feel that hon. members opposite take their task of opposing too much to heart, we would still not wish to see the form of our legislative body changed. This is all to say that, no matter what the issue, no matter what the time, there will always be opposition to every proposal because, as the expression goes, "You can't please all of the people all of the time."

With regard to unification, it would be easy for us to say, "Let's wait a few years" and put it off, just as it would have been easy for the present Minister of National Defence to bask in the successes of integration and to leave the more difficult part of the job to his successor. But no one who is a member of this

house will remain so for long if he always takes the easy way out. As members of parliament we must have the courage of our convictions, and having recognized our duty we must carry it out. Our duty now, I submit, is to pass this bill, to make Canada's defence force stronger and more able to do the tasks it will be called upon to perform. Let us get on with it and take our place in the vanguard of forward thinking nations.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Macaluso: I see that I still have some time left—

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Macaluso: I had not quite finished.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I was recognized on a point of order.

Mr. Macaluso: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry if the hon. member thought I had finished; I was just moving my chair.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member may have recognized that he had some time left when he resumed his seat. The Chair had recognized me. The hon. member cannot now get up and say that he had a minute or two left.

I wish to draw to the attention of the Chair that the hon. member, by reading word for word from a prepared text for the last 25 minutes, has broken a rule of the house. This is another indication of how Liberal members think. When in committee the minister and other Liberal members were prompted by advisers from the department, sitting behind them. The hon. members had not the brains to ask their own questions. Here we see an attempt by Liberal members to repeat something that has been put on paper for them by officials from the minister's department.

Mr. Macaluso: On a point of privilege—

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Six o'clock.

Mr. Macaluso: On a point of privilege—

Some hon. Members: Closure.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Six o'clock.

Mr. Macaluso: I only take cognizance of talk that is talk. An empty seat is like an empty brain.

The Chairman: Order, please.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Knowles: What about tomorrow?

Mr. Hellyer: Tomorrow we shall continue with this debate; should it conclude during the course of the day we would take up the bill in the name of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, and following that, the consideration of the temporary rules.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, April 6, 1967

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

[*Translation*]

VACANCY

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received from the hon. member for Outremont-Saint-Jean (Mr. Lamontagne) written declaration of his intention to resign his seat in the House of Commons.

Pursuant to section 6 of the House of Commons Act, chapter 143 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1952, I have directed my warrant to the Chief Electoral Officer for an issue of a writ for election of a new member for the said electoral district.

[*English*]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

VIMY RIDGE SERVICE—REPORTED REFUSAL OF FRANCE TO PARTICIPATE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I address my question to the Prime Minister. It arises out of press reports to the effect that the Republic of France has refused to participate in the guard of honour and other observances at the fiftieth anniversary service at Vimy Ridge on April 9. Will the Prime Minister indicate what explanation there may be for this incomprehensible act on the part of France in view of Canada's tremendous sacrifice, and whether any representations were made to France? It seems impossible to understand why that country would not be represented on an occasion commemorating a battle that helped mark Canada's emergence as a nation and in which Canada poured out its blood and treasure.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, preparations for this special Canadian ceremony to mark the fiftieth anniversary of the battle of Vimy Ridge, which is a landmark not only of the war, but, as the right hon. gentleman has said, in our history, are primarily the responsibility of my colleague the Minister of Veterans Affairs. I can say that the preparations have been carried out with the full co-operation of the French authorities. The French government has appointed official representatives both for the ceremony and for the reception of His Royal Highness Prince Philip on his arrival. I believe there are no grounds for suggesting that the French government has not given adequate recognition to this observance.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Would the Prime Minister say why the usual French guard of honour for such events is being denied by that country?

Mr. Pearson: Some of the details in some of the reports about this matter are not quite accurate. I hope shortly to be able to give the house a detailed account of the exact ceremonies that will take place at that time, and the extent of French participation in them.

NATIONAL REVENUE

STUDEBAKER CORPORATION—INDEBTEDNESS FOR CUSTOMS DUTIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Revenue. Last November the minister indicated that he had received a report from the Department of Justice in connection with the importation of some 10,000 Volkswagen cars by the Studebaker company. Has his department now decided whether these cars properly came within the Canada-United States auto agreement, or whether they are subject to taxation under the general tariff provisions?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue and President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult question to answer. We have received advice from the Department of Justice and are acting on that advice. I can assure my hon. friend that we will act within the law as it exists, but I may not indicate to him what we are doing with respect to a particular taxpayer's affairs.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am not asking the minister to indicate what he is doing with respect to a particular taxpayer, but in view of the fact

that other auto companies must know what they are entitled to do under the Canada-United States auto agreement, have the minister and the Department of Justice decided whether it is proper for an auto company under the provisions of that agreement to bring into Canada cars manufactured by another company?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, we have made our decision in this matter, and I am sure all the auto companies know what our thinking in this type of matter is and how we will treat them as individual companies. But as my hon. friend knows I may not discuss the affairs of an individual company in the House of Commons.

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of the extensive lay-offs that have taken place in the automobile industry, the fact that the auto manufacturers have approached the government asking that they be relieved of their full responsibility under this trade pact, and that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association has asked for a complete study and review of this agreement, would the Prime Minister now think it wise to refer this auto agreement to a standing committee of the House of Commons so all the facts may be brought out and an accurate assessment made of this agreement?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I certainly think it wise to look carefully into my hon. friend's question, and I shall do that.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of National Revenue has said he must not give details of individual cases. I presume he has read the report of the Auditor General, who says that under this scheme Studebaker owes Canada $2 million in income tax. Is the government in agreement with the Auditor General?

Mr. Benson: No, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact the situation with regard to a particular corporation, which the Auditor General did not indicate in his report as the Studebaker corporation, has been examined carefully by my department. We will deal with the particular people involved, as we must deal with them, according to the law as approved by the parliament of Canada.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Does the minister suggest that there is any other automobile company which owes $2 million for the importation of these automobiles?

[Mr. Douglas.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest the further supplementary question is argumentative.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Well, Mr. Speaker, we have to get the information. The minister has stated that he cannot give us the information because of some income tax rule, but the Auditor General referred to this fact. Surely parliament is entitled to know whether this government will do what the Auditor General says it should.

Mr. Starr: This is another reason for having a committee.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

CONSUMERS AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the right hon. Prime Minister and ask whether it is the government's intention to set up a department of corporate and consumer affairs, and if so just when we can expect an announcement regarding the implementation of that decision.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, certain functions which concern corporate and consumer affairs have already been transferred to the department of the Registrar General from other departments. We are now giving consideration to the possibility of recognizing that fact by recommending to parliament that the name of the department be changed, but this is a matter for parliament to decide.

[*Translation*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

INQUIRY AS TO STEPS TO AID UNEMPLOYED TEXTILE WORKERS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Prime Minister.

In view of the many lay-offs resulting from a gradual decrease in the output of textile factories, as well as the closing down of some textile factories, does the government intend to take action in order to find jobs for the workers affected?

[*English*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the plans and policies of the government in respect of aid to areas where there is unusual unemployment have been made known in this house more than once. However, I will be glad to look into this situation so far as the textile workers are concerned.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

CAMP HILL, N.S.—REPORTED LACK OF HOSPITAL ACCOMMODATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I had intended to direct my question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. In his absence may I direct it to the acting minister and ask him whether he is in a position today to reply to the question I posed on Monday with regard to charges that hospital beds were not available for pensionable overseas veterans while at the same time beds were being occupied by merchant seamen from Canada and other countries.

Hon. Leo Cadieux (Associate Minister of National Defence): I am afraid this question will have to be taken as notice once again. I am sorry for this.

AIR POLLUTION

EQUIPPING OF AUTOMOBILES WITH PROTECTIVE DEVICES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the government of Ontario announced that as an anti-pollution measure it will order the installation of clean air packages in all cars to be sold in Ontario. In view of this I should like to ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare whether he would not seriously consider reversing his present position and ordering the clean air package as a national standard.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, there appears to be some misunderstanding as to what the minister said. I understood Dr. Dymond to have stated that the clean air package would be put in use once its effectiveness had been demonstrated.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the announcement made in Toronto yesterday, and in view of the indivisibility of our atmosphere, may I ask whether the federal government is taking any steps to make sure that the various governments of this country will act in concert on this important issue of controlling air pollution?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, at present the Department of National Health and Welfare is giving consideration to the most effective role which can be undertaken by the federal government with respect to air pollution in Canada, and there is undoubtedly some necessity for co-ordination in this particular field.

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary. In view of the fact that the United States government has already ordered this package in cars to be sold in the United States, I should like to ask the minister whether there is any serious doubt about the effectiveness of this particular feature.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This question is certainly not in order.

Mr. Bert Leboe (Cariboo): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the Minister of National Health and Welfare will include cigars and cigarettes in this prospective anti-pollution measure.

HOUSING

SASKATCHEWAN—REPORTED REDUCTION IN STARTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): I have a question for the Prime Minister. In view of the serious reduction in housing starts in Saskatchewan, reported to be 45 per cent for the months of January and February as compared with a year ago, will the Prime Minister ask his ministry to expedite new housing plans?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I will be glad to take it up with the minister.

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): May I ask a supplementary question. In view of the steady worsening of the housing crisis in Canada, and in view of the need this creates for a full time minister, has the Prime Minister given any further thought to the establishment of a separate ministry for housing and urban affairs? If so, what decision has he made?

Mr. Pearson: I think this matter is worthy of consideration, and that consideration is being given.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): It was my intention to ask my question of the Minister of Veterans Affairs, but it will fit in very nicely with the preceding question so in his absence I will direct it to the Prime Minister. Will the government consider amending the Veterans' Land Act to reduce the amount of land required for building under that scheme, in order that at least in this category housing may be provided on a city or town lot?

Mr. Pearson: I will have to take that question as notice and discuss it with the minister concerned.

PENITENTIARIES

QUEBEC—AWARD OF CONTRACT WHILE QUESTION BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): May I direct a question to the Minister of Public Works or perhaps the Solicitor General in order to clear the air—I think it is most important—as to whether there has been a deliberate or unintentional insult to the joint committee on penitentiary matters.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is this. For what reason was a contract recently awarded to the Secant Construction Company of Montreal in the amount of $2,823,000 for site engineering at the maximum security prison 20 miles north of Montreal when the entire question of prisons and prison design has been referred to a joint committee of the House of Commons and Senate, which committee is meeting again this afternoon? I ask, Mr. Speaker, what are the grounds upon which contracts are let for maximum security prisons while the matter is receiving consideration by a joint committee appointed by this government.

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I will have to take the question as notice. I am not aware personally of a contract being let but I will look into the matter and reply at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Winch: May I ask a supplementary question, and Your Honour will tell me if it is in order. Is it not rather unusual for a minister not to know that such a contract has been awarded, according to the press?

Mr. Speaker: I can tell the hon. member that it is not in order.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Pennell: Perhaps I might be allowed to expand on an answer I gave earlier in reply to the hon. member for Vancouver East. With respect I would draw his attention to the proceedings before the joint committee on penitentiaries dated January 24, 1967. In his evidence the superintendent of penitentiaries stated:

> The St. Anne des Plaines tender was accepted at $7,100,000 in round figures. There will be at St. Anne des Plaines an additional sum of $2½ million in development of the site, but that development will provide services which will also be available for other institutions to be built there in due course. The basic cost is $7,100,000.

I hope that is a satisfactory answer to the hon. member's question.

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION

INQUIRY AS TO DISCUSSIONS RESPECTING FEDERAL DISTRICT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

In view of the fact that more and more is being heard about the establishment of a federal district for the national capital area, that is Hull and Ottawa, is the Prime Minister in a position to advise whether talks have taken place between the government or between himself and the provincial authorities concerned? If not, is it the Prime Minister's intention shortly to have talks with the Quebec or Ontario authorities.

[*English*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): To my knowledge, but I should like to check it, there have been no such talks. In so far as the plans of the government in this regard are concerned, I have nothing to add to what has been said already in the house.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

STEVEN TRUSCOTT—INQUIRY AS TO FINDINGS OF SUPREME COURT

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Solicitor General whether he is in a position to give the house any indication when the Supreme Court of Canada may be expected to hand down its judgment or recommendations in the Truscott case. I ask this because for some reason in the last few days inquiries have come from all parts of the country.

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the law officers of the crown have

no advance information as to when the judgment will be rendered in this case.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Has the clerk of the Supreme Court of Canada been communicated with, and if not will the minister communicate with him to ascertain whether the court has any particular date in mind?

Mr. Pennell: Mr. Speaker, with great respect I hesitate to suggest that the law officers of the crown should approach the court. I hope of course that judgment will be rendered in the near future.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reg Cantelon (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. In view of the minister's announcement that Welland canal fees should meet the cost of the canal, and his statement of recent date to the effect that the new transport bill was based on the principle that all phases of transportation should pay their way, I should like to ask the minister whether it is now his intention, in accordance with this principle, to raise the ferry rates in Newfoundland sufficiently to recover the $13 million subsidy which is required to operate that ferry.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This question should be put on the order paper.

GRAIN

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Can the minister provide any information about the purpose of the negotiations presently under way in London to consider the possibility of extending the 1962 international wheat agreement for one more year on the basis of the existing price structure? Will the signing of such an agreement await the outcome of the Geneva talks, or would the GATT agreement supersede any existing agreement?

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, we are pinning our hopes on a successful conclusion to the talks in Geneva which are presently under way. The discussions now going on in connection with the international wheat agreement in London are purely pro forma and not a matter of substantive negotiation.

OATS AND BARLEY—REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO SHIP INTO MANITOBA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to answer a question asked yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition in connection with the feed grain situation in Manitoba. The situation is that currently in elevators in Manitoba there are 8 million bushels of oats and 4.3 million bushels of barley available for sale. There are, therefore, ample stocks of oats and barley available in elevators in Manitoba.

With regard to the transport of grains from one province to another to which my right hon. friend alluded, it is the policy of the wheat board to move board stocks freely to any areas in Canada where they are required. The right hon. gentleman obviously had reference to non-board stocks which would be sold in competition with board stocks, and the wheat board is not prepared to authorize the interprovincial movement of such non-board oats, barley or feed wheat.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in connection with oats, barley and feed wheat the minister has said there are sufficient stocks in Manitoba. Has he not had any representations from livestock feeders to the effect that such is not the case? They are the representations I have had.

Mr. Winters: No, sir, I have not.

FLOODS

FRASER RIVER—REQUEST FOR PREVENTIVE ACTION BY GOVERNMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I want to ask the Prime Minister. Has the Prime Minister received an appeal from Hon. H. H. Stevens of Vancouver urging him to take action to avert floods in the lower Fraser river by sending an engineering team to that area?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did receive a letter from Mr. Stevens yesterday afternoon. I immediately got in touch with the departmental officers concerned to see what the nature of the

problem is likely to be, what could be done about it, and to ascertain whether the situation is likely to be as desperate as Mr. Stevens suggested.

[*Translation*]

LOTTERIES

INQUIRY AS TO AMENDMENT OF CRIMINAL CODE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put my first question to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General whom I should like to congratulate on his recent appointment and from whom I hope to receive a favorable reply.

In view of the fact that his department has been studying the question of lotteries for the last two years and further to the recent statement of Dr. Szabo before the provincial commission on the administration of justice to the effect that a lottery would be a healthy public measure, is the minister considering an early amendment to section 179 of the Criminal Code to enable the provinces who wish to do so to establish provincial lotteries for purposes of education and social welfare?

Hon. P.-E. Trudeau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, basically, the statement made by Dr. Szabo before the provincial commission is of interest to the provincial commission. I would have to see his statement, that is read the recommendations made to the commission. As to what is happening within my department, I must say that I have not yet received any report on the subject and, personally, I do not intend to initiate such legislation.

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

I should like to ask the Minister of Justice and Attorney General—whom I congratulate on his appointment—whether his department has communicated with the Quebec Justice Department with a view to having that section of the Criminal Code amended so that provinces may introduce lotteries, and whether he intends to follow-up these requests?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think the hon. member's question is essentially the same as the one put by the hon. member who spoke before him.

[Mr. Pearson.]

[*English*]

NATIONAL PARKS

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—INQUIRY AS TO NEW PARK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Melvin McQuaid (Kings): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. When may we expect a decision by the government about establishing a national park in Kings county, Prince Edward Island?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This question should be on the order paper.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

NATO—DISCUSSIONS RESPECTING ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEM

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): My question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Is a conference in progress in Washington on a ministerial level with regard to an anti-ballistic missile system? If so, who is representing Canada at that conference and what is Canada's policy with regard to the proposal?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Defence is in Washington today, as he indicated the day before yesterday he would be. He has had some discussions with his opposite number, Mr. McNamara. The view of the Canadian government was stated by the Minister of National Defence the other day when he pointed out that Canada hoped the discussions between the Soviet union and the United States with regard to this program would result in an agreement by both sides not to proceed with it.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister of National Defence be there tomorrow as well as today?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Defence hopes to be back tomorrow.

Mr. Churchill: At what time?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I shall have to get that information at ten o'clock.

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): I wish to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs a related question. Could he inform the house whether the question of Canada joining with

the United States in the development of a common user battlefield communication system involving the use of satellites is also being discussed?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I should like to take notice of that question.

NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION

REQUEST FOR IMPROVEMENT IN CONDITION OF OTTAWA STREETS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): I want to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. In view of the deplorable condition of almost every road and highway leading into Ottawa, and in view of published reports that during centennial year the city will be filled with sewer excavations, road widenings, potholes, etc., could the minister not do anything to consult the local municipal officials and see that during centennial year visitors to Ottawa will not feel they are visiting some sort of devastated country?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure the minister concerned has noted the representation.

[*Translation*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

FEDERAL OBSERVERS AT QUEBEC COMMISSION ON CRIME

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice who is certainly one of the most brilliant acquisitions, for the province of Quebec, on the federal scene.

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Let us hear about the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan).

Mr. Choquette: I am pleased to salute the future Conservative chief.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice, a little smarter than the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi, whether his department intends to send an observer to the inquiry which is going on at the present time concerning the administration of Justice, since that inquiry will certainly end up by recommending amendments to the Criminal Code?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. P.-E. Trudeau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the administration of Justice, according to the constitution, comes under provincial jurisdiction. If we had been invited, I think that we would have considered attending, but as far as I know, we have not received any invitation. Anyway, I shall inquire.

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for the honourable "most brilliant acquisition" from the province of Quebec.

Mr. Choquette: On the federal scene.

Mr. Grégoire: On the federal scene. Would the hon. minister tell us whether his department also intends to send an observer to the sittings of the States General of French Canada, who intend to put forward amendments to the constitution?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not believe that this question is urgent enough to be acceptable at this time.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, may I answer the most brilliant separatist acquisition on the federal scene?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

GRAIN

QUEBEC—POSSIBLE SALE OR LEASE OF ELEVATOR

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the hon. Minister of Transport. Has he received a telegram from the president of the executive council of the Coopérative Fédérée de Québec, Mr. Gingras, advising him of the possible rental or sale of the Quebec grain elevators to an American company?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[*English*]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I think the question is urgent—

An hon. Member: You are not the Speaker.

Mr. Pickersgill: —and I can assure the hon. gentleman that the government has no intention of approving the sale of the elevator at Quebec, and I underline the word "sale".

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ricard: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Are we to understand that the government could rent those elevators to an American company?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, it could happen, but there is nothing sure about it.

[*English*]

Mr. Ricard: Selling out to the United States.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Perhaps I might ask a supplementary question on this. If a lease is granted for ten years may I inquire whether the result will not be that the entire movement of domestic and export grain from the St. Lawrence will be under the control of international companies rather than Canadian companies?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, unlike the right hon. gentleman, when I became a politician I did not attempt to become a prophet, and I could not answer that question.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I hope he does not become one, because up to the present time any prophecies he has made have been entirely without basis in truth or fact.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I ask the minister whether, under the provisions of the Canada Grain Act, it was not intended that the control of wheat exports should be under Canadian companies and not under United States companies, as might well happen if there were a lease or sale of elevators owned by the National Harbours Board.

Mr. Pickersgill: I have never been so flattered in my life to think that one of the most eminent counsel in Canada should ask a layman, as I am, for a legal opinion, but I do not think the rules allow me to give it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The minister had better look into it.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Because of the jurisidction involved in this matter with respect to the export of grain and the need to store it in elevators controlled by the National Harbours Board, would not the Prime Minister consider that a decision to rent or sell the National Harbours Board's elevators should be taken only after consultation with the Department of Agriculture and other departments, including the Department of Trade and Commerce, so such action will not take place haphazardly but will be given consideration and done in an orderly manner.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suspected from the first question, which I should have liked to rule out of order, that we would be engaging in debate. I think we might go to another question now.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

MEDICARE—RIGHT OF PROVINCES NOT TO PARTICIPATE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. R. Ballard (Calgary South): I have a question for the Prime Minister arising out of a statement he made recently to the effect that any province had the right to opt out of medicare. Does this represent a change in attitude on the part of the government? If so, what type of financial arrangements would be made by the federal government with provinces which opt out?

Mr. Speaker: This question is out of order.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REQUEST FOR POSTPONEMENT OF DISCUSSION OF NATIONAL DEFENCE LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): I have a question for the leader of the house. In view of the absence today of the Minister of National Defence will the hon. gentleman consider asking the house to proceed with some other legislation so we can make some headway with the items on the order paper before proceeding with the defence amendments when the minister returns?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): No, Mr. Speaker. The very competent Associate Minister of National Defence—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McIlraith: —will pilot the bill through the committee stage, and we are very hopeful that we can get forward with our consideration of this important measure so it can go to the other place for discussion and receive royal assent, and we can get on to the new session of parliament.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Who will be present to pilot the bill tomorrow, when the Associate Minister of National Defence is on his way to Vimy?

Mr. McIlraith: Though I have tried to keep the house well informed, I find it is best in this responsible position as house leader to go just from day to day.

Mr. Starr: Hour to hour.

Mr. McIlraith: The Minister of National Defence will be here tomorrow to pilot this bill through the house if it is still before us. It might go through tonight.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McIlraith: If it is not finished tonight I am sure we can arrange to have the minister available whenever the house is ready to proceed with the bill tomorrow.

Mr. Churchill: In order to expedite the passage of the bill will the house leader speak to his colleagues, such as the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and ask them not to make provocative speeches while the matter is being considered?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, I will be very glad to deal with that.

Mr. Ricard: You are about to make one yourself now.

Mr. McIlraith: The speech made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs yesterday was a very fine one, and I would hope hon. members opposite would raise the level of their discussion to the same high calibre.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): The hon. gentleman spoke of operating on a day to day basis. Would he consider the day and night operation of the house and tell us who will be piloting this bill tonight in view of the fact that the associate minister is required to be at Uplands airport by 8.30 this evening?

INDIAN AFFAIRS

CONSULTATION RESPECTING RELOCATION OF CERTAIN FAMILIES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development with reference to the recently announced policy of transporting Indian families from isolated communities to locations of greater opportunity. Can the minister inform the house whether the people affected have been consulted and, if so, what has been the nature of the consultation?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): In all instances where plans have been approved consultation has taken place and agreement has been forthcoming.

INDUSTRY

REPORTED DECREASE IN CANADIAN AUTOMOBILE PRODUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Minister of Industry): Yesterday the hon. member for Oxford asked to what extent the Canada-United States automotive agreement might be responsible for an 11.4 per cent decrease in the Canadian automotive output during the first quarter of 1967.

The automotive program is not responsible for the reduction in Canadian production of motor vehicles. On the contrary, it may be that because of the safeguards contained in the program for Canadian producers their output has been maintained to a greater extent than has been possible in the United States. In the United States output has declined by 24 per cent during the first quarter of this year compared with the same period last year. The figure mentioned by the hon. member respecting the decline in Canada is less than half this amount and if anything indicates the success of the program in the face of a world-wide decline in demand.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REQUEST FOR CONTINUATION OF BASEBALL BROADCASTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State. Has the hon. lady received complaints about the removal of the baseball game of the week from the C.B.C.'s plans for the coming baseball season. If so, would the minister ask that this decision be considered?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This question should be placed on the order paper.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): The Prime Minister and I, at least, are interested in this matter, so I think I will bring it up at ten o'clock.

AGRICULTURE

REMOVAL OF SUPPORT PRICE FOR MANUFACTURING MILK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Lee Grills (Hastings South): I should like to address my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Why was the support price of manufacturing milk shipped by whole milk shippers removed, thus reducing their price to a level below that of last year, at a time when we are importing butter?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question is argumentative.

Mr. Grills: If you heard the voices of the farmers as I do, Mr. Speaker, you would realize that this is an important matter.

Mr. Speaker: I am not suggesting it is not important. What I am suggesting to the hon. member is that the question cannot be asked at this time.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF ALLOWANCES IN RELATION TO ANNUAL INCOME

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Revelstoke): My question is for the Minister of Veterans Affairs, and I have sent him notice of it. Has the minister considered making a review of the allowances paid to those veterans who find themselves poorer than they were before the guaranteed annual income plan was put into effect?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I cannot, of course, accept the hon. member's premise that they are poorer. The reason some of these allowances will not be available to them is that their income is considerably above the permitted level. I think I have stated earlier that the level of income permitted to recipients of war veterans allowances is $145 a month, which is considerably more than the $105 contemplated under the guaranteed income plan. Therefore it is not the case that they are poorer.

They have all been advised to consult with their regional officers in deciding where their advantage lies, and the department will counsel them in order to make sure that the greatest advantage under either scheme is available to them.

[Mr. Speaker.]

• (3:20 p.m.)

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

AMALGAMATION OF NAVY, ARMY AND AIF FORCE

The house resumed from Wednesday, April 5, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof—Mr. Hellyer—Mr. Batten in the chair.

The Chairman: When the committee rose last evening clause 2 was being considered.

On clause 2—*Canadian forces, Canadian armed forces.*

Mr. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the associate minister a brief question. In view of the reference made by the house leader to the associate minister's capabilities, with which I agree, and also the implied suggestion by the house leader that there is a possibility this legislation might be passed tonight, are we correct in assuming it is the intention of the associate minister to introduce this afternoon some important amendments to the legislation which would make it acceptable to the country or, alternatively, that he is prepared to withdraw it entirely for the time being?

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I must advise the hon. member that I have no useful suggestion to give to him in that regard. I believe the bill which is before the house now is the policy of the government. This is the way we see it and this is what we want to put through with the co-operation of hon. members.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman—

[*English*]

The Chairman: Order. I apologize for interrupting the minister but there seems to be a little more noise than usual in the committee. Perhaps those who have conversations to carry on might do so outside the curtains so that we may hear the comments of the minister.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): Mr. Chairman, before launching into the remarks I intend to make on this bill, I should like to answer three questions put to me the other night by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire).

Here is the first. I see the hon. member is absent, but I think *Hansard* can convey my

reply which he will, I am sure, find useful, and can have circulated. It concerned R.O.T.C. pilots who, according to him, would have signed three-year contracts with the government. He accused the Department of National Defence of breaking those contracts unilaterally.

Further to a written request from the hon. member for Lapointe, we gave a reply to the effect that the matter is now under consideration as a result of a new ruling for pilots with a permanent commission. This ruling stipulates compulsory service for five years. As there is no contract but rather what is called a gentleman's agreement between the Department of National Defence and R.O.T.C. pilots, we have withheld a decision to give us time to study the matter. We hope to be in a position to announce our decision in the near future.

The second question concerned the briefs prepared by Mr. Marcel Chaput when he worked for the Defence Research Council. I must say to the hon. member for Lapointe that those reports were brought to the attention of the commission of inquiry on bilingualism and biculturalism but that the latter did not deem it useful to ask us for copies of them.

In the third place, the hon. member for Lapointe asked me a question concerning the use of the French language on Canadian military bases. I must remind him that, on all Canadian bases, administrative and supplementary orders are issued in both languages. Therefore, there is no reason to conclude to any discrimination and the incident he referred to the other night is, if anything, an unfortunate exception.

Mr. Chairman, I should now like to summarize, as succinctly as possible, the position I believe hon. members should take with regard to the issue now before us.

Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that we have been considering this matter quite sporadically for almost five months, I have a feeling that we have not made much progress and that perhaps we are carrying on what I would call a debate by proxy.

It is useful and possibly even essential to have the views expressed before the committee on national defence, in the newspapers and through other media. However, it seems to me that we must be careful not to pose as the spokesmen of the officers now retired or in the armed forces and continue on their behalf, so to speak, a debate which will not settle the matter because those officers have taken a position which will surely not change.

Our problem is not to speak for them but to form our own opinion and to reach our own decision.

Mr. Chairman, I am not saying that such evidence is useless; on the contrary, I feel that we must get the gist of it, weigh it, make up our own minds and reach our own decision.

Besides, it is obvious, as shown last night by the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Macaluso), that some of the evidence, even on the same side, was contradictory and that the same witness managed at times to contradict himself.

Therefore, I would not want us to revert to our starting point and, in addition, to introduce further controversial subjects in the discussion concerning the unification of armed forces. I know that all hon. members who express their views in the house are quite sincere, but I believe there comes a time in a democracy when a consensus must be reached through a vote.

In my opinion, new factors have been introduced in the discussion when reference was made, for instance, to roles or missions. Some people say they are unable to make a decision on such a matter until the roles or missions of the proposed force have been determined.

It would be wonderful indeed, Mr. Chairman, if we could have an instantaneous foreign policy which could be changed from day to day and adapted to our desire to see our country play the role which we believe it is destined to play. But it seems to me that we should believe in our armed forces, in their ability to adapt themselves to these operations or roles which may change eventually.

Having been privileged to work closely with the armed forces in the past two years, I am surprised and even astonished to discover what a store-house of extraordinary talents they are. Let me give as an example the military tattoo.

This is a theatrical performance which is being taken round the country and which I consider to be extraordinary; it was staged entirely by the services. We managed to find in the armed forces people with theatrical experience who were able to produce from scratch a really extraordinary show. All this in my opinion shows the versatility of the officers and soldiers of the Canadian army.

I am also thinking of the contribution to Expo '67 in Montreal, which I find exceptional, made by an officer in the Canadian army, I am referring to Colonel Churchill. His contribution to Expo proved once again that the armed forces are a potential supply of competence. Therefore, when one thinks that the armed forces would be unable to face their role, if changed, one makes an error of judgment.

I wish, Mr. Chairman, to speak very briefly at this stage. I sincerely think that now is the time to determine where we stand and I apologize if, by saying this, I am repetitious. I classified into four groups the circumstances in which we find ourselves:

• (3:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

First, as far as I can see there is nothing that can be added in the way of evidence, facts or figures which has not already been stated. It seems to me that all of the evidence has been given by the minister in the white paper, in his remarks on second reading and by the minister and the military staff before the standing committee. Second, on the other side of the coin those who oppose the concept of unification have been offered every opportunity to make known their views before the committee and through the news media. Third, we have arrived at a crucial point in our deliberations. We can either waste time and go back over the same evidence and testimony again and again with no further progress in sight or, based on all the evidence we have received, we can begin to concentrate on the clauses of the bill now before us.

Mr. Nugent: Would the minister permit a question? When he says those who are opposed have had a full opportunity to express their views through the news media, does he have in mind any means by which those who are on retirement leave and not yet released from the forces could express their views through the news media, since it would be against the law for them to do so?

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): I said they had every opportunity to make known their views before the committee and through the news media.

Fourth, I believe it was the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek who alluded to the fact that most of us have come to some conclusion regarding the merits of this bill. I for one have listened with great interest to all the evidence presented to the standing committee and it seems to me that the reasons this debate is beginning to become repetitious fall within basic areas. What are those basic areas? What is unification? The minister in tabling the white paper said:

> Following the most careful and thoughtful consideration, the government has decided that there is only one adequate solution. It is the integration of the armed forces of Canada under a single chief of defence staff and a single defence staff. This will be the first step toward a single unified defence force for Canada.

On May 28, 1964 the minister said:

> So far as the ultimate objective is concerned, this has been clearly stated in the white paper, and I think this is a fair recognition that this is the first step towards a single unified force for Canada.

That was on second reading of the bill. On December 7, 1966, he again devoted many words in explanation of the single service concept. Again on February 7, 1967, at page 440 of the committee proceedings he said:

> —a single integrated service encompassing the naval, land, air and support units necessary to carry out its assigned roles and missions and operating under unified management and control.

Here then are four explanations voiced in different words but all meaning the same thing—a single Canadian armed forces rather than three individual services, the army, navy and air force. If there needs to be any further explanation it is set out in clause 2 of the present bill which says:

> The Canadian forces are the armed forces of Her Majesty raised by Canada and consist of one service called the Canadian Armed Forces.

Therefore I am satisfied that the goal of one service has been clearly stated and I am sure that all hon. members opposite are fully aware, as I am, that this remains and has been the basic goal ever since it was first announced in the white paper.

What is the purpose of one service rather than three? Like the definition, the purpose has been explained many times before, in the white paper, at various committee hearings, in the minister's comprehensive speech on second reading and on many other occasions. As a matter of fact, there have been so many reasons given for one service I am afraid we are concentrating on each rather than on the *raison d'être* itself.

Essentially, as I see it, this can be stated in the following way. All of the members of our Canadian forces, whether combat or support, whether they are in the army, navy, or air force, have one common purpose in respect of which these people can be identified. That is the defence of Canada. Traditionally it has

been assumed that to carry out this purpose they must be grouped into three services, one representing the land forces, one representing the sea forces and one representing the air forces.

I can recognize that the overlapping of areas of responsibilities and weapons technology has created grey areas which can no longer be served by the traditional three service concept. We have tried to do something about that. Bill C-90 was the first legislative step required to begin the implementation of a program that would enable us to operate our forces in light of this overlapping of responsibilities by establishing (a) a single chief of defence staff and (b) a single defence staff. The single defence staff was created on a functional basis, that is, personnel, operations, technical services and comptroller general. At the next level commands were reorganized to carry out the following functions: air transport, training, materiel, air defence, maritime and mobile. At the next level the bases were also reorganized along functional lines: transport, operations, administration and supply.

• (3:40 p.m.)

From July, 1964, to the present we have been integrating our forces to carry out these functions. But because the function—not each individual service—forms the basic criteria for our reorganization, the continuation of a rigid three-service system hinders the full development—

Mr. Nugent: Ah.

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): —and the full benefits that could be gained by a single force.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, would the minister answer one question? Can he give me one instance of any evidence given to the committee as to how it hinders at all? Can he give me one word of such evidence given before the committee?

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): Mr. Chairman, I would ask my hon. friend to extend to me the courtesy which I extended to him. The hon. member has spoken many times in this debate and I never asked a question with a view to interrupting him.

Mr. Nugent: I am only seeking information, sir.

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): Much has been made of the fact that the navy does not have any officer to speak for the navy at defence council. In the functional system which the reorganization of the Canadian Armed Forces is bringing about, neither the navy, the army, nor the air force has specific representation at defence council. Instead, the chief of defence staff and the vice chief, together with the chief of technical services, the chief of personnel and the comptroller general as associate members, represent the Canadian Armed Forces. Whether they are army, navy or air force does not matter. They are members of the defence council who represent their functional responsibility and I insist on the word "functional".

Similarly, at the armed forces council there is no specific service representation. The commander of maritime command speaks not for the navy but for maritime command; the commander of training command speaks for his command and not the individual three services which combine to make up his command. Who, then, speaks for the navy, the army, or the air force? The answer is no one, because the traditional three-service concept is redundant in a functional defence system. That is why at this stage in our progress it is necessary to remove the three-service concept and create a single unified force which can operate not as army, navy and air force but as officers and men in training command, in mobile command, in air transport command and in all the other commands or headquarters' functions.

Without going into all the reasons, which are already on the record, I have come to the conclusion that what Canada requires is a single defence force. As I said on February 1 in this house:

> This is the crux of the problem. From a single force containing land, sea and air elements, we must be in a position where we can detach the required portions necessary to fulfil a particular commitment. If the particular commitment requires a combination of land and sea elements, or land and tactical air elements, or just a land element we can provide this portion by detaching from the single force the strength and type of force required.

What may be difficult for my hon. friends opposite to understand is that even though there will be no army there will still be soldiers, even though there will be no navy there will still be sailors, and even though there will be no air force there will still be airmen.

Mr. Lambert: How will they know it?

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): Because they will perform the functions. In other words, there will continue to be those who fly aircraft, mariners and warriors. These men, together

with those who support them, will not be grouped together in individual services but in one service, the Canadian Armed Forces.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to direct the attention of the committee toward a very important fact. For almost five months, in one way or another, there has been a debate on this bill. Either we will have a single unified force or we will not. What has become most upsetting during the past five months is that the service people do not know the outcome. They are most perturbed—

Mr. Lambert: Who brought it on?

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): —that it has taken so long to decide their future course. I agree with them that to extend this period of uncertainty can do nothing but decrease their morale. Whatever period it takes to implement the plans toward the final goal of unification does not concern them. What they want is a decision yes or no. Do we proceed toward unification or not? I think that all the necessary evidence and testimony are now before us.

Mr. Lambert: God has spoken.

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): But as General Eisenhower once said, "This is the place where the buck stops."

Mr. Churchill: It was Truman who said that.

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): I am sure I speak for all servicemen when I say, let us get on with the decision.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): I believe that the forces are convinced that the goal of unification is correct. They have been engaged in planning toward this goal in carefully measured steps. Parliament has been asked for the necessary permissive legislation to proceed along the reorganizational cycle. This is one of those steps. I for one cannot charge our forces with the responsibility of providing the best possible defence with the least expenditure and at the same time deny them the authority they require to carry out their task.

Mr. Lambert: Oh.

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): Some people say —and the hon. member is one of them—"All right, we accept integration, but let us stop there; let us pause." To me this is not possible. You cannot have integration without unification.

Mr. Lambert: Oh, that is nonsense.

[Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne).]

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): And I will say that you also have to have it now.

Mr. Churchill: Prove your point.

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): Allow me to sum up again, Mr. Chairman. Integration established one chief of staff and from that point a single chain of management and command. Because the forces include sailors, soldiers and airmen, and as far as one can see into the future will continue to do so, many have difficulty understanding why we should not continue to have a Royal Canadian Navy, a Canadian Army and a Royal Canadian Air Force. These have been replaced as organizational structures by a single, integrated structure. As a consequence it has now become increasingly difficult to manage personnel on the three-service system, virtually impossible and certainly meaningless to manage finances on that system and, more important, to determine roles and policies on the basis of a three-service division.

• (3:50 p.m.)

All unification is doing is tailoring the cloth to the developing new organization. The inconsistency between the three-services organization and the present organization causes the shoe to pinch more and more and the point will be reached when the lines of distinction which should be maintained in a three-service organization can no longer be maintained because there will be no sensible way of drawing these lines in the single organizational structure that has now been developed. The only way to overcome this difficulty is to remove the requirement established by law to maintain three services. After this authority has been granted, there will be a great deal of work to be done in terms of amending existing regulations and instructions and it will therefore be some time before the single service can be put into effect.

It is important that this legislation be passed as soon as possible and any lengthy delay would set the stage for a very difficult situation—I believe an unmanageable situation—in the not too distant future. This is not only the course of common sense to enable the orderly progress of the reorganization that was commenced with the legislation that was passed to establish a single chief of staff in 1964 to continue, but it is the only course that will do for our servicemen what they have the right to expect, that is, to establish the fundamental legislative direction and authority to govern the inevitable transition into a single service.

At the risk of confusing what I hope has been a simple explanation of the problem, may I add that there will be no difficulty in identifying soldiers, sailors and airmen in the fighting units. It is normal and healthy to expect men in a particular fighting environment to identify with it in some distinguishable way. There is nothing inconsistent in this with a single service. The difference between this and the present system is that it is now necessary to maintain throughout a division between navy, army and air services which is no longer sensible and will become increasingly unworkable.

In conclusion I should like to give a few figures in order to demonstrate that the defence expenditure situation has already been improved by integration. In the way of general background it is perhaps worth noting that the defence expenditures have not varied widely over the last ten years. As a result the proportion of Canada's resources devoted to defence has steadily declined. Expressed as a percentage of G.N.P. the expenditures of the defence department have dropped from about 6 per cent ten years ago to about the current level of 2.7 per cent. This expenditure policy has made it necessary to re-examine continuously defence activities, procurement policies and methods of organization and—operation to find the—economies necessary to offset rising costs. It should also be apparent under these circumstances that every program must be viewed in the light of the resources available and, in particular, its contribution to Canada's defence needs as against that which would result from directing all or part of the resources to other defence programs. For example, if one thinks of buying, on a one-for-one basis, modern warships to replace the 16 frigates that have been taken out of service, the $800 million or so capital cost plus the continuing operating costs must be considered in the light of what it displaces in the way of other forces.

The Chairman: I regret to interrupt the minister but the time allotted to him has expired. Does the house give unanimous consent for the minister to continue his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): I thank hon. members for their courtesy. I will not be too long. I have two more pages. This is the real nature of the decisions that have to be made so long as there are strict limits on defence expenditures, as there have been over the last decade.

When integration was commenced in 1964 we undertook to manage the defence budget within an escalation not exceeding 2 per cent a year although the actual escalation in salaries and other prices was considerably in excess of this. At the same time we undertook to divert a larger share of the defence budget to capital needs. In the three years, 1964, 1965 and 1966, since this program commenced, defence expenditures have been held within the original targets. Compared with the preceding three years, defence expenditures over this three-year period were reduced by $184 million if the actuarial adjustments to the pension accounts are omitted, and by $158 million if they are included. For comparative purposes it is preferable to omit the actuarial adjustments as the policy of current adjustments to the pension account did not apply throughout the period. By any standard of measurement this is a considerable reduction, particularly when it has been accomplished in the face of rising costs.

Mr. Lambert: Fifteen thousand fewer men.

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): I am not trying to hide facts. By way of illustration of rising costs, per capita costs of military personnel were $5,082 per annum in 1961, the first year of the six-year period, and $6,514 in 1966. On the civil side the per capita costs rose during this period from $4,004 to $5,143 and in both cases the major portion of this rise took place in the last three years.

The average military strength in 1963 was 122,700 compared with 105,000 in 1966. The difference, at 1966 per capita rates, amounts to about $115 million per annum. I mention this only to emphasize the problem of coping with rising costs and the compelling need to improve continously our ways of doing the defence business to avoid large increases in the defence budget. We have not managed during this three-year period to meet our original targets for expenditures on equipment. Expenditures on naval equipment in the last three years have been higher than in the previous three years, $208.5 million against $194.4 million, and this has also been the case for army equipment, $120 million against $100.8 million. On the other hand, expenditure on air force equipment have been substantially less. $289.4 million against $507.1 million. The main reason for this is that expenditures in the earlier three year period included $308.2 million for the CF-104 aircraft and there has been no aircraft program in the

last three years requiring such a large expenditure. The figures I have used will no doubt vary somewhat when the final 1966 figures are in, but not significantly.

It seems to me, then, that the conclusion is clear. Defence expenditures have been reduced, and quite substantially. While equipment expenditures have not been increased as much as we had hoped, they have been increased in the areas where equipment shortages were most acute. As the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre said yesterday, Mr. Chairman, this is my case.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Nesbitt: Having heard the remarks just made by the associate minister, Mr. Chairman, I must say that I agree, at least in part, with some of the comments he has made. He stated that the basic questions with which we are faced in this committee are, what is unification and what is its purpose. The associate minister then went on to give his interpretation and his views of unification as well as its purpose. I must say that his observations would seem to be of a rather individual character.

There is one other matter upon which I should like to comment before I get around to the point of examining what unification is and what its purpose is, and that is who developed this plan. This question has been asked on a number of occasions, and I think it is important for the members of the house to know who the author of this plan was. We do not see it being carried out in other countries which are great military powers. We do not see it being carried out in Great Britain. We do not see it being carried out in the United States, France, West Germany or the Soviet Union. Consequently one cannot help but wonder whence comes the idea.

Clearly the idea did not come from the senior officers of the three armed services in view of the large number of retirements, resignations and outright firings that have taken place in that group, somewhat over 40 in all. It clearly did not come from there. In the defence committee General Moncel gave evidence he had prepared four papers on the subject of unification for the minister, but General Moncel was not satisfied with any of them. The minister accepted one of those papers on unification which General Moncel considered was the poorest of the four. I believe this whole question of where this plan comes from is one of the most important questions. Military matters are highly technical and require a great deal of expertise and experience. For these reasons I believe we are entitled to know who thought up this plan. Why is it being pursued now when no other country is pursuing it?

Yesterday the Secretary of State for External Affaires intimated in his customary vague way that he hoped other countries would follow along. The evidence we heard in the committee did not seem to give the slightest indication that any other country was going to do the same thing. It has been stated by the minister and some of his colleagues that the civilian authority must always control the military authority. I believe every one of us would accept that point of view. The only point is that when we are dealing with a highly technical matter such as defence, upon which the whole safety of the country depends, plans which radically change our defence structure should be developed by people who know what they are doing.

We have had no evidence as to where this plan comes from. Indications are that it would seem to come from the minister himself. Perhaps the plan was originated in the cabinet, but we do not know. We would like to know where it comes from. If the plan did originate in the cabinet, the only person who would seem to have any qualifications with regard to military matters would be the Minister of Defence Production who had some senior military experience. There is no one else.

Was this plan thought up by the minister's adviser, Mr. Lee, to whom reference has been made so often? Apparently it has been said that many of the officers and others who are left in the armed services now agree with the plan. Of course, this is probably true because the minister has made it clear that anyone who does not agree with him does not stay in the forces. I would hardly expect any other point of view from the officers who are left. This is one question I would hope the Associate Minister of National Defence might answer before he leaves for Europe this afternoon or perhaps the minister will answer when he returns from his conference in Washington.

I think we are entitled to know who thought up this plan and why it is being pursued, particularly in view of the fact other countries are not pursuing it. There is no evidence that they are going to do so. Most of the senior officers have not recommended it and indeed have spoken against it, with the exception of those who are left in the armed

forces. Of course, they are in a rather captive position.

I should like to make one brief quotation from a letter which was reportedly written by Lord Mountbatten to the chairman of the defence committee. The letter appeared in the Ottawa *Journal* last evening and I should like to quote from the article in that newspaper:

> He described himself as "an ardent advocate of unified command and integrated administration of the services."
>
> But he wrote: 'Unified command at the appropriate level is exercised by an officer from any one service, wearing his own uniform and using his own service rank assisted by an integrated staff who commands all units of the three services placed under his command.
>
> I firmly believe that the steps taken in the recent reorganization of the British services are on the right line.
>
> In the British organization care has been taken to preserve esprit de corps and morale and those traditions which help to maintain this in the services and fighting units.
>
> It has been accepted that to achieve this the three services must retain their uniforms and ranks with an identifiable professional head of their service. The idea of a single uniform and rank structure was also rejected as undesirable and unnecessary."
>
> The letter continues:
>
> "The general cut and colour of naval uniforms are internationally so well known that a sailor from any one country can readily be recognized as a sailor in any other country."

These are the views of Lord Mountbatten and they have been promoted by those in favour of unification as an indication that Lord Mountbatten is in favour of unification as envisaged by the government, which he clearly is not.

• (4:10 p.m.)

The next question, to which I hope an answer will be forthcoming sooner or later, is: What is unification? A few moments ago the associate minister attempted to give an explanation. I am glad it is very clear to him because it certainly does not appear to be clear to anybody else, including the former chief of staff who retired only last summer.

I should like to refer to page 2312 of the minutes of evidence of the defence committee, where Air Chief Marshal Miller made the following statement:

> I did not know, and I do not know now, the whole answer, all the proposals for unification.

If the chief of staff did not know, then I cannot understand how the associate minister, let alone any of us, knows what it is either.

In this regard I should like to refer to a newspaper which is generally considered one of Canada's leading and most thoughtful—the *Globe and Mail*. The March 22 issue carried an editorial entitled "An Unseemly Rush To What?" The following is an extract from the editorial:

> It remains too big a pig-in-a-poke for any parliament to ask Canada to buy, and the commons defence committee, for all its questioning, has not been able to trace out its shape. What is needed is a complete re-examination of the whole defence apparatus, and of the job it is intended to do.

I hope that on another occasion during this debate the associate minister, or the minister himself when he returns, will attempt to give the committee a more lucid explanation of what unification is. As I say, if the former chief of staff was not aware what it was and most of the other senior officers, according to the evidence they gave, did not know or only knew partly what it involved, how can laymen such as the members of this house know?

I now come to the purpose of unification, Mr. Chairman, and certainly this is the $64,000 question. There seems to have been a great deal of difference in the viewpoint not only of members of the house but also of members of the cabinet. The Secretary of State for External Affairs made an interesting but extraordinary speech yesterday which seems to be quite at variance with the evidence given by the present chief of staff, General Allard, as well as with the speech of the associate minister this afternoon. However, as usual the Secretary of State for External Affairs, whose speech I will deal with in detail in a moment, was very careful to make observations which may be taken both ways so that he is fairly well covered in that regard.

As to the purpose of this new unified force, as it is called, we were told by the minister, as well as by his colleagues both inside and outside the house, that one of the advantages of unification would be that it would be cheaper and more economic. That is certainly an important consideration, as everyone would agree.

This afternoon the associate minister gave us the most extraordinary set of statistics. It is often said that statistics can prove almost anything, which reminds me of the statistician who was six feet tall and drowned in a river with an average depth of two feet. The fact remains that we were told that unification would bring about economies and reduce defence costs.

A few moments ago the associate minister indicated that we would now be spending a

smaller proportion of our gross national product on defence than was the case previously, that there would be economies. This is an interesting way of looking at the subject, but the fact remains that according to the defence estimates for the coming year, which the house will recall from previous discussion were compiled as if the bill had already been passed, defence expenditures this year are some $115 million more than they were last year. One of my hon. friends on the government side of the house has indicated that we are certainly going to save money with unification.

Mr. Matheson: That is right.

Mr. Nesbitt: The hon. member for Leeds says that that is right. It may be true, but I would suggest it is a strange way to try to convince the public we are going to save a lot of money and reduce expenses by unifying the forces when we have no way of proving this. The only thing we do know for certain is that it will cost over $100 million a year more to start with, though some of the evidence given in the defence committee indicated that it will cost even more. Although I realize that expenditure is important, it is not of prime importance when we are dealing with matters which affect the future safety of this country. In such case cost itself is not an overriding consideration.

The next question is: What is this unified force going to do? There seems to be a great difference of opinion on this score. Since defence is interrelated very closely with foreign affairs and foreign policy, as everyone agrees, we have to look to foreign policy to see how we should design our defence forces.

Yesterday afternoon the Secretary of State for External Affairs made a very long and interesting speech on foreign affairs and he reiterated Canada's foreign policy. I listened very carefully to the minister's speech and I reread it this morning. There is nothing in his speech vis-à-vis foreign policy with which I disagree. I thoroughly agree with his enunciation of our foreign policy. However, toward the end of his speech the Secretary of State for External Affairs stated—words to this effect are to be found at other places in his speech—as reported at page 14567 of yesterday's *Hansard*:

> Indeed, it—
>
> That is the unified force.
>
> —will be capable of performing the same variety of roles required now by our foreign policy commitments and, in my view, performing them much more effectively.
>
> [Mr. Nesbitt.]

I am glad to hear that the Secretary of State for External Affairs is so well assured in that regard, because he did not give one shred of evidence to support his view to this effect. Indeed, just the opposite: he admitted the increasing danger of nuclear submarines sent out to sea by the Soviet Union.

Our naval capabilities are now less than they were but the minister failed to explain why we are unable to man some of our ships. The new ones supposed to be laid down have not been laid down. How can we carry out our defence commitments vis-à-vis the navy in view of the increasing submarine danger? The minister had some sort of answer to this, and as reported at the bottom of page 14563 he said:

> In addition to the bomber and the I.C.B.M. threat there is a growing threat to this continent, which obviously we cannot ignore, from submarines. This was pointed out by the hon. gentleman who spoke a few moments ago. In answer to what he said I would point out that we are co-operating with the United States to meet this threat, not only as a matter of continental defence but also within the NATO framework.

• (4:20 p.m.)

As he frequently does, the Secretary of State for External Affairs got around this particular argument in a nebulous way by saying that we are working in co-operation with our allies. I think it is clear, since our naval forces do not now have the capability they had several years ago, that our allies, particularly the United States, are taking over this function to an increasing degree.

I now wish to ask a question bearing on our improved military capability. The Secretary of State for External Affairs told us yesterday that in his opinion he was sure it would improve. I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs this question, and I am sure it will be referred to him by others. Has he ever discussed this matter with Air Chief Marshal Miller or with General Allard? Certainly the Prime Minister did not discuss it with Air Chief Marshal Miller and if the Secretary of State for External Affairs did so I should like to know.

In any event, referring again to the testimony of the former chief of staff who retired last summer I point out that he said he saw no significant financial or military advantage in unification over integration. Are we to ignore the expertise of the chief of staff appointed by the present Minister of National Defence, are we to ignore Air Chief Marshal Miller's great knowledge and accept statements of laymen in this matter such as the

Secretary of State for External Affairs, admittedly a layman, or the Minister of National Defence? If the air chief marshal said there was no financial or military advantage in unification, why are we doing it? I should like to know. The associate minister seems quite sure in his own mind; he is satisfied with this measure. I am not, and I think many other hon. members are not satisfied.

For the past few months it has been strongly hinted that the purpose of this new force is really to perform only some sort of peacekeeping operation on behalf of the United Nations. In some remarks I made on January 31 last I quoted from an editorial in the Ottawa *Citizen* last year—I do not want to take the time of the committee to quote it again—pointing this out. As hon. members know, the Ottawa *Citizen* is generally considered by most people to be the leading spokesman for the government, for various reasons. If the Ottawa *Citizen* said this I do not see how we can very well ignore it. Other newspapers have said this, including the *Globe and Mail*, which until recently had a pipe line to government intentions. That pipe line seems to have been ruptured within the last few days. In an editorial of March 22 last, to which I have already referred, the *Globe and Mail* said:

> A Defence Department that is creating a unified force which could not deal with these present commitments anyway and which seems wholly designed to undertake international peace-keeping interventions which the world has not asked Canada to undertake and which Canada's External Affairs Department has not said that Canada will undertake.

This makes the speech of the Secretary of State for External Affairs yesterday very interesting because he made it very clear, which is saying something, that Canada's basic commitments were for the defence of Canada through collective agreements, including the defence of our coastal waterways, that we are still keeping our commitments to NATO, NORAD and the rest, and that we would like to be able to meet requests from the United Nations. The Secretary of State for External Affairs made it clear that our international commitments as outlined by him had not changed. Then why are there these other suggestions?

In this regard I think the most important observation comes from the present chief of staff, General Allard, who made the following statement when testifying before the defence committee:

> —Canada now wants—while remaining faithful to its existing commitments—to decide itself on the part it wishes to play in the new international society—this is not only its right—it is also its duty. It is its duty to participate, to the best of its ability—in keeping the peace by supporting the organization which has made itself the champion of the smaller nations—the United Nations Organization.
>
> In short, that is the transformation proposed by the white paper. That is what we are trying to do. My duty is to organize the military forces in accordance with government policy.

That statement, perfectly simple, perfectly straightforward, is completely at variance with the statement of intention made yesterday by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. With conflicting evidence as to the purpose of the force, what are we in this house to do? Where are we going? What is this for?

General Allard, the chief of staff, says one thing. The Ottawa *Citizen* and the *Globe and Mail* agree with him. The Secretary of State for External Affairs says another thing. In fact, he refuted strongly the idea that Canada should take up only a peace-keeping role, implying that that was a cloud nine idea and thereby taking a slight crack at his friends in the New Democratic Party who do not think it is a cloud nine idea.

Mr. Knowles: What is wrong with cloud nine?

Mr. Nesbitt: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre asks what is wrong with cloud nine. Cloud nine is usually described as something nebulous that has a habit of dissolving when strong light is shed on it. It is something that is not very substantial.

It seems that there is much difference of opinion about the purpose of this force. Is it to be solely for United Nations peace-keeping or will it be used for our regular commitments? If it is for our regular commitments I point out that the Secretary of State for External Affairs has suggested how we can integrate this force with the forces of our NATO allies in Germany, in NORAD and the like. Evidence given before the defence committee showed that integrating this new force with the existing forces of our allies is like trying to mix oil and water. It will not work. So I ask, what is all this for? I think we are entitled to a much better explanation than we have had to date about this matter. It is very disturbing indeed.

If the force is to be used only for peacekeeping purposes and we let the United States look after the defence of North America completely, where does that leave

us? Will we end up with this country being partially occupied by United States forces? Is that in accordance with present day Canadian nationalism? I think not. If we become nothing but a military province of the United States, this lovely peace-keeping force we are arranging would never be used. The United Nations would never dare to use it because it would be thought that it was some sort of quasi-United States or United States influenced organization. We would be in the position, as the right hon. Leader of the Opposition said, of being all dressed up and having no place to go.

• (4:30 p.m.)

We need a great deal more clarification of some of these matters before this bill is decided. The associate minister has told us this issue must be decided quickly before any more questions are asked. Well, some fundamental and basic questions have not yet been answered and I think it is up to the government to give us the information required. Otherwise the only conclusion reasonable people can draw is either that the government is attempting to deceive this house and the public as to the real reasons for unification or, as is so often the case, the government does not know where it is going. In an apparent attempt to contribute to cabinet solidarity the Secretary of State for External Affairs told us yesterday that he thoroughly believes this unifying force will enable us to meet our present commitments more efficiently. He expressed this view even though the evidence of all those who possess expertise on the subject is to the contrary. We should like some clarification of these matters and I hope it will be forthcoming before the present debate is terminated.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Oxford has indicated that before clause 2 passes a lot more clarification is needed. The note I would stress in the course of my few remarks this afternoon is: "Let us get on with it." I refer to an editorial under that title written by service people in the publication *Voxair* which is put out by the Canadian forces base at Winnipeg. It begins:

> The integration process began two years ago and that, to the rank and file, seems a long time.

I would point out that this editorial was written on August 19, 1966. It says that servicemen find it hard to understand the reason for the slow rate of progress, and goes on:

> More difficult to comprehend is the opinion, often expressed in the recent controversy, that the integration process is too fast...

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

> Most proponents of the "too fast" idea appear to be those who were against integration in the first place and who believed that integration and unification would not become a reality. When it now appears that it will, the natural reaction for anyone resisting change must be to attempt to delay the change.

Later in this editorial, which is in strong terms, the editor writes:

> Integration appears slow to those in the field. This should make a good argument for speeding up the process as much as possible. Any change of the magnitude of the one undertaken is difficult and sometimes painful, but the quicker we complete the change, the less painful it is going to be. If, on the other hand, the phase of change is allowed to go on ad infinitum we can be certain that morale will be adversely affected.

The concluding words of the editorial which, as I say, was written on August 19, 1966, are:

> It was known before the start that this was a difficult undertaking, but the over-all gains clearly justified the decision to go ahead. Now, in the middle of the changeover, let's not procrastinate for reasons of doubtful validity, but let's get on with it.

Mr. Churchill: Who is the author?

Mr. Matheson: The author is a wing commander.

Mr. Churchill: Has he been promoted?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Matheson: I am not going to answer what I think is a contemptuous remark with respect to a senior serving officer.

Mr. Churchill: It was not contemptuous.

Mr. Matheson: These officers have the right to express their judgment through their own proper channels.

As to the provision of information, I believe that commencing with this administration there has been more clarification of issues involving the ministry of defence than has ever been the case in Canada's history. I do not believe there has ever been a statement on the subject of defence as exhaustive, as fair and as detailed as was given to the Canadian public by the present Minister of National Defence in the course of his lengthy statement of December 7 last.

Mr. Churchill: Will the hon. member accept another question?

Mr. Matheson: I will be happy to receive questions at the end of my remarks.

Mr. Churchill: Oh, I don't know that I can sit here that long listening to the hon. member.

Mr. Matheson: Perhaps not, but I have sat patiently through speeches made by the hon. gentleman, and this might be a good point at which to tell him that his comments last evening reminded me of the venerable character who was resolved to treasure and preserve all the institutions and habits of the past and not inclined to take even a brief look at the present. I think the time has come when we in Canada should be prepared to examine searchingly and conscientiously criticize all the institutions and conventions of the present in anticipation of the challenges and opportunities of the future.

Mr. Churchill: Did the hon. member say I was venerable? Is he making fun of me because I am older than he is? Does he not respect age?

Mr. Matheson: I think that no one travelling in a bomber across the ocean could hope for a more delightful travelling companion than the hon. member. I wish we could go together again soon.

My hon. friend referred yesterday to the events which took place at Vimy. When we reflect on what happened there half a century ago we think of the colossal wastage of human life that occurred there which, as at Verdun, destroyed a generation. We think of the Somme, of Passchendaele, of the tremendous loss of life which occurred in those battles and their lasting effect on Britain, France and the dominions.

I visited Vimy with some emotion because the name of one of the members of my own family is on the memorial there. Referring to the events of April 9, 1917, Gregory Clark had this to say, writing in *Weekend* Magazine of April 1:

> At 5.30 a.m., April 9, in a sleet and snow blizzard, the volcano of our artillery erupted.
>
> Behind the wall of fire we floundered up the ruined and filthy slope.
>
> We took the Ridge. In the next three days we went 4,500 yards, took 4,000 prisoners, 54 cannon, 104 trench mortars, 124 machine guns.
>
> We lost 3,598 killed and more than 7,000 wounded.

The author concludes: "Symbols are costly".

I have visited many of the battlefields of Europe and several in Asia. I really do believe that progress in military expertise, in tactics and in strategy has been phenomenal. I was with Colonel Fane, if I may call him that, going over some of the ground of the first world war, and I like to believe that there has been definite progress in the arts of war designed to reduce human slaughter and yet to accomplish those things which are intended to preserve peace and liberty.

In this regard I would call attention to some things which were said by General Worthington. "Worthy" was assistant adjutant and quartermaster general at national defence headquarters. A dynamic personality in every appointment, he became the revered and gallant commander of the 4th Armoured Division in 1942 and commander in chief of the Pacific command in 1945. Just think of some of the personalities with whom he was associated—men like Admiral Halsey and others of that calibre who were among the most outstanding military leaders of that decade. General Worthington showed his imagination and his managerial talents as coordinator of civil defence for Canada in the years from 1948 to 1957. Some of the things this great Canadian did in those years in a field which was of little interest to most people showed how truly knowledgeable he was.

I feel it would be useful at this point to refer to an article written by General Worthington under the heading "Reorganization Of The Armed Forces Long Overdue". This appeared in the Ottawa *Journal* of Tuesday, April 4, 1967. The general said:

> In February and March the parliamentary defence committee sat for six weeks hearing 23 high-level military "experts" on the integration and unification of Canada's armed forces.
>
> The testimony of most of these experts had a disturbingly familiar theme: What was good enough for the last war will be good enough for the next.
>
> As one of Canada's oldest generals it is my opinion that at the end of any large war the existing generals should be thanked, decorated and pensioned off.
>
> Put up statues, if you like, but don't let the old brigade meddle with the future organization of the services. Hand that responsibility over to the young, fighting colonels who had to fight the war with the existing weapons.
>
> • (4:40 p.m.)
>
> Almost invariably the senior commanders plan with their heads looking over their shoulders back to the time when they were young and trained on equipment and tactics of that day.

General Worthington warns us of the peril at this time of thinking backward which could result in annihilation. He says:

> I believe the present reorganization of our armed forces is long overdue. It indicates up-to-date planning and foresight as opposed to prejudice, obsolescence and nostalgia.

He points out that Canada's military personnel could be wiped out in a single battle. I consider that significant because when we look at the statistics of Canada's defence effort we notice that currently we are spending approximately $1.6 billion. I feel that the Associate Minister of National Defence only started to put on the record the broad line of economies which have been effected. There could have been several speeches on this aspect alone had it been felt desirable to make them.

Had we never intended to change or modernize anything but merely replace the proper modern materiel for our existing establishments, this alone would cost many hundreds of millions of dollars. I believe I am correct in saying that the utilization for defence purposes of only 2.7 per cent of the gross national product of a country such as Canada places us in the category of being the third lowest contributor to the NATO alliance. Countries such as the United States, which comparatively have an immensely larger gross national product, are making much higher contributions. The point is that we in Canada are not making large contributions on the basis of our wealth and general economic strength. In terms of people we actually have a little over 100,000 men, sailors, soldiers and airmen, and this very fact alone at this time happens to be most helpful to us in the engineering of new processes, of new experimentation and in the pragmatic effort of bringing into being a concept which has been anticipated in every serious military school in the world, in the Soviet, in the United States, and all through Europe.

General Worthington said:

> Any suggestion that we provide defence for Canada alone is a ludicrous myth.

We are not in the stand on guard era any more with regard to Canada against an American enemy. If that is our thinking, then we should do it with splendour and simply multiply the kind of exercise performed at Fort Frontenac where we have ceremonials which I watch each year. They are decorative but neither practical nor very real.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs made an important contribution to the debate when he reminded us that our defence responsibilities are in the new collective sense and not in the isolationist or independent sense. I think he brought into proper balance our responsibility to NORAD, a contract that was entered into by the previous administration, and to NATO, which responsibility we assumed under the leadership of the late Louis St. Laurent, and to the United Nations.

[Mr. Matheson.]

General Worthington continues by saying:

> But Canada can produce a new, compact, efficient and integrated force to meet the challenges of the future. This force would be a highly skilled fighting machine, mobile and flexible, with an understanding of land, sea and air combat.

When we discuss mobility I am reminded of General Macklin who some people characterize as the author of mobility. I think it a fact that when we sent a mobile force to Suez some years go we had to dismantle our one capital ship in order to put our so called mobile force ashore. This is incredible. I believe that if Canadians generally could have sat in on some of the hearings of the national defence committee, especially when we were privileged to visit mobile command—at that time as I recall it was under the command of General Allard—they would have been impressed with the step-up that has been achieved in communications.

It would almost seem that many of the military concepts which were familiar to people as recently as the 1950's now tend to be somewhat obsolete. We are moving at a rapid pace. Frankly, I was impressed with certain parts of the evidence given by Air Chief Marshal Miller. I thought he was right when he spoke in terms of the pragmatic effort in what we are doing and the fact that this never can be achieved overnight. The Minister of National Defence has made this point more than once. This is something which never will be finalized. Certainly it will take a period of years to bring about a high degree of perfection. I believe at one point he suggested it might be something like seven years before unification can be finalized. Air Chief Marshal Miller stressed the fact, which was emphasized by the Secretary of State for External Affairs yesterday, that the interrelationship between defence policy and foreign policy is like the chicken and the egg in that defence policy really carries out or supports foreign policy.

If I wished to be frivolous I could pull out a quotation of Mao Tse-tung to almost the same effect, except that he considers war to be an extension of politics. I like to think that we are doing it in the reverse and that basically what Canadians are concerned about is to develop a military policy to protect and enlarge peace.

In his remarks the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, I thought very appropriately, mentioned Somalia. Perhaps this is the best example of a potential danger area. Here

we have Somalia occupying a strategic part of Africa. Berbera looks across the Gulf of Aden to the British base of Aden which once dominated these waters. Britain plans to pull out of Aden next year. Many of us have had discussions with people who know something about this situation. At the moment Russia is moving into Somalia and is providing 150 Mig fighter bombers and enough T-34 tanks for an armoured brigade. This is just a little country. Egypt and Algeria present special and disturbing problems, as well as Syria and Iraq.

This is a current topic in world news. It is a frightening commentary that little Syria can bring war to her neighbours, Lebanon and Jordan, and from this area to the world. Many military prophets have suggested it is from the Middle East that there could develop a conflagration. Looking at these disturbing patterns we see, as the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Minister of National Defence have previously indicated, that Canada has an important role in these areas of operation. I do not like to call them policing operations but in some places that is what they are. However, in other areas these operations require as much valour and far more imagination than was demonstrated in the battles of Passchendaele. So I think we must venture into the future with courage and great imagination.

• (4:50 p.m.)

A few days ago I was in Jakarta and spent some time talking to friends who explained to me why Russian tanks were patrolling the streets. They told me that under President Sukarno that little country—perhaps I should not say little because it has a population of 110 million but it is little in the sense of wealth as we know it today—actually beggared itself to the extent of $2 billion for Russian armament. This presented a tremendous problem which happily has been resolved as a result of political developments.

If this House of Commons has the courage, and this proposal calls for a special form of courage and a certain quality of faith, we propose to venture into new concepts in the military field just as we have done in a variety of economic areas.

Just think, Mr. Chairman, of the imagination that was demonstrated in this country when the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National decided to institute the piggyback system. This disturbed many existing concepts. Think of the results in Canada from the coast to coast large scale suburban development and urban redevelopment when many of the old lines of demarcation and boundaries were struck out in the interests of people and real social objectives. In the words of Air Chief Marshal Miller, the only approach that could be taken was the pragmatic approach. But let us move decisively toward that objective. We are not sure just how it will be accomplished or how soon, but we must not box ourselves in by fixing rigid lines in every area.

Let us reflect on the difficulties of the Canada-United States auto treaty in respect of which we all share a burden of responsibility and pride in this parliament. We do not know where it is going to lead us exactly but we think it will lead to progress for Canadian workers and the Canadian people.

Let us consider the great contribution of Colonel Ed Churchill mentioned by the associate minister a few minutes ago with respect of Expo. The whole idea of Expo came from the previous administration. This was an adventure in faith. Many of us have gone down to Montreal by helicopter, by ship, or by car to look at St. Helens Island and we all remember what a mess it was just a few months ago and how hopeless the whole thing looked. Yet through co-operation on the part of various agencies of government, the private and public sectors of our economy, industry and labour with its various skills, together with the co-operation of many nations, this great international complex has come into being.

Let us think of what has happened in the whole area of communications. We have moved rapidly from the telephone and wireless to radio, to Telex, to television, and to Telstar. All the old boundaries and ideas had to be stripped away and replaced.

I have been told abroad that many countries are looking at our act of faith in respect of unification with increasing interest because they know our military purpose and that purpose is peace. In addition, for the very reason indicated by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre the past performance of Canadians in stormy places like Vimy, Passchendaele and the Somme has proven that we do not intend to welsh out of our responsibilities. We are not trying to pull out of NATO or to get out of our responsibilities to the United Nations or to our good neighbour on this continent. Whatever we do in the

military field our purpose is to preserve liberty and peace for all men. That is our approach and we are trying to carry out this obligation wisely and with imagination.

Let me repeat the plea of my distinguished colleague, the Associate Minister of National Defence, and the requests of servicemen over some considerable period of time: let us get on with the job together.

Mr. Churchill: Perhaps I may be allowed to ask the hon. member a question. He mentioned that he was aware of many countries that are watching Canada's experiment with great interest. To which countries was he referring?

Mr. Matheson: Perhaps my friend, as I am sure he is, will permit me to give him this information privately. I think it would be evidence of very bad taste on my part to refer to private conversations that I have had with people here in Ottawa and abroad.

Mr. Nugent: With responsible people?

Mr. Matheson: With people who represent their countries.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Such as Taiwan?

Mr. Matheson: I was not referring to Taiwan and I will not mention people or countries if you do not mind.

Mr. Churchill: Perhaps I could ask the associate minister a question. He gave the impression when he spoke so eloquently that he was very much interested in the passage of this bill with a certain amount of expedition. Will the minister be here in the house next week to assist us in our discussions on this bill? Will he be here to help us out?

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): Is that a fair question?

Mr. Fane: Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting for quite a while to make a few remarks on this issue. Before commencing I should like to say I am happy to be able to commend the hon. member for Leeds who is one member on the government side who has made his own speech rather than read one prepared by a member of the staff of the minister or the associate minister.

I am pleased to know that the associate minister is going overseas as a representative of Canada at the fiftieth anniversary celebrations of the battle of Vimy Ridge. I wish he had left this morning before he read his speech because it was not entirely worthy of such a fine gentleman who has always been held in very high regard in this house.

[Mr. Matheson.]

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): May I interrupt the hon. member and point out that I only read part of the speech?

Mr. Fane: Presumably the part you read was the part I did not like. I very much regret that because of previous commitments I am not able to accept the invitation of the Minister of Veterans Affairs to attend those celebrations. I happen to be one of the individuals described by the deputy minister in a letter written for the minister. The thought expressed in that letter is very nice in that it suggests that medical care should be provided for the 73 veterans who are being taken to Vimy Ridge to represent their battalions.

• (5:00 p.m.)

He felt that this extra precaution was necessary in view of the quite advanced age and rather frail health of many of those who will be making the trip. Of course this does not apply to me. Being one of the possibles, I would have liked to be there. I would have liked very much to have the opportunity to accompany the associate minister because I might have been able to discuss with him some things about defence and perhaps show him why it is that people like me, whose service in Canada's army was very long, although perhaps not as illustrious as some—

Mr. Matheson: You were decorated.

Mr. Fane: —are opposed to the total unification of Canada's armed forces. I am opposed to it not because I am a member of the opposition and not because I belong to the Conservative party; if I were a Liberal and on the government side of the house I would still oppose it because of my personal convictions.

I believe this attitude holds good for the members of this party. We do not go all out for the total unification of Canada's three armed services. We think it is a wrong step. We think it should not be made at this time. We believe that the process of integration of the senior echelons of the services is adequate at this time. That is a view I have held for almost 50 years. I do not think anybody can say that my views are political. Fifty years ago I was not very politically inclined even though I started voting when I was 18 years of age because I happened to be in the army at that time. I very strongly resent the statements made by some hon. members on the government side that the opposition to this bill is entirely for political reasons. I do not believe that is so. It amazes me more than I

can tell you that 100 per cent of the Liberal members can vote for this bill. It is entirely beyond my understanding how they can support it.

I sometimes wonder from whom the minister is taking his orders. He is so extremely adamant in his support of his bill. We cannot change his mind at all. He will not listen to reason. He simply will not deviate one iota from the ideas that he set forth in the original draft of the bill. True, there have been a few small changes made, but they do not amount to very much. Many people are blaming the minister and only the minister. That is not the way I see it. The minister is merely the member of the government who is spearheading this legislation and trying to get the bill through parliament. He cannot do it without the support of every member of his party in the house and without the full support of the rest of the cabinet, including the Prime Minister. So, any blame that is placed on the minister must be placed equally on all the other ministers, the Prime Minister and every member of the Liberal party in the house.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Everyone?

Mr. Fane: Everyone. Nobody in that party voted against the bill at any time. I think it was the hon. member for Lambton West, who has just come into the chamber, who remarked that the committee did not assume political implications until the hon. member for Cape Breton South was made a member of the committee in my place. I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that from my observations the committee became political a long time before the hon. member for Cape Breton South was made a member of it. I had to give up my place on the committee not because I was too quiet or for any reason like that but because of commitments in other places which I had to carry out.

The biggest trouble this bill has encountered has resulted from its presentation by the minister. The minister has made statements which have had to be somewhat modified at times, but the first statement that got him into trouble was his explanation of unification. I should like to read the definition that the minister gave on December 7, 1966. He had said this before. I quote from page 37 of a copy of the speech the minister made in the house on December 7 last:

> Unification is the end objective of a logical and evolutionary progression.

What in the name of heaven does that mean? On page 59 of the same speech, the second paragraph, he made a statement which has probably got him into more trouble than his explanation of unification. He said:

> Although a unified personnel management system will be introduced, the separate units and elements of naval, field and air forces will continue to exist.

Now comes the important part:

> That is to say, while the barriers to movement of personnel between the forces will be removed, personnel in the combat forces will continue to be identified as sailors, soldiers and airmen until the force structure within the unified force is developed.

Isn't that a dandy?

• (5:10 p.m.)

> They will continue to be identified as sailors, soldiers and airmen until—

Note the "until"

> —the force structure within the unified force is developed.

A statement like that would get anybody into trouble. I wonder whether he read it before he made it in the House of Commons.

Those are the things that have caused trouble for this bill. In the defence committee on February 7 he changed his statements a little. I quote from page 440 of proceedings of the committee No. 14 where he said:

> When I refer to a unified force I refer to a single integrated service encompassing the naval, land, air and support units necessary to carry out its assigned roles and missions and operating under unified management and control.

What does that tell us? Not very much more. It makes one wonder just exactly what is going on in the mind of the government, in the mind of the Prime Minister and in the mind of the Minister of National Defence. Until today I have liked to think that the Associate Minister of National Defence was not quite in accord with everything that was going on. I had hopes for him. I would still have hopes for him if I were only able to go with him to Paris tomorrow as I had the opportunity of doing.

We have been briefed by a number of very able and noted former servicemen. We were briefed by a few who were still serving, such as Air Marshal Sharp, Air Marshal Reyno and Major General M. R. Dare, who is the deputy chief of reserves and a long time friend and associate of mine in whom I have great faith. We were also briefed by Brigadier Lawson, judge advocate general. A number of ex-officers who belong to the Tri-Service Identities Organization also appeared before us. We also had before us the chairman of the

committee on the maritime component of the Canadian defence forces, the president of the Naval Officers Associations of Canada, Mr. Wilson, and the president and vice president of the Ontario division of the Navy League of Canada. We were briefed also by the president of the Toronto branch of the Naval Officers' Associations of Canada.

I will list the very senior and experienced officers who have seen very responsible service in the past and briefed members of the committee. They were headed by Rear Admiral Brock, Rear Admiral Dillon, Rear Admiral Landymore, General Foulkes, Mr. Patrick, Lieutenant General Moncel, Air Marshal Annis, Air Vice Marshal Hendrick, Lieutenant General Fleury, General Allard, who is still serving as the chief of the defence staff, Vice Admiral Rayner, Air Marshal Curtis, Lieutenant General Guy Simonds, and Air Chief Marshal Miller. The majority of these people who are not serving now were against the total unification of Canada's armed services. They have the same attitude that I have, and it is not because we are old fogeys or are living in the past. These men are mostly young men who have just been retired before completing their normal term of service.

There are a number of things that I simply cannot understand. For example, how in the name of heaven are the Canadian armed forces going to operate with one rank structure? It is difficult to imagine a lieutenant colonel commanding a ship or an admiral being a lieutenant general. It is not so difficult for the air force to conform to the new rank structure because before their present rank structure they had army ranks and army uniforms.

The provision of a single uniform for Canada's defence forces seems to me to be a little out of line. No less a person than Admiral Lord Louis Mountbatten said the same thing as reported first in the Victoria *Colonist* of April 4, I believe, and in the Ottawa *Journal* of April 5. Incidentally, his letter was written to and published by the brother of the former chairman of the defence committee. The article reads as follows:

> Lord Louis, in the letter to Commodore Groos, said he hoped to clarify previous statements. He described himself as "an ardent advocate of unified command and integrated administration of the services".

I agree with that. It continues:

> But he wrote: "Unified command at the appropriate level is exercised by an officer from any one service, wearing his own uniform and using his own service rank assisted by an integrated staff who commands all units of the three services placed under his command.
>
> I firmly believe that the steps taken in the recent reorganization of the British services are on the right line.
>
> In the British organization care has been taken to preserve esprit de corps and morale and those traditions which help to maintain this in the services and fighting units.
>
> It has been accepted that to achieve this the three services must retain their uniforms and ranks with an identifiable professional head of their service. The idea of a single uniform and rank structure was also rejected as undesirable and unnecessary."
>
> The letter continues:
>
> "The general cut and colour of naval uniforms are internationally so well known that a sailor from any one country can readily be recognized as a sailor in any other country.
>
> Sailors the world over take great pride in this and so in their own services do soldiers and airmen."

• (5:20 p.m.)

I subscribe to that view very strongly, as I have said at other times in this house. My time is going quickly, unfortunately, but I wonder what the minister is trying to do to Canada's armed services. I wish he were here today to listen to what I have to say about him, because it is what I believe and what I have been told many times back on the prairies where people are credited with not showing too much interest in this debate.

In Alberta, the people say, "This man Hellyer, what about him?" He was a corporal and we know the record concerning two other corporals who had ambitions. Corporal Bonaparte took the name of Napoleon and as a result of his ambition he ruined the flower of France's manhood at the time he was running the affairs of that country. He jumped from a corporal to a field marshal. We also have the recent example of Corporal Schicklgruber who took the name of Hitler. He ruined Germany. He jumped from a corporal to commander in chief of the forces and ruler of the nation.

Today we have ex-Corporal Hellyer who is trying to do the same thing but he is trying to do it legally by having this bill approved by parliament. At this time may I read a little item from B. H. Liddell Hart's book, "The Other Side Of The Hill." The author sets forth the views of some of the German people about their leader, Hitler.

> He (Hitler) would not believe what he did not want to believe.

Is there not a parallel there with our minister? The author states that General Jodl had

come to the conclusion that a dictator, as a matter of psychological necessity, must never be reminded of his own errors in order to maintain his self-confidence, the ultimate source of his dictatorial force.

I should also like to quote a remark made by Grand Admiral Erich Raeder of the German navy in his book, "My Life." He said:

> To have a service ... dominated by an overburdened politician with no military accomplishments whatsoever, rankled.

I believe this statement describes our feeling toward the present Minister of National Defence. He is prone to making statements which he has to retract later. For example, he made the statement that Admiral Landymore, a gallant officer with a very notable war service, had been disloyal for 18 months before he was fired. If the minister found that this gallant officer was disloyal to Canada before he was fired he was very derelict in his duty in not having him courtmartialled and legally put out of his position rather than just thrown out because he did not agree with the minister's idea of unification of the armed forces. This goes for the 40 other noted, senior officers in the Canadian army, who were fired or forced to resign. The minister should show a great deal more respect for the advice of people who have served and unquestionably have the interests of Canada at heart.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Legault: Mr. Chairman, one of the remarkable things during this debate and during the proceedings of the committee was a constant uttering and re-uttering of hypothetical suggestions for and against the unification of the armed forces.

The hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Andras) has indicated that reports in the press were superficial and not serious.

The in-depth study of the report by Mr. Westell in the *Globe and Mail* reveals contradictory statements in their testimony by witnesses opposed to this legislation. I was most surprised to hear, in the defence committee, an Air Marshal condemn the CF-105 and later admit that he knew nothing about that airplane except what he had heard from others.

I think it is useless to continue arguing back and forth since the interpretation of the government supporters and the opposition is repetitive and time consuming. I think we are in a position to determine here the precise difference in policy between Liberals and Conservatives. Here, in this legislation, is a practical reform measure which is fully adapted to change and which would bring about an efficient state of affairs according to our means and our capacities.

On the other hand, we have a negative opposition favouring the status quo and deeply concerned if not buried in the past.

Major General Worthington, in his article published in the Ottawa *Journal* on April 4, stressed that point most eloquently, as well as the fact that we have to face our responsibilities today and tomorrow.

The reorganization of the Canadian armed forces into a single, flexible and effective service, which is what this bill means, was throughly explained by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer) last Monday.

In this connection, it must be borne in mind that members of our armed forces are recruited on a voluntary basis and not, like in many countries, on a compulsory basis.

Air Chief Marshal Miller said in his testimony, that the Canadian armed forces, judging by the country's potential, are the best, as compared to that of any other country. According to international statistics, in Canada, the period of military service is longer than anywhere else.

It is easy to understand, therefore, why the men in our armed forces are better trained than those of other nations.

The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) has often mentioned that the morale of the men is not what it should be. However, General Allard has given us the assurance that, at the present time, morale is good, as compared to what it was at certain times in the past.

The hon. member seems to forget the confusion which prevailed in 1963 when he was Minister of National Defence because no decision could be made to equip our weapons with nuclear warheads. This must have irritated servicemen who probably lost any confidence they had in the authorities, at that time.

[*English*]

We have to evolve, Mr. Chairman, and adapt ourselves continuously. It is regrettable that some have to maintain a musket mentality and refuse to recognize the facts and the necessity of the reorganization called unification, best defined as a single armed force which would be the most efficient and practical solution to the conditions of today and the projected requirements of tomorrow.

No longer do we see the army battle another army or the navy fight another navy or simple aerial combat between aircraft. Each one of these services is called upon to co-ordinate and inter-mix its operations. It is urgent that unification be completed so as to eliminate any possible or probable catastrophes because of lack of practical co-ordination.

• (5:30 p.m.)

A vivid example of this is the suggested glossary of words used commonly by all personnel. Errors have been made with regard to specific technical terms common to one service but interpreted differently as to their meaning by another service. This causes delays and often costly mistakes. An experience that I have been made aware lately involved a telegram sent by an army officer to an air force base. I quote the contents: "Please acknowledge receipt of wire". The recipient wireless operator at the air force base immediately forwarded the message to the supply depot of his station as the word "wire" indicated to him that it referred to materiel. Many other expressions in each service have to be made uniform for instant comprehension.

There is a lot of debate on the policies and philosophy of the Department of National Defence relevant to the various organizations in which we participate for the mutual protection of democratic countries. These commitments we shall honour. But experience has shown that other situations could arise which, in the best interest of all concerned, could quickly alter our responsibilities. We have to accept the possibility of other commitments and a readjustment of the present ones. A unified force, efficient and flexible, is the answer to all requirements.

Another of the most common suggestions made during the course of the hearings of the standing committee on the defence by some hon. members opposite and by a number of retired officers was to the effect that the unification program has adversely affected recruiting. I do not believe this to be the case, and there is very convincing evidence to support this belief.

First and foremost, recruiting and total strength figures have climbed steadily since last September throughout all the adverse publicity and criticism by those who oppose the government's program. This in itself is real evidence that the reaction of the men and women of this country to this progressive and imaginative program in no way resembles the picture painted by certain members of the opposition.

[Mr. Legault.]

On February 23 the Minister of National Defence stated before the defence committee, as reported at page 1571 of the minutes of evidence:

> It has been suggested that recruiting has been and will be affected by the introduction of a unified service. There is little, if any, evidence to support this contention. Recruiting for the calendar year 1966 was the highest it has been since 1963. I have been advised by the officers in charge of recruiting that they expect a modest increase once the unification bill has been passed.

Farther on in the same statement the minister went on to say:

> To the extent that recruiting has been affected by unification, it seems to be more directly related to the controversy that has arisen and the negative statements by a number of retired officers.

In 1966, Mr. Chairman, despite the public controversy and the reaffirmed intention of the government to proceed with unification, factors which according to hon. members opposite have hurt recruiting, the armed forces received over 900 more recruits than they did in 1965. I understand also that recruiting for the first quarter of 1967 is equally good even though complete figures are not yet available. This is convincing evidence indeed that the reorganization of the armed forces has in no way adversely affected recruiting.

In 1966 the re-engagement rates for the forces also showed a considerable increase over previous years. Air force re-engagements improved by 2 per cent to a re-engagement rate of 84.9 per cent, the army by 10 per cent to 84.4 per cent, and the navy by 10.4 per cent to 66.4 per cent. In his statement to the committee the minister noted that naval re-engagement rates are considerably higher than those in the United States or the United Kingdom. If one considers the reaction of the men and women of the forces to the integration-unification program as shown by the recruiting and re-engagement ratio, as some hon. members have suggested, then we must conclude that their reaction is most favourable.

It is important to note as well that enlistments are improving during a period when the armed forces are subject to extremely heavy losses because of factors quite removed from the forces themselves and the present reorganization. On April 1, 1965 the defence committee heard an excellent brief by Group Captain C. R. Knowles, the director of recruiting at Canadian forces headquarters. In

the course of his brief Group Captain Knowles stated:

> During the next two years some 24,000 serving personnel will be lost to the services through normal attrition—the largest part of them having reached retirement age.

I think it should be evident to all hon. members that not only during the past two years but at the present time the services are bound to undergo a tremendous loss of personnel who signed up at the beginning and during the course of world war II and are now reaching normal retirement age. I understand that this is commonly referred to by the military as the "war time hump" and that the greatest losses are occurring over the current span of years. I emphasize that these losses have nothing whatsoever to do with unification. They would have occurred in any case.

Another factor of considerable importance to armed forces recruiting is the employment situation in the Canadian economy. The particularly healthy state of the Canadian economy has resulted in an unprecedented demand for highly skilled, highly trained personnel. Anyone who has ever compared the salary of a fully trained pilot in the armed forces with that offered a pilot with similar training and experience by the civilian air lines can well appreciate the difficulties of retaining skilled personnel in the forces. The same situation exists in the case of electronic technicians and all the other skills which are required by a booming civilian economy.

The Minister of National Defence pointed out in the House of Commons on November 7, 1966, as reported at page 9650 of *Hansard*, that this problem is not unique to Canada. He said:

> Both the United States and the United Kingdom which are experiencing similar economic conditions have also been affected by manpower shortages. In January of this year the national board for prices and incomes in a report to the parliament of the United Kingdom noted that the British armed forces had had an over-all shortfall of 10 per cent in their recruiting target. The report went on to say:
>
> "In short, the services are facing a formidable problem in recruiting and retaining sufficient personnel and in their view (the services) the problem is likely to grow in the next few years".

Farther on the minister stated:

> On March 14, 1965 the New York *Times* reported that of the service men in the United States navy only one-fifth of those eligible were re-enlisting, and in addition primary recruiting had dropped drastically. In comparison, re-engagement rates for the Canadian forces reflect a healthy state of affairs . . .
>
> However, I repeat that there is no evidence to support the contention that recruiting and re-engagement rates are related to the policy of integration and unification. Our naval re-engagement rates are better than those of the United States and the United Kingdom.

I do not intend to suggest that there are not some people who have left or have not joined the services because of unification; I am sure there are. But I am equally sure that the contentions of some hon. members with regard to the effects of unification on recruiting and re-engagements are not valid. I am certain that conditions of service, pay, housing, promotions, career opportunities, and a job which he considers is worth while and in which he can take pride, often determine the average serviceman's decision to stay in the forces. All of these conditions have improved during the past few years as a direct or indirect result of the integration-unification program. These are the kind of factors which affect recruiting and morale.

• (5:40 p.m.)

In conclusion I remind hon. members that the chief of the defence staff, General Allard, told the defence committee that any postponement or delay in starting the final stage of the reorganization—unification—would have a serious effect on recruiting. No evidence or argument that we have yet heard in the house, in the committee or anywhere else has convinced me that unification should not be proceeded with immediately. On the contrary, from the point of view of recruiting, re-engagements and morale I believe the passage of Bill C-243 is most necessary.

Mr. Churchill: Would the hon. member permit a question? If recruiting is as good as he says it is would he explain why our navy is unable to man its ships and why our infantry battalions are seriously under strength?

Mr. Legault: I stated that recruiting has improved since 1966. I stated also that the depletion had been caused by what is called the wartime hump, with practically 24,000 members of the forces leaving because of reaching normal retirement age. I think this is self-explanatory.

Mr. Churchill: Would that include General Moncel?

Mr. MacRae: Mr. Chairman, I wish to enter this debate briefly because of my lifelong interest in the military forces of our country and because of my deep interest in the army especially. Before beginning I wish to digress for a moment. I trust, sir, that you will not

rule me out of order. I would like to congratulate those members of the government who have been promoted within the last day or two. I congratulate especially the very able former minister without portfolio, now Registrar General, the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George. I realize only too well that in our system of government the executive has become more powerful over the years and the legislative arm, in which we serve as members, has become of less import. It is vital for governments to have the best men and women that can be found. While I do not wish the ministers a long tenure of office, I wish them well.

As the Associate Minister of National Defence is in his seat I wish to thank him for the many courtesies he has extended to me. I do not think any member of this house writes more than I do to the associate minister, especially about matters dealing with the immense Canadian forces base at Gagetown. I appreciate the never failing courtesy and help in these matters that have been extended. Though I have not always received the hoped for solution, I know that the minister has always attempted to be helpful, and I thank him for that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacRae: I said that I would not be too lengthy but I wish to raise several important points. I have tried to approach the unification of our forces with an open mind. It distresses me that the whole development of this measure has proceeded as it has done. I am reasonably certain that many on the government side have grave misgivings about unification. No doubt a few members of my party to some extent agree with unification. Yet it seems to me we have been backed into a position where this has become an almost purely political matter on which the government has taken a fixed position and on which we have adopted a similar posture. I regret this. I have tried to approach this whole question with an open mind, as I said.

Though I believe that integration as originally conceived and implemented was an excellent objective for the minister and the government to have aimed for, from what I have read and heard in the sessions of the defence committee I have attended I am not convinced that we should proceed with unification at this time, certainly not with the haste with which the minister seems to be proceeding.

Among the many representations we have received have been some excellent ones from the Tri-Service Identities Organization, known as TRIO, for short. This body of men gave honourable service in wartime and having returned to civilian life are leaders in their communities across the nation. The position they have taken is not because of political preference. They are deeply concerned about this measure and they have made some excellent suggestions to us, as members of parliament. During my brief address I should like to put on record communication received yesterday from the Tri-Service Identities Organization. I shall comment on each point they make in their letter sent to every member of this house.

Their first point is:

> It is noteworthy that not one recently retired senior officer no longer having any attachment to the Department of Defence has supported the program which will be carried forward if Bill C-243 is enacted and everyone of any stature outside the services or government whose military opinion would command respect who has testified before the defence committee has expressed criticism or reservation on the proposed reorganization of the defence establishment.

I attended most of the sessions of the defence committee, either as a member of it when asked to do so by my leader or as an interested observer. The evidence of Air Chief Marshal Miller impressed me more than the evidence of any other officer who appeared there. By this I do not mean to detract from the evidence given by such able men as General Moncel, whom I have known since the war years, Admirals Rayner and Landymore, Air Marshal Annis and General Fleury and others. Their evidence was helpful and it was devastating to the principle of that which this house is asked to enact.

Air Chief Marshal Miller was until a few months ago the senior serving service officer in this country, a distinguished and brilliant officer. I now wish to quote from a *Globe and Mail* editorial of Wednesday, March 22. I bring this editorial to the attention of the committee because I feel it is so well written, and I should like to place a portion of it on the record. It stresses precisely the point I am raising.

• (5:50 p.m.)

> When Air Chief Marshal Frank Miller retired last July he did so quietly, without any comment about the differences over unification then roiling the armed forces. Until that point, as the first chief of the integrated defence staff, he had been Defence Minister Paul Hellyer's right hand man—how significantly so is indicated by the fact that he had been persuaded to stay three years past the normal retirement age of 55.
>
> The testimony which Air Chief Marshal Miller gave to the Commons defence committee this week

is, therefore, of peculiar importance, for it is the testimony of a man who had the regard of the minister, who personified integration, and who studiously observed the duty of an officer not to comment publicly on matters of public policy.

Air Chief Marshal Miller told the committee that unification, while it might well be the end result of integration, would not at present be timely; that more time was needed for the orderly development of the integration process.

One of my hon. friends has put on the record of the house the exact exchange as it took place in the committee, and the testimony given bears out what this editorial has to say.

"I felt that a lot of careful planning was necessary and probably time to educate people was required before the next step of unification." Implementation of the bill could seriously demoralize the forces if it were rushed; the loss of personnel so far had been bad for the forces—"some key men have left."

He said he saw no significant financial or military advantage in unification over integration.

Such testimony from such a man cannot fail to raise serious doubts in any thoughtful member of the committee—or of the public—about the wisdom of Mr. Hellyer's unswerving and headlong rush toward unification. It also raises again the question of what sort of communication has existed in the Defence Department. Air Chief Marshal Miller said he did not think any defence chiefs had advised that unification go ahead, but that the subject had been much discussed. Perhaps discussion and advice are sometimes two names for the same thing—which would suggest that the burden of discussion had been against unification.

I think the point is very clear. None of these knowledgeable senior serving officers, many of whom retired before the final decision to proceed with this measure was taken, support the legislation which is before us.

The second point raised in the letter from the Tri-Service Identities Organization to us is as follows:

Claims that other countries are following the Canadian example have not been substantiated. In fact government intentions as expressed in white papers on defence in the United Kingdom, France and New Zealand show no indication of emulating the Canadian plan which will be carried forward if the bill is enacted. Informed persons in both the U.S.A. and the United Kingdom, as evidenced by recent articles and statements, have indicated concern or disenchantment with the Canadian experiment.

I do not see any particular merit in being the first nation in the world to rush into unification. I think it would be much wiser for us to make haste slowly at this time, to secure one base before moving to another. No other nation in the world today is groping as Canada seems to be doing.

The third point raised in this letter is:

The effective strength of the forces is below 104,000 men or 20,000 under the strength at 31st March 1963. The original objective was to reduce the forces by approximately 10,000 men.

I did not disagree with this objective but I feel that the strength of our armed forces has now fallen to a dangerous level. The letter goes on:

Included in this excessive loss are not only many senior officers well in advance of retirement but also many officers in the rank of lieutenant colonel and colonel or equivalent in all three services. In the normal course they would have been available to fill appointments of greater responsibility, yet their retirement must restrict the selection for future leaders. This can have serious repercussions for the future if something is not done to check this exodus.

The fourth point raised in this letter is as follows:

There is evidence of concern over our capability to meet out military commitments as a result of the situation which has developed in the defence department in the last four years.

This, it seems to me, is a vital point for us to consider. It is true we are not one of the great powers of the world though some, including myself, like to think of Canada as being one of the middle powers. Though our population is only 20 million this nation has played a part far more important than might have been expected in the two great wars of the last half century and in the lesser wars which have been fought in Korea and elsewhere. It is significant that in 1914 when our population was only nine or ten million we sent almost 750,000 men and women to fight for democracy. Many of them are still with us including the honourable and gallant member for Winnipeg South Centre, the former defence minister, and others who defended this nation in the great battles such as Passchendaele and elsewhere. In the second great war this country put almost a million men and women into the armed forces. Our contribution in northwestern Europe, in Italy and in the Far East, including the tragic episode of Hong Kong, the service of our seamen on Canada's little ships on all the seas of the world, our valiant air force, all made a record far more impressive than might have been expected from a country of our population.

This being the case, our ability to fulfil our military commitments assumes a particular importance. It seems to me that the free nations of the world, and possibly some of those which are not free, have come to expect that when Canada undertakes to do certain things

it will do them. If the commitments we have undertaken cannot be fulfilled by a unified force we will have been placed in an almost untenable position. Yet this is the opinion, almost without exception, of the expert witnesses who appeared before the committee. I think immediately of General Moncel and of Air Chief Marshal Miller, to mention only two. They have told us that with a unified force it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to fulfil the commitments we have made to NATO, to NORAD and to the United Nations.

• (6:00 p.m.)

Mr. Chairman, may I call it six o'clock?

The Chairman: Order. It being six o'clock, in order that the house may proceed to the consideration of private members' business I do now leave the chair.

Progress reported.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Allard), Transport—possible elimination by the Quebec Central Railway of certain trains between Quebec and Sherbrooke; the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), Finance—drugs—inquiry as to removal of sales tax; the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. MacInnis), Historic Sites and Monuments—Louisbourg Fortress —return to work of men laid off.

The house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions, private bills and public bills.

Mr. McNulty: Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent may we stand notices of motions Nos. 145, 137 and 128 and proceed with notice of motion No. 201 in the name of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett)?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It has been requested that notices of motions numbered 145, 137 and 128 stand.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The house will now proceed to the consideration of notice of motion No. 201.

[Mr. MacRae.]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

GEOGRAPHICAL CO-ORDINATES RESPECTING BASE LINES

The house resumed, from Thursday, February 23, consideration of motion of Mr. Barnett:

> That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all notes and other communications exchanged between Canada and the United States of America since the enactment by Parliament on July 16, 1964, of the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act having to do with the issuance by the Governor in Council of one or more lists of geographical co-ordinates of points from which base lines may be determined in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

Mr. John R. Matheson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the motion of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett) with regard to notes and other communications exchanged between Canada and the United States of America since the enactment by parliament on July 16, 1964, of the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act I think it is useful, if I may, to refer to some of the authorities on this subject.

I should like to refer first to *Todd* on Parliamentary Government, volume 1, at page 358:

> In 1860 a motion in the English House of Commons for the production of a copy of a despatch received from abroad (upon a subject on which negotiations were pending) and before it had been answered, was successfully opposed by the Foreign Secretary (Lord John Russell) on the ground that "such a course would not only be contrary to precedent but contrary to every principle recognized by the constitution:" it "would be like inviting the House to dictate the answer."

Jumping to our own Canadian experience, on February 25, 1929, a member moved for a copy of all letters, cables, correspondence and other documents or agreements entered into by the Canadian government in connection with the Imperial Cable merger of 1928. The postmaster general, Mr. Veniot, asked for the motion to stand as the correspondence was of a private nature between the contracting parties, the different governments of Canada, England, Australia and New Zealand. He pointed out that until permission was received to place that correspondence on the table it could not be tabled.

On January 17, 1939, in the course of debate, not on a motion, the leader of the opposition, Mr. Manion, asked if it would be possible to have published the correspondence relating to the Munich crisis of September, 1938. The prime minister of the day, Mr.

Mackenzie King, replied that correspondence between governments, particularly where it relates to the possibility of war, is necessarily highly confidential and to make it public would require the consent of the governments concerned. So in that case the motion was denied.

Looking at more recent examples in this chamber I should like to refer to a motion for papers which was brought by the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) on the subject of the imposition of United States embargoes. On January 24, 1955, Mr. Diefenbaker asked the government of the day for a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents since May 1, 1954, which had passed between any department of the federal government and the government of the United States regarding the application or imposition by the government of the United States of embargoes, in whole or in part, against importation into the United States of Canadian farm products. The present Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) on behalf of the government, indicated that the motion concerned diplomatic correspondence with a former government and dealt with negotiations still in progress. Therefore he maintained that the information was privileged according to the well established practice of the house and that it would not be possible to bring it down at that particular time. The Leader of the Opposition asked that the matter be allowed to stand. The Speaker intervened and added that perhaps in the circumstances it would be better to have the motion dropped. The motion in fact was dropped.

Incidentally, on that same day the Leader of the Opposition also asked Mr. St. Laurent for a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents exchanged since the first day of May, 1954, between any department of government and the governments of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba relative to the South Saskatchewan dam and irrigation project. On that same day Mr. St. Laurent in replying pointed out that since other provinces were concerned this would involve the consent of all these parties.

Moving to the year 1956, we have a motion for the production of papers relating to the Passamaquoddy project and involving an economic feasibility survey. It was motion No. 70 by Mr. Brooks. He asked for everything that had passed between any department or officials of the federal government and the International Joint Commission, the government of the United States of America, and any other government or organization of individuals, relating to a survey or surveys of the economic feasibility of the development of the Passamaquoddy tidal power project. Again the reply was made by the present Prime Minister who referred to the usual rules of privilege regarding international communications. At page 3615 of *Hansard* for May 7, 1956, he is reported as follows:

• (6:10 p.m.)

—in so far as the correspondence with the United States government is concerned, naturally the consent of that government will have to be obtained. In so far as International Joint Commission correspondence is concerned, it has been customary to regard correspondence of this international agency as privileged in this house.

The motion was not debatable and a vote was not taken. Mr. Speaker then said:

This will have to be explored on other occasions. When the hon. member wishes to have his motion debatable he will put it on the order paper without an asterisk. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion subject to the remarks made by the minister?

By agreement the question was transferred for debate.

Let us then move to 1957 when a new administration was in power headed by the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker). On December 9 motion No. 45 moved by Mr. Hahn for a copy of the preliminary report entitled proposals for the hydroelectric development of the Columbia river system in Canada was answered on behalf of the government by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) who was at that time the acting minister of northern affairs and natural resources. He said, as reported at page 2083 of *Hansard* for that date:

Mr. Speaker, I must oppose this motion ... It is a departmental document of a type which is not normally tabled.

He referred to the fact that negotiations with the United States regarding the hydroelectric development of the Columbia river system were taking place and would likely continue for some time, and that it was not in the public interest that these documents be made public during the progress of those negotiations. Mr. Hahn continued to press the matter, at the conclusion of which Mr. Speaker said as reported at page 2084:

That is my recollection, that the document was not quoted except to identify it. This is not a debatable motion. The minister has explained his objection to complying with the order, and all that remains now is to dispose of the motion. Those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: Those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

The precedents to which I am referring relate in every case to correspondence between Canada and some outside agent or country.

Let me refer to *Hansard* for April 17, 1961, page 3704. On that day Motion No. 100 by Mr. Argue was answered by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill), then the minister of veterans affairs. Mr. Argue's motion was:

> For a copy of any contract, letter of intent, correspondence, or other documents exchanged between Eldorado Mining and Refining Limited and the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority since January 1, 1956, in relation to the purchasing of Canadian uranium concentrates by The United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority.

The then minister said in his concluding sentence that the motion could not be accepted. The Speaker then said:

> In view of the explanation made by the minister, what is the wish of the mover?

Mr. Argue withdrew the motion. It was dropped, the order was discharged and the motion was withdrawn.

On December 11, 1963 the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) brought a motion for papers in these words:

> That an order of the house do issue for a copy of a general assessment of the Battelle institute report to the Alaska international rail and highway commission—

It was motion No. 160. He also requested the recommendations to the United States Congress prepared by the economic division of the department of northern affairs dated May 26, 1961. The present Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Laing) replied in these terms:

> I can assure him that if the report which he asked for, dated 1961, were made public it would be accompanied by a series of calculations and recommendations to the government which would demarcate the government's bargaining position in any conclusions or agreements made with the United States government if we arrive at the position where such a mutual undertaking was in prospect.

The hon. member for Yukon responded in the way in which I invite the mover of the motion now before us to respond. The order was discharged and the motion was withdrawn.

There are many other precedents to which I could refer in respect of motions regarding

[Mr. Matheson.]

relations between Canada and other countries. We have built up certain traditions in this house regarding the publication of documents between Canada and provincial governments.

On March 26, 1961 Mr. Jones moved for a copy of letters and other documents between the federal and B.C. governments relating to Indian bands. The response was made by the present Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) who pointed out that while he was prepared to produce the existing correspondence with the government of British Columbia, in respect of correspondence with Indian bands the superintendent of Indian affairs acted as trustee for the Indians in these matters and the correspondence should not be produced unless the Indians agreed. In this case he brought another principle into play. We have heard about the principle in respect of a government or an agency such as atomic energy. We now have the principle in respect of interested parties, in this case the Indians.

On September 3, 1958 Mr. Benidickson moved for a copy of all correspondence since September 1, 1957 between the federal government and the province of Ontario in respect of sharing of costs of the roads to resources program. The motion was responded to by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton), then minister of northern affairs. He concluded by saying, as reported at page 4517 of *Hansard* for that day:

> It is impossible to table this correspondence while negotiations are going on because it would embarrass the governments concerned.

On February 2, 1959 the present Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Robichaud) moved for a copy of all documents exchanged between the federal government and the government of New Brunswick or the New Brunswick Electric Power Commission concerning the construction of the East Saint John thermal plant. The motion was allowed to stand since negotiations between the governments were still in progress and it would have been improper to produce the papers at that time.

There is a great deal of relevance to some of the precedents I have just cited, particularly when we consider that the motion of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni is for a copy of notes and other communications exchanged between Canada and the United States since July 16, 1964 in respect of lists of geographical co-ordinates or points from which base lines may be determined in accordance with the provisions of the act.

On January 18, 1961, the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge), a member of the party to which the hon. member for Comox-Alberni belongs, moved for a copy of all correspondence and documents exchanged between the department of northern affairs and national resources and the B.C. government regarding the development of hydro resources on the Columbia River. The minister speaking for the government at that time was the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale), who opposed production until negotiations with the United States were over and the agreement ratified. The motion was withdrawn.

On April 17, 1961, Mr. Argue moved for a copy of any contract or other documents—I will not go into the details—exchanged between Eldorado Mining and Refining Ltd. and the United Kingdom atomic energy authority since January 1, 1956. As I mentioned before, the then minister of veterans affairs, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill), felt that they could not be produced and in fact they were not produced.

• (6:20 p.m.)

While wishing to be co-operative, it is clear that there has been established in this house an important principle in this regard. To depart from this principle would occasion embarrassment to a government faithfully carrying out confidential negotiations with another country, a province or agency. For the foregoing reasons, Mr. Speaker, I very much regret that the government does not find it possible to accede to the hon. member's request.

Mr. Grant Deachman (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, just before I rose to speak I was listening to the words of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) and I noticed something very peculiar in the chamber. Finally it became apparent to me, after looking around, that the trouble was that we were not graced with the presence of a single Tory.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am in the house.

Mr. Deachman: I concluded, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps they were absolutely exhausted by their efforts to defend the country against unification. However, I am very happy to see that one at least has strayed into the chamber, namely, the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh). I see that the sap is rising again.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. Deachman: I would be delighted.

Mr. Howard: Does it matter whether or not the Tories are here?

Mr. Deachman: No. We miss them for the aesthetics of their presence more than anything else.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Deachman: Certainly.

Mr. McIntosh: I think the last question was asked because there is so much unanimity between the Liberals and the N.D.P. that it does not matter whether we oppose what the government are doing; the N.D.P. will support them anyway.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I think this might be a good time for me to remind hon. members that perhaps we ought to get back to the discussion of the motion before the house.

Mr. Deachman: I certainly agree with you, sir. The N.D.P. and those of us on this side of the house are interested in the House of Commons and we should return to the matter under discussion. I wish to review briefly what brought about the discussion on the production of papers in connection with the 12-mile fishing limit. Some changes are taking place in the fisheries of the world which need to be emphasized from time to time because they affect the livelihood of many Canadians. This question is important to our trade abroad. It is important to the future growth and development of Canadian trade and to the employment of people on both our coasts. Therefore I think it important to review some of these points for a moment or two.

When the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) spoke on February 9 last on this motion the argument he put forward was that the matter before the house was in reality a motion for the production of papers. He based his argument on that point. However, I want to go behind the motion to what gives rise to it. A matter of very grave interest gave rise to the motion of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett). It was my privilege last year, at the outset of this session when the estimates were brought down, to have the opportunity to chair the fisheries committee in its examination of the estimates. It was an exercise which I enjoyed

very much and from which I hope I have profited.

I entered the committee room with other hon. members knowing virtually nothing about Canada's fisheries and found myself the chairman of a group who were very expert in this field. There were hon. members from both sides of the house, representing coastal constituencies and constituencies with inland fisheries, who had long been accustomed to looking after the needs of fishermen and thinking in terms of the Canadian fisheries economy. It was a pleasure to me to have the opportunity of associating with them and to explore with the Department of Fisheries, the Fisheries Research Board and the minister the grave problems affecting not only the Canadian fisheries industry but the world food and world population situation. This makes our Canadian fisheries so important and it makes our discussion of the 12-mile limit very pertinent.

After its examination of the estimates the committee made four recommendations to the minister. We recommended that the efforts and research of the department be strengthened in these areas: first of all, coastal pollution and pollution of our inland waters; second, increased research and the development in particular of methods which would bring to commercial feasibility the artificial production and spawning of lobster on the east coast and salmon on the west coast. Our third recommendation concerned the policing of some of our subsidized fisheries programs and, fourth, we dealt with the incursion of foreign fishing fleets into Canadian waters, which is the subject at hand and about which we were considerably worried at that time.

The world situation in respect of food needs no elucidation in this house other than to say that the world population is exploding at an unprecedented rate and our capability of finding food for the population of the world is not meeting that expansion. Hence, people in countries are going to sea as they have never gone to sea before in an effort to find the food and the proteins necessary to feed their vastly expanding populations. This has given rise to a number of changes in the fishing industry. First of all, the United States itself, although a wealthy nation and capable of taking care of the food needs of its own people, has become an importer of fish and fish products to an increasing extent. This has provided for Canada an increasing U.S. market.

[Mr. Deachman.]

• (6:30 p.m.)

It is of particular interest that the expansion of the market in the U.S. has been characterized by a great expansion on the west coast, particularly in the state of California where much of the increase in the west coast fishery market is now being found. It is a fact that European fishing fleets, long accustomed to fishing off the Grand Banks and in the waters of the Canadian east coast, now find they are bringing an increasing amount of their catch back to the European market and less to the U.S. market which they have long served. So the European market is making increasing demands upon that particular fishery. These demands have extended to the extent that the fisheries of the east coast are beginning to reach a balance of production, and it will not be too long before the world's greatest ground fisheries will be in danger of over-fishing and measures of conservation will have to be applied.

On the west coast we are experiencing for the first time the sight of foreign vessels in considerable numbers fishing off that coast with massive fishing equipment the like of which the Canadians and Americans accustomed to fishing that coast have never seen. I speak particularly of the huge Russian fishing fleets which have moved in around the entrances to the Canadian coast to the south and north of the Queen Charlotte islands, and also of the Russian fisheries fishing off the Aleutians and down the coast of Alaska, in addition to the increase in the Japanese fisheries fishing off that coast. This has come about simply because of the need to find protein for the increasing population of those countries. It has come about also as a part of the increasing technology of those countries and their capability of engaging in a major fishery based on huge equipment and done upon a very scientific basis.

It is this innovation on the west coast, at a time when our own ground fishery is increasing, that frightens the people of that area in respect of their fisheries, and of the future of their fisheries, if methods cannot be found and agreements cannot be reached to protect these great inland fisheries from being fished out by foreign fleets hungry for proteins for their starving and undernourished peoples.

We have other reasons for being interested in the growth of the ground fisheries, the protection of which is associated with the establishment of a 12-mile limit. We are accustomed on the west coast to the salmon

fishery which is fished only when the runs are on, and this comes over a very short period of time. Then the canneries operate for a very short period of time, and when that is finished the man who is engaged, either in fishing salmon at sea or in the cannery, finds his work done. If it were not for other kinds of fish and other methods of fishing on the west coast the fishing industry there would be a very ephemeral and seasonal occupation indeed. But it has been because of the development of the ground fishery that the fishing season and the use of vessels and canneries have been spread out to occupy a much longer period during the year and to make of the fisheries on the west coast a much more stable industry.

This has meant that the fishing industry has had to get into business with much heavier equipment, with boats 60, 70 and 80 feet in length, vessels costing upward of $100,000, $200,000 and $300,000, and equipment and gear which is very expensive to operate and which must be amortized over a considerable period of time, and as the result of a very stable fishery. It has also meant that the old fashioned fishery, which was an old wooden shed with very little equipment in it, has been modernized into the most modern plants that you will see in Canada involved in the packaging and processing of food. It has meant that these plants are engaged in much more work in the course of a year, to process the fish brought in by trawlers which are now working on the ground fisheries off the coast of northern British Columbia and in the Pacific coastal waters.

There is a further development which is of interest to us as Canadians. One plant on the west coast has now a subsidiary operating in California. This subsidiary is receiving frozen fish blocks which are used for cutting up into fish sticks and portions, which it is packaging and selling in the U.S. market. So we are not only expanding a Canadian industry but we are engaging in the development of a foreign trade and establishing plants in the United States. I think the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Gordon) would be delighted if he could hear this explanation of the very reverse of what he considers to be American imperialism in Canadian industry. This is more a case of Canadian imperialism in the United States, and it is very desirable from the standpoint of the west coast industry.

All this means that the fishery on the west coast, which once provided only a portion of the livelihood of people, has now become a very stable industry, not only at sea but on land and in the export trade, one that is capable of employing an increasing number of people and engaging a larger segment of the economy. Therefore it is essential, and becomes increasingly so, that this kind of fishery be well protected. There are several ways in which this can be achieved. One way of course is in the development of treaties and arrangements with regard to conservation between the United States and ourselves, and any others who may fish in these waters both on the west and the east coast, to see that we do not fish out these fisheries; because if we cannot conserve them, not only will they be of no good to us but they will be of no good to the rest of the world which relies on these fisheries for the food they so badly need.

The second point I want to drive home is that these fisheries are an off-shore resource of the Canadian people, and to whatever extent possible we as a nation should do what is in our power to protect this resource for our own people as a source of employment for them, and as a source of the future development of our own markets abroad.

• (6:40 p.m.)

We do not object, as Canadians, to the historic fisheries that have been developed in the waters off our shores over periods of hundreds of years, since the discovery of this continent. However, I believe there must be a recognition of the fact that we have some rights in these waters, and in the fisheries which we have taken the trouble to conserve and for which we have developed markets. It is important that we be aggressive as Canadian people in establishing the 12-mile limit and in protecting the bays of our offshore waters which are necessary to the conservation of these fisheries.

I cannot therefore be too forceful in urging upon the government and upon the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Robichaud), who I understand at this moment is in Russia discussing this question, amongst others, with his counterpart in the Russian government, the need to reach an agreement with the operators of the world's major fisheries on behalf of the Canadian people. In the last little while the United States has been successful in negotiating a 12-mile limit for Alaskan waters. They have had to make some concessions in order to achieve this. They have had to give the Russians a concession which enables them to come into Alaskan ports for food, for ship repairs and the like.

Of course, this kind of concession enables the Russian fleet to maintain itself offshore and engage in extensive fishing beyond the 12-mile limit for a longer period of time. This represents a considerable concession the United States had to make in order to establish this limit. We, to date, have not been too badly put upon by the massive fleets which the Russians are able to bring to bear on these fisheries. We have had a taste of this on the west coast, so that we know the initial, exploratory work in our ground fishery has been done by these foreign fleets. A serious problem is shaping up for us in the future, if we do not rest on top of it.

In closing, therefore, I want to say that I am glad to see this motion on the order paper because of the opportunity it provides to discuss this serious matter and emphasize to the government of the day, which I am proud to support, that this is a serious matter for those of us who live on the coast. We hope that the efforts of the minister, when he is in Russia, will be fruitful and that he will continue to impress upon the Russians, as well as our United States neighbours, who are tough customers to deal with on the subject of fishing in Canadian waters, that these Canadian resources should be used for the Canadian people.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Barnett: I hoped the hon. member would allow me time to pose one question.

Mr. Speaker: Is there agreement?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Barnett: Arising out of the report the hon. member gave us of the activities of the Minister of Fisheries during his visit to Russia, I want to ask if he can tell us whether the minister has been discussing the establishment of base line co-ordinates with the Soviet authorities?

Mr. Deachman: Like Will Rogers, I only know what I read in the newspapers. All I saw to that effect was that he was discussing this question when he was in Russia.

Mr. Andrew Chatwood (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this motion because of the vital importance of the subject to fishermen and because of my particular interest both in the geographical co-ordinates and the 12-mile limit. The question, I believe, is whether it is desirable to make public the notes and communications requested, and also if it is possible or proper, in light of the rules governing diplomatic correspondence, to produce these documents and letters exchanged between one government and another while negotiations are still continuing.

I should like in a moment to come back to a discussion of whether or not it is proper, and I do not believe it is. First of all, I should like to deal with the question of whether it is desirable to produce these papers. It would seem, Mr. Speaker, that by producing them at this time there would be an adverse effect on the negotiations taking place with other nations with regard to the establishment of the 12-mile limit. The 12-mile limit and the establishment of the co-ordinates are of vital importance. One hears now of cases of foreign draggers coming into our inshore waters and ruining the gear of our shore fishermen. This results of course in damage to the gear and a loss of catch. The continued activities of these draggers is resulting in a reduction in the amount of fish being taken by the shore fishermen, so there is an adverse effect on their living. The continued expansion of these foreign fleets and the methods they use for taking the fish have resulted in a reduction in the catch of our Canadian draggers who are operating farther out. We must look also at the fact that the world relies on the sea for food. We must therefore maintain the fish we have in the ocean, to maintain the world food supply. The control we would have through the establishment of these limits as a result of negotiations with other countries would be of utmost importance, both in establishing where these operations should take place, and in establishing the type of fish that should be taken.

We hear of cases where certain of these draggers using new systems are taking fish of all types, keeping the type they want and throwing the others overboard. This means that there are dead fish floating around which could have been used. Negotiations between the various countries would assist in both controlling the fishery and in ensuring that it will continue.

This excessive dragging in certain inshore areas has resulted in a reduction in the catch of the shore fishermen. This reduction has occurred for two reasons. In the first place, these large draggers from other countries are taking an excessive amount of fish, with the consequent reduction in catch for our fishermen. There has been a reduction in catch also as a result of the fact they have disturbed the

area in which spawning takes place. The fact these operations have moved inshore has reduced the amount of fish in these areas and has forced our shore fishermen to move farther out. They have been forced to use larger boats and heavier gear. At the same time, the trawlers move through these areas and cause damage to the gear, as I mentioned before, and this has a serious effect.

The desire to establish a limit is not new, but it is of vital importance that we should have it. It is also important that we should discuss with other countries the appropriate limit we should have, so that it can be recognized by those countries which are fishing near our shores.

• (6:50 p.m.)

Some of the limits that have been set were set early in the 1900's. Norway declared her limit of four miles in 1906. In 1907 Argentina declared a limit of 12 miles; in 1909 Spain declared a limit of 6 miles; in 1912 Italy declared a limit of 7 miles; and in 1914 Greece declared a limit of 6 miles. Colombia declared a limit of 12 miles, Ecuador 15 miles, Korea 50 to 60 miles, the Dominican Republic 12 miles, El Salvador 200 miles, Cambodia 12 miles, India 100 miles and Ceylon 100 miles. These limits have already been declared by these countries.

However, I think we all realize that declaring a limit without the agreement of other countries who might want to fish off shore is not satisfactory. It would take a tremendous number of patrol boats to patrol a limit of, as is the case with some countries, 100 or 200 miles, and in view of this ineffective patrolling the limit could not be enforced.

Talking of our present limits and regulations, by agreement and by regulation the Department of Fisheries is doing an excellent job of patrolling both with the use of patrol boats and planes. I feel that this effort on their part would be improved if the limit were increased, and we had the agreement of other nations to such extension.

The effect of a limit on our fishery shows the importance of any bill to make this provision. It must be established here whether this production of papers would serve the purpose of protecting our fishermen and our fishery. It appears to me that the production of these documents would have an adverse effect upon the implementation of the base lines and of a 12-mile limit. It is necessary to make this provision under international law, and we must make sure that other countries obey such a limit.

In 1947 the United Nations set up the international law commission. Ten years later that commission, after a very exhaustive study of every aspect, presented a report covering this whole topic. In 1957 the United Nations called for a conference to be held in Geneva in 1958, and the conference was held in February through to April of that year, 86 nations attending. Progress was made. They did not make as much progress on this limit as we would have wished, but effective discussions were held. These discussions between the nations are what will make effective the provision of a 12-mile limit and the setting of base line co-ordinates.

If we do something at this point which will disrupt the negotiations we are having with the United States and other nations, the effect would be to set back the discussions we have already had and the possibility of bringing in the 12-mile limit within a short period of time. This would result in a further spate of discussions, which would set off to a later date still the setting of a limit.

These limits are of vital importance to the continuation of the fishery both on the west coast and on the east coast, where larger ships of other nations are moving in. Russian fleets have lately started to move in. The Soviet Union has developed even larger and more modern vessels, and their techniques are such that they are able to net a larger amount of fish than some of our traditional fishing neighbours who come from long distances across the sea. The Portuguese have been fishing off our east coast for some 500 years; and some of our American neighbours to the south have been coming into what are Canadian waters and taking what are the resources of Canada for many years.

When the limit is brought in we will have to recognize, at least for a limited time, some of the traditional rights of these countries. However, it is desirable—indeed, it is a requirement—that we gradually withdraw some of these rights, particularly in the case of vessels which are coming closer in to the shore.

The fishery on the east coast has been carried on almost since the time the continent was discovered. When the first settlers located along the coast of Newfoundland in the early 1500's they started to fish. Other crews came out from Europe to fish, and then returned at the end of the fishing season.

From that date, Mr. Speaker, the fishing industry has grown each year, although we have had the occasional bad year. It is now

undergoing, especially on the east coast, a tremendous change in that new methods are being adopted in an effort to modernize the industry and assist the fishermen to obtain larger catches of fish as well as to market better products. At the same time the value of these efforts is being lessened by the fact that foreign draggers are operating offshore and closer inshore than they should, which both reduces the amount of fish available to be fished and hurts the grounds where the fish breed and spawn.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we must move as quickly as possible to bring in the 12-mile limit and control the method of fishing this area. If we were to produce these papers and disrupt the present negotiations, all progress would be hindered and virtually stopped. So I suggest that the papers requested should not be produced, because of the adverse effect this would have on the industry.

The fishing industry is divided into many parts—the shore fishery, the fishery from longliners and the fishery by trawler. The amount of fish taken from the shore has been increasing as the fishermen have improved their methods. Other methods of fishing have also improved. The amount of fish that the trawlers and larger ships, particularly the ships of other nations, are able to take has increased to a far greater extent and, as I have already mentioned, an adverse effect on our fishery.

In order to protect our fishermen, then, I suggest that we should not produce these papers at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have to bring to the attention of hon. members that the time allotted for the consideration of private members business has now expired.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask whether the sitting of the house could be suspended for an hour for dinner.

Moreover, if members are agreeable, I am prepared to move an order similar to the one we had for the last number of weeks, providing for the suspension of our sittings from seven to eight o'clock on Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays, and from one to two o'clock on Fridays. If the house wishes I will put the motion in that form.

• (7:00 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Chatwood.]

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I move:

That on April 6, 1967, and until the end of the present session the sitting of the house shall be suspended from 7:00 o'clock p.m. to 8:00 o'clock p.m. on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Thursdays, and from 1:00 o'clock p.m. to 2:00 o'clock p.m. on Fridays.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, the special committee on procedure has made its report as set out in *Votes and Proceedings* of March 20. It recommends that standing order 6 be provisionally amended for the next session of parliament, that on Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays, except when private members business is to be considered in any such sittings, the sittings of the house shall be suspended from 6 o'clock p.m. until 8 o'clock p.m., and where private members business is to be considered the interruption would be from 7 o'clock p.m. until 8 o'clock p.m.; and that on any day on which a morning sitting is held—the next day being tomorrow, Friday—the sitting of the house shall be suspended from 1 o'clock p.m. until 2.30 o'clock p.m.

I felt, considering the unanimous agreement of the special committee, that for the balance of this session we might adopt these recommendations and put them into practice. I feel that a little good will by the government in this respect would do a great deal toward expediting the business of the house. If the government feels it must put pressure on this house, then of course we shall have to abide by what it does, and conduct ourselves accordingly.

Mr. McIlraith: We thought we were removing pressure. I of course would be happy if the report of the committee could be adopted immediately. I am sure if it were adopted now, I certainly would be prepared to move that the new rules come into effect for the balance of this session.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McIlraith: They could be made applicable for the remainder of the session.

Mr. Starr: My congenial friend, the government house leader, is trying to put another stumbling block in the way of the matter under discussion. I feel there is no need to adopt the report at this time; that should be done at the proper time. The government has asked that the second report stand, on a number of occasions when it has been called by Your Honour. That has been their initiative. The motion now before us could have been drafted on the basis of the special committee's recommendation.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Starr: On division.

Motion agreed to.

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

AMALGAMATION OF ARMY, NAVY AND AIR FORCE

The house resumed consideration in committee of Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof—Mr. Hellyer—Mr. Ethier in the chair.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Ethier): Pursuant to order made when Mr. Speaker was in the chair the committee stands suspended until eight o'clock.

SITTING SUSPENDED

SITTING RESUMED

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

The Deputy Chairman: When the committee rose at six o'clock, clause 2 was under consideration.

Mr. MacRae: Before continuing my brief remarks on this clause may I say, sir, that we are all very happy to see you back in the chair, after your brief absence. I trust you are restored to complete health.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacRae: As a basis for my remarks on this subject I was using a letter received from the Tri-Service Identities Organization by all members of parliament a few days ago. The point in the letter to which I was addressing my remarks was the fourth, which reads as follows:

> There is evidence of concern over our capability to meet our military commitments as a result of the situation which has developed in the Defence Department in the last four years.

When the able and distinguished former senior officers were before us, I took occasion, as did many other members of the committee, to ask General Foulkes, General Moncel and others whether they believed that if the forces of this country were unified we could discharge the commitments we have made to NATO, to NORAD and to the United Nations. Every one of these military leaders stressed the point that they did not believe we could fulfil our present obligations under unification. I will admit that the Minister of National Defence did not agree with this, and he said so on several occasions, once in answer to a question I put to him. However, the evidence is there, for the record, in the committee reports. The able officers who gave evidence before the committee did not agree with the minister on that point.

Next I should like to place on record the fifth and sixth paragraphs of this letter, which are related.

> (5) Expenditures on equipment for the five years ending the 31st March, 1968 will not match the spending for the five years ending the 31st March, 1963 despite claims that the reorganization is to make more money available for equipment.
>
> (6) It is admitted that the steps in the reorganization which will be possible under Bill C-243 will not lead to savings of any account. Thus, if any savings are possible, it will be as a result of those steps taken since 1964 under the authority of Bill C-90. Bill C-243 having been categorized as permissive, the wisdom of proceeding at this time would seem to be questionable if economies are not to be effected and in face of the widespread criticism which the department's program is encountering.

One of the arguments in favour of unification which appealed to a great many people in this country is that a considerable proportion of our military budget could be saved each year if unification were carried out. This would be a valid argument, if it were true. But it would appear from the evidence placed before the committee which examined this bill that such is not the case. As this letter points out, there will not be as much money available for equipment in the next five years as there was in the past, and the economies which have been effected up to this stage have resulted from integration, not from unification. Again I would suggest that there is very little opposition either in this house, in the country as a whole or in the armed forces themselves to the principle of integration: It is unification which is disturbing all of us.

The seventh paragraph is one in which I am deeply interested and reads as follows:

> It has been admitted that morale should be improved. Many service personnel are deeply disturbed by the uncertainty which now exists for a service career and are unwilling to accept the reorganization as they now see it. Nothing should be done to aggravate this situation.

In my discussions with servicemen as I travel back and forth across the eastern part of this country I have found that a great many are deeply disturbed about what is happening, although there are, of course, some who are not giving the matter much thought.

Recently I was talking to a young helicopter pilot who was travelling from Halifax to Toronto. His feeling was that a great many key personnel were simply waiting to see what would happen, and that if this bill were to become law there could very well be a considerable exodus of key personnel from the armed forces. This would be tragic, especially when we have lost so many capable men already.

Paragraphs eight and nine of the letter read as follows:

(8) It seems remarkable that the critics of the reorganization have been variously categorized as emotional, unprogressive, unreasonable, disloyal, obstructionist, destructive, politically motivated or without responsibility. Do none of the extensive body of Canadians who hold opinions contrary to those of the minister of defence do so by reason of knowledge, capability, experience, conviction, concern or sincerity? Surely the calibre of some of the witnesses who have appeared before the defence committee dictates a high degree of credibility for their views and in no way justifies any discounting of their evidence and opinions.

(9) Overwhelming support for the reorganization program does not exist amongst Canadians generally. Thus the latest Gallup poll showed less than 50 per cent of Canadians support it. Observing that this poll was taken before the defence committee started its hearings, and before so much cogent evidence was presented by so many knowledgeable persons against the plans and policies as presently disclosed, would certainly permit the conclusion that even fewer Canadians support the program now than six weeks ago.

That is indeed an interesting observation. Finally:

(10) The military merit of the proposed reorganization has not been established in the light of our declared military commitments at least to the satisfaction of experienced ex-senior officers who appeared before the committee.

In summary I submit that no legislation has been presented to you during the long session now drawing to a close which has less justification or foundation for enactment than Bill C-243 as it is now written. While it is possible that amendments may be made to make the bill acceptable, these would have to go to the root of the legislation, namely section 2, and provide for the continuance of the navy, army and air force, the identities of which will be abolished under the present proposals. As this would in effect nullify much of what is now proposed, on balance the prudent and proper course would be to shelve the proposed bill and thereby the program which will be made possible thereunder pending further examination of all aspects of our defence.

I dealt with this aspect earlier in my address.

• (8:10 p.m.)

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say again that I think a great many officers and men in the services believe integration is a good thing. It has had beneficial results, but two or three years are required for it to shake down before it will have its full effect. Undoubtedly it will be beneficial. It has proven to be beneficial up to this point, but I believe, as I feel a great many Canadians do, that we should now proceed with caution. This particular bill at this time should stand, let us say, six months or a year, at which time it might be raised again when the feelings of opposition perhaps have lessened, when worries have been quietened, and when there is more evidence to show that unification is a step which we should take in respect of the whole organization of the armed forces of this country.

[Mr. MacRae.]

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding that this debate, if debate it is, was supposed to be a discussion of the bringing up to date of Canada's armed forces in the world which we face in the late 1960's and early 1970's. We are supposed to be debating a program to bring Canada's armed forces into line so that they will be able to deal with the new technology with which our forces are equipped, and with which they are to be equipped. This means, Mr. Chairman, that when we are debating this subject we should be debating the form we want the army, the air and naval forces to take, and what we want them to do. It means that our judgment must be on the basis of efficiency and effectiveness, because armed forces are expensive.

Unification, as I understand it, implies the merging of administrative and support functions, command functions, command responsibility, personnel management, supply services, pay services, recruitment and training. To me it means taking a three dimensional look at our armed forces, and the world in which we must use them. The last time I participated in this debate on this subject I said that to me defence is only a function of foreign policy, and therefore we should take a look at our foreign policy to see what policies we intend to follow in order to determine what kind of force we require to fulfil those policies.

Yesterday the Secretary of State for External Affairs gave us a most interesting tour of the world, as it appears to him. He underlined the assumptions and attitudes the Canadian government is taking in determining the function that the armed forces would perform as a result of this particular bill. In going over his speech, I find that he seemed to make three points. First, he said we were in NORAD to defend North America, because

this is the collective way to do it, and that the United States is a pillar upon which all western security has been based since the second world war. Furthermore he intimated that one of the reasons France was withdrawing from the NATO alliance was that France was not willing to assume that the United States would stand up to protect her any longer.

The second point he made is that NATO now is basically a political alliance, whereas in its beginning it had been basically a military alliance designed to protect both Europe and North America from sudden attack from Russia. Things are changing. The NATO alliance itself now is in danger of breaking up, since the withdrawal of France and the subsequent moving of NATO headquarters to Brussels. The minister pointed out that it is necessary for all countries concerned with NATO to re-examine their position to see whether it is necessary to maintain the alliance under the present circumstances.

The third function which Canada has performed in a military way is that of participation in United Nations peace keeping operations in Cyprus and on the Israel-U.A.R. border. In addition it has provided observers on the frontiers of Israel, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon and Kashmir. Canada also participates in the International Supervisory Commission in Indo China, although this function of course does not come under the United Nations jurisdiction.

This is the basis for our foreign policy as the minister outlined it. It indicates a shifting role for Canada in its foreign affairs and in the role our military forces should play in order to take their full part. In other words, we seem to be moving away from what could be described as a static position or a holding operation to a position where our forces would be mobile and capable of moving quickly to trouble spots wherever they may be, and wherever our forces may be required.

I should like to remind hon. gentlemen that since the second world war we have had some 40 odd bushfires, small wars, which have broken out. It is this type of operation which I believe will require the participation of the smaller nations, such as Canada, which do not have any great interest in founding an empire, if you like, or in furthering their own national goals. We are able to go in as detached observers, and we have had fairly good results in this field.

There have been a number of arguments raised against unification. I think that basically they resolve into two arguments of substance. The first and most difficult to attack is the argument that we are going too far too fast. It is difficult for those of us in the House of Commons who are not experts in these fields to determine whether or not we indeed are going too far too fast. However, whether we should use this argument as a means to impede progress is another matter. My own feeling is that the argument, that we are going too far too fast, is the argument used by Conservatives when they wish to stop movements which are progressive in nature. In other words, this is the natural Conservative reaction to a progressive proposal. I would suggest to those newspaper reporters and editors who have said that there is no Conservative party in Canada that the defence debate we are having here is a perfect example of this, in the way they are putting forward the argument "too far too fast".

The Deputy Chairman: Is the hon. member rising on a question of privilege?

Mr. Clancy: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the hon. member how old he is.

Mr. Reid: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can tell the hon. member for Yorkton that my age is 30 and I hold the position at the present time of being the youngest member in the House of Commons.

Mr. Clancy: I feel sorry for you.

Mr. Reid: The other argument which has been put forward is that of emotion. I think there is some sentimental attachment, if you like, to the idea that our forces should remain in the way we find them at any given time. I am not one of those who are particularly attached to the past although I must confess that before coming to this house I made my living as an exploiter of the past while serving as a professor of history. I do think there are times when change must come. Change involves a certain amount of risk.

No one here to my knowledge ever has admitted that he is perfect. Mere men will make mistakes. Whether the mistakes we will make in bringing forth a unified armed forces are greater than the mistakes we would make by maintaining our forces in the static form in which they now are, I leave for you to judge. My own personal opinion is that we must move; we must unify our armed forces; we must bring them up to date and we must make them truly effective. I believe that to

unify is to provide our armed forces with the means to be effective and to take advantage of the new weapons systems which are increasingly becoming available, and that to unify is to take a realistic look at the world.

Mr. Churchill: Does the hon. member mind answering a question at this stage?

Mr. Reid: Not at all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Churchill: I am very much interested in this first class debate which is taking place. I should like to ask the hon. member in what way unification will increase the effectiveness of our armed forces.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Mr. Reid: I was going to refer to this particular point and perhaps this would be as good a time as any to do so. I have in my hand the last issue of the *Atlantic Monthly* in which appeared an article entitled "How the Pentagon Works" by Adam Yarmokinsky. He deals with the changes that have taken place in pentagon bureaucracy as a result of the activity of Mr. McNamara and the order he has imposed upon the chaos that existed there.

Mr. Lambert: That was not unification.

Mr. Reid: I agree that was not unification, but I want to point out that one of the things going on here is substantially the same, namely the reorganization of the upper command structure. The author states that by the mere apportionment of funds one can bring down the conflict that exists between various forces when there have been substantial changes. He says:

> That this apportionment of funds sometimes had more to do with the relative needs and ambitions of the military services than with the requirements of United States foreign policy was an unhappy but unavoidable consequence of this way of doing business.

They made the changes but they called them something other than unification. In point of fact I believe that streamlining of command function such as is taking place and has taken place will lead to considerable savings.

Mr. Herridge: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Reid: Certainly.

Mr. Herridge: Has he heard anyone in the opposition suggest that the organization of our armed forces should remain static? Are we not all in favour of integration?

[Mr. Reid.]

Mr. Reid: That is a very interesting argument in semantics. Nobody yet has been able to define the difference between unification and integration.

An hon. Member: Not even the minister.

Mr. Reid: The minister in his most recent speeches has said that, so far as he is concerned, they are one and the same thing; that integration and unification are the same, and you can call it what you will. Whatever you call it, this is part of a cycle during which there will be a transformation of the armed forces over a period of eight years. Perhaps that fact alone will lessen the confusion more than anything else.

Mr. Churchill: Would the hon. member answer another question?

Mr. Reid: Certainly.

Mr. Churchill: I think it rather improves the hon. member's speech when we ask questions from time to time. As a good young representative of Canada at the age of 30, is the hon. member in favour of striking out on Canadian policy, rather than bringing in McNamara policy from the United States? Has the hon. member consulted Walter Gordon in this regard?

Mr. Reid: I am one of those who does not care where a good idea originates. I will not turn one down because of its parentage.

Let me return to what I was saying. I should like to make two or three additional points in respect of what I think is really taking place during this debate. There are a variety of issues at stake which have not come to the surface as yet. There is a struggle going on between the armed forces bureaucracy, if you will, and civilian control. Who is going to run things and who is going to say what equipment should be bought or how deployment should be effected? That is one aspect of the matter.

The whole contest between these opponents has occurred in respect of the concept of unification. This is the point about which the hard battle is being fought. The members of the command structure, the retired senior officers, have been called upon to form the ranks of this new army within an army. They have fought a very impressive battle. Had they not done this I am sure the debate would have been over and done with long ago.

There is also a struggle going on within the armed forces between the senior and junior

serving officers. General Worthington is reported in the Ottawa *Journal* of yesterday as having said that those senior officers who remained with the forces after the last war should have been released as soon as the war ended, in order that command could have been turned over to the young fighting colonels. There is a contest taking place between these two groups of men, one which is looking backwards to make their plans, while the other, I hope solidly in command, is familiar with the use of new weapons, technology and computers, if I may use that word in this house. They are familiar with the new way of doing things.

Mr. Churchill: These are very helpful on the battlefield.

Mr. Reid: This certainly has caused the serving officers some difficulty because they do not find compatible this attitude in national defence headquarters. In my own personal opinon this is perhaps one of those struggles which takes place between generations from time to time and I cannot really sympathize with the older fellows who are losing out.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask another question?

Mr. Reid: Certainly, sir.

Mr. Churchill: I am interested in the reliance the hon. member places on the words of General Worthington. I am a great admirer of that gentleman, who was the father of the armoured corps. I served with him at Camp Borden and I always felt he should have commanded a division in the second world war, because of his skill in directing troops and because of his fighting attributes. Why does my young friend place such reliance on General Worthington's words? He is no longer a young man. How old is he now?

Mr. Winch: Eighty eight.

Mr. Churchill: Why does the hon. member not rely on others like General Moncel, who is about 47, and other retired officers who are about 50 or 51 years of age? Because of my own age I will not refer to myself. I know the hon. gentleman has already relegated me to the ash pile.

Mr. Reid: First of all, I think it is only fair to say I do not like to make a difference between generations simply because of age. One has to accept good ideas wherever he finds them. General Worthington admits that he is one of those who should have been turned out after the second world war, so that command could have been turned over to the fighting colonels who actually fought the battles.

• (8:30 p.m.)

My last comments are in relation to the opposition claim that because no other country has adopted unification Canada should not adopt it. I am rather proud that Canada is taking a lead in this area. I think it is commendable, and we should do more of this type of thing. I think we have not done so because of an almost built-in inferiority complex. We are making an experiment in this regard. We are trying to look at the world through new eyes. We are trying to reorganize ourselves so that we may cope effectively in this area.

The other arguments put forward by members of the opposition are rather negative. The fact is that very few other countries have the same problems as Canada, and very few other countries want to play the same type of role that we want to play, as was outlined yesterday by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I think it is a fine thing that we should be willing to take on a fairly risky role as a peacemaker. I think it is a fine thing that we should go ahead and produce the forces required to make our participation in that kind of role an effective one. To my knowledge that is the only argument that can be made to the type of negative proposals put forward by the opposition.

The last thing I should like to say, Mr. Chairman, is that when the hon. member for Edmonton West spoke on Monday last he said that government members were committed by their vote on second reading. He went on to say, as reported at page 14441 of *Hansard*:

> And, may I say, so are the members of the opposition.

As I understand the rules of the house, this debate is a perversion of the rules, because it seems to me that after the vote on second reading has been taken, the principle itself is no longer under debate in the house. What should be the concern of members of the house is to go through this complicated bill in detail and check the various provisions in it, to ensure that the principle is being rightly and truly carried out to the fullest extent. I think that with this debate on clause 2 of the bill the opposition are guilty of short-circuiting or perverting the rules of the house. I suggest that if the opposition were really concerned about the armed forces, they would pass clause 2 as quickly as possible, or force a vote to show their opposition to the principle of the bill, and get on with the business of the

house. The provisions of the bill are certainly complicated and far-reaching, and I think the country, the house and the armed forces would be better served if this were done.

Mr. Lambert: A dear boy in a rush.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the hon. member a question. I listened to him with a great deal of interest. Actually, I have two questions. First, with regard to the principle of the bill no longer being under discussion because of the decision on second reading, I would point out that I received a letter from a professor—I think this will arouse some interest in the hon. member's mind because it is a case of one professor speaking to another—on that very question. He asked: Is parliament right in determining, on second reading when the decision is made, that the principle of the bill has been decided? Would it not be sounder, and was it not really the original intention that the passing of the bill on second reading is only a declaration that the bill is acceptable in form and should then be considered in detail by the committee of the whole house or a special committee?

That is an interesting thought, rather than that on second reading we are settling the principle of the bill.

Mr. Reid: It is an interesting thought, Mr. Chairman, but it is not the way I read the rules of the house, nor do I think it is the way other hon. members read the rules of the house. My interpretation of the rules is that when you have given a bill second reading, the principle has been decided, and having decided the principle one then got down to discussing the details of the bill, to ensure that the principles were carried out to the fullest extent.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member a further question. I wonder whether the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River raised that particular thesis with the minister, and whether he examined the minister's opening speech in connection with the very idealistic theory that he has just propounded. If he had examined the minister's speech I think he would have seen that there is contained in it a whole history of integration and justification for the principle of the bill. The minister spoke for 50 minutes on integration, and less than 10 minutes on unification. Therefore, perhaps the hon. member would care to suggest to the minister, "Physician, heal thyself."

[Mr. Reid.]

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I have just one other question for the hon. member. I think we are making this an interesting evening for him. The hon. member was talking about the number of brush fires that have occurred since the end of the second world war and said that our forces should be prepared to move quickly to trouble spots. Is the hon. member advocating the use of the proposed unified force for peace restoring, and what would be his definition of peace restoring? The phrase was used by the minister in his speech of December 7, which I hope the hon. member has read, and it has been used by other people since. What does the hon. member understand to be the meaning of peace restoring, and how would he use our forces?

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I think it is a case where we would not go barging in unilaterally. It is a case where we would go in if we were invited by both sides, such as was the case with Cyprus, for example. We would really be providing a buffer. I do not think it is for us to go around playing the policeman, the way the United States is apparently trying to do in various parts of the world.

The point I am trying to make is that peace keeping, to my mind, means that when two countries happen to get into difficulty and require a buffer, we should be ready to provide that buffer at a moment's notice. Like politicians, countries often get into troubles that they regret later, and they look for a face-saving way of getting out of them. I think Canada can contribute in this way.

Mr. Churchill: The hon. member is qualified for the post of secretary of state for external affairs, because he has done exactly what the minister did yesterday. I asked the minister about peace restoring, and he transformed it into peace keeping and gave me a completely different answer from what I expected from him. The hon. member has done exactly the same thing.

Mr. Reid: It would seem to me that peace restoring would be a situation where you barged in unilaterally. Peace keeping would be a situation where you attempted to keep the parties apart and allowed time for the healing graces to work. I cannot see Canada, under any circumstances in the world, barging in unasked by both parties and trying unilaterally to settle an international incident.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether I would be permitted to ask the hon. member a question. I have followed very

closely what he has said, and what he did say intrigues me. Has the hon. member forgotten that when Bill C-243 was introduced in the house, the members of this party and the official opposition, because of voting on the principle on second reading, pleaded with the government to send the bill, before second reading, to the defence committee for clarification and explanation and so we could hear evidence in respect of this question. We were denied the right, by those of the government benches, to have the bill go to the defence committee before the vote on second reading. Because of the denial of the right to have the bill go to the committee before second reading, when it came to second reading we in this party said we would vote for second reading but only on the basis of the bill then going to the committee for clarification, explanation and to find out what the goal is in this respect.

• (8:40 p.m.)

We voted that way to get the bill to the committee. Now how can the hon. member say that we have accepted it in principle in view of what the official opposition and our party have tried to do before second reading, which was denied us by the government? How can he make such allegations when the government refused us that right?

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, there is an easy explanation for this. First of it all it seems to me that the hon. member for Vancouver East is propounding a novel constitutional doctrine in this house. It is the government's responsibility to put forward its point on policy, to force it to a vote in the House of Commons and to accept the responsibility in accordance with the decision of the house. In this case the government did accept its responsibility. What the hon. member would like us to do is to send bills to committees before they are accepted in principle in the house, and therefore to debate the principle in committee. This may be right or wrong, but the fact of the matter is that the tradition, the custom and the way in which this house operates is to have the house decide on the principle and then send the bill to committee for discussion of its various aspects to ensure that the principle is carried out adequately.

Mr. Winch: If my hon. friend is saying that we have never sent a bill to the committee before second reading, then he should check and see what in fact has happened.

Mr. Reid: I am not saying that, because I remember that in 1964 a bill on transportation was sent to the committee for investigation of a particular aspect upon which the government had not reached a decision. In the case now before us the government had made up its mind, had decided to risk a vote in the House of Commons, and had accepted its responsibility. If integration or unification, call it what you will, does not work out in the way in which the minister says it will, then the government may fall. However, the point is that we do have a system of responsible government. If something goes wrong, the people of Canada will know where to point. It seems to me that the hon. member cannot ask for anything better than that.

Mr. Winch: Heads will fall at the next election.

The Chairman: The time allotted to the hon. member has expired.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Chairman, although I have not had the privilege of being a member of the committee dealing with this important subject I must confess at the outset that this is the third time I have participated in the debate. First I participated at the resolution stage. I did so again at second reading, and I am doing so now as we proceed toward third reading. I do so because I am becoming increasingly amazed at the government's tactics as they proceed from stage to stage in dealing with this particular piece of legislation. There is an old saying that what matters is not what you do but the way in which you do it.

As I have followed the deliberations in the committee and the discussions during the current third reading stage I have been amazed at the government's, and in particular the minister's, persistence in trying to bulldoze the legislation before us through the house, regardless of the evidence that was produced in the recent deliberations of the committee and regardless of the very sound arguments that have been propounded in the course of the debate at the present time, arguments which are largely gleaned from the voluminous committee reports which prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that there is a creditibility gap in what the minister has been presenting with reference to the present discussion.

Not so long ago the minister was being hailed across the nation as a miracle worker in reorganizing Canada's armed forces. The press in general, with minor exceptions, was loud in its praise of the manner in which the

new minister was proceeding to accelerate the process of integration which has been going on in Canada for the past ten years. I know the suggestion has been put forward in this debate that this is an idea which has emerged from the new Liberal government and from the minister himself, but anyone who has been in touch with military affairs not only in this country but in other nations as well knows that every modern nation has been endeavouring to reorganize its armed forces on the basis of the integration principle, that is integration at the command level.

Having proceeded successfully thus far I am amazed to find the minister, seemingly supported at this stage by his very capable public relations service which up until recent times has been able to steer the press in the right direction, destroying his reputation, and permitting his reputation to be tarnished by a bullheaded approach to a policy which can only result in the destruction of our defence potential in carrying out our obligations and our various international commitments. This is an argument put forward not only by a stubborn opposition; it is an argument which has been put forward by men who were in key positions less than a year ago and who had the responsibility of carrying out the integration program.

The present government's stance is also being criticized to an increasing extent by the members of the fourth estate. One of the newspapers which has been most critical is one which has been known as the voice of Liberalism on the prairies, namely the Winnipeg *Free Press*. Since this debate started they have once again been thundering editorially against the nihilistic, destructive program of the government with reference to its decision to go the ultimate degree in destroying Canada's defence potential. Indeed the latest editorial in the Winnipeg *Free Press*, which appeared on April 4, is headed "Destroying Defence". I should like to read one pertinent paragraph which sums up in the proverbial nutshell the case we have been trying to make. Of course I take this on my own responsibility. It reads as follows:

> This revolutionary gamble and experiment is being foisted on Canada in face of the strongest possible protest by nearly every experienced admiral, general and air marshal in the country. If this step could simply be classed as a further blunder by an accident-prone government, and could be corrected when its faults became clearly apparent, the country could perhaps afford to go along for the ride. When it is realized, however, that Mr. Hellyer is playing with an annual investment of some $1.6 billion which vitally concerns the defence structure of the nation and involves our international obligations, the magnitude of this error becomes obvious.

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

That is the voice of Liberalism in mid-western Canada, the Winnipeg *Free Press*.

• (8:50 p.m.)

There is a sense of shock, too, that the government, in our centennial year, should be proceeding with a policy that is so destructive of our traditions. We had hoped that this session would have been concluded before Easter, and that we could have proceeded with a new session known as the centennial session, when we could have taken under consideration more positive and beneficial programs for this nation. Instead, the decision has been made, notwithstanding everything that has been said by the opposition, by the press and by military authorities, to press on regardless of this tradition destroying process.

It is little wonder that one of the distinguished members of the press gallery who has just completed a centennial survey of the nation endeavouring to get the pulse by visiting every capital, by talking to each of our provincial premiers—I refer to Mr. Peter Newman—summed up his series by saying he found that Canada was suffering from neuroses. How could it be otherwise, when you have a government which deliberately creates a situation of division that seems to be based on the old Pavlovian psychological technique of blowing hot and cold to such an extent that not only is the government confused but they have confused the whole nation. The centennial commissioner, John Fisher—I have heard him on this theme many times—constantly urges Canadians to get off the psychiatrist's couch, to move forward on positive lines, to think in terms of things that hold us together, to emphasize those things which unite us rather than those things which divide us.

The approach of the government toward the bill now before us almost reflects the spirit of anarchy that is abroad in the world today. Now, admittedly, as I listened to the minister make his lengthy statement in opening this phase of the debate on Monday, there was a change in his attitude and his tone. His arrogance was subdued. The tendency to describe members of the opposition as ignoramuses, because they did not agree with his viewpoint, was also subdued somewhat. I think perhaps this was more the result of the recent press criticism that has arisen rather than any criticism that has come from this highest court of public opinion. The press has been criticial of the minister's unbending,

stubborn, arrogant attitude on this matter. Not even the skill of his public relations apparatus has been able to smother this growing press protest. Of course, there are still some of the gentlemen in the press gallery who are dependent upon handouts from the efficient public relations machine for their information.

The myths have been destroyed. The myths that gave the initial program such unusual momentum and which resulted in the accolades from across the nation, and also outside the nation, have now been destroyed. There was the myth, for example, that the opposition was merely an admiral's revolt; it was a case of the government resisting a revolt of the military against the civilian, and so forth. As we had speculated at an earlier stage of the debate, there must be something radically wrong with the morale in the defence department when up to 40 of the top level military personnel are either forced to resign or are fired because of disagreement with and disillusionment from the approach of the minister. The myth that had made such a strong appeal to the public of Canada, to the ordinary citizen, that the policy contemplated in Bill No. C-243 was going to mean greater efficiency and greater economy has also, to use an air force phrase, now been shot down in flames. As the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre and the hon. member for Calgary North have pointed out in presenting detailed statistics, rather than resulting in greater economy it is going to result in greater expenditures.

The associate minister presented statistics today which pointed out minor savings in certain areas of the armed forces. However, he did not mention that it has cost the defence department $22.7 million for re-enlistment bonuses in order to preserve the level of recruitment even at the declining level at which it has been operating over the past two or three years. Of course, the over-all increased cost of defence expenditures has been mentioned several times.

Now, I mentioned the growing credibility gap. This is a $60 phrase for a procedure that has become all too common in public information services today of using techniques of propaganda in order to confuse the public. It is sometimes referred to as hidden persuasion. I am not going to go into this aspect of the debate this evening, but certainly it is misleading if it is not downright dishonest. There certainly has been confusion in the country and obviously there has been confusion even in the government ranks. The hon. member who just resumed his seat said nobody was able to distinguish between the terms integration and unification, and I am sure that includes the minister if one can judge from the comments he has made. In his speech the other afternoon, the minister used an interesting phrase which I think is revealing. He referred to the integration-unification cycle. I was reminded of the motto we used to have in our air force mess, "Those who go round in circles shall be known as big wheels."

There has been a cyclical approach in the attitude toward integration and unification and no one, let alone the minister, has endeavoured to give a clear definition of the two terms. The one aspect of unification that is being opposed by the official opposition is the ministerial decision that he is going to bring about a single service situation in Canada's defence forces; he is going to abolish the separate entities of the navy, army and air force. This is the one fundamental point that we are opposing at this particular time. In the course of my remarks, I shall give reasons for my own particular opposition.

The tragedy is that the minister himself, in the somewhat subdued approach he made in his speech on Monday, has confessed that the bill is unnecessary to do the things that are required under a so-called integration program. He merely wants the carte blanche permission of this house and approval of this parliament to proceed to that ultimate step which the voice of Liberalism on the prairies has referred to as destructive of our Canadian armed forces, as we know them at the present time.

I should just like to read the ministers's own statement as reported at page 14438 of *Hansard* for last Monday. He said:

> It is true that many more benefits could still be obtained from the integration process minus legislation to create a single service.

So he admits, Mr. Chairman, that this bill is unnecessary. This is the measure that is holding up progress of business at the present time. This is the major issue which is making it impossible for this house to proceed to more constructive and positive business. This is the one item that is making it impossible for this parliament to conclude an interminably long session so that we might get into the centennial session. If I may continue with the minister's confession, he went on:

• (9:00 p.m.)

> It is true that much of the continuation of the integration process could be completed without this bill.

We could not agree with him more, Mr. Chairman; that is the argument we are making. He goes on:

> It is equally true, and I want to make this point as forcefully as I can, that there are some problems which cannot be solved, there are some questions which cannot be answered, until we know the intention of parliament in respect of this bill and whether or not the ultimate goal is a single service.

What about the people of Canada? What about the opposition which has grown across Canada by leaps and bounds in recent weeks? What about the comments of the men who, as a result of long service in the armed forces of this nation, have acquired experience and have staked their reputations and sacrificed their careers in opposition to this unnecessary, authoritarian approach to carrying the program of unification toward a single service, thereby placing our whole defence structure in jeopardy?

As I say, Mr. Chairman, this is beyond comprehension on the part of anybody who understands the parliamentary process. Why does the minister not quit while he is still ahead? Why does he persist in ramming this bill through the house. It seems to me that his colleagues, realizing the situation that is being created and the negative reaction that has set in, might take some action themselves. Perhaps while the minister is away the associate minister, as suggested by the house leader of the official opposition earlier today, might seize the opportunity to do those things that were recommended by the committee and to establish a reasonable basis of compromise put forward in the form of amendments in committee thus making it possible for this house to proceed to other business.

The government have been guilty of poor management. The members of the official opposition used to be criticized when they were the government for not being able to organize the business of the house. Goodness knows, Mr. Chairman, when this session is going to conclude; and I see that the government house leader has come into the chamber just at the critical point.

I understand that when the new ministers who were appointed yesterday were having their pictures taken, the Prime Minister made the observation that although they looked very healthy and vigorous at that time, perhaps they should have their picture taken six months hence, when they will be in a condition of utter exhaustion. If the government is in utter exhaustion they have only themselves to blame, by assisting in a disorderly approach to the business of this house.

So much for the Minister of National Defence. The other aspect I should like to deal with is the essential reason why we oppose the single service idea. I am even more surprised at the attitude taken by the minister of external affairs, as displayed in his contribution to the debate yesterday. The criticism that has been levelled by the military authorities, who resigned or were fired as a result of their protests, has simply been, as I understand it, that this reorganization carried to the ultimate—the "redundant ultimate", to paraphrase the phrase of the Minister of National Defence—is placing Canada in the position where it can no longer defend itself adequately. Second, it places Canada in a position where it will not be able to meet its international obligations.

There were even difficulties, Mr. Chairman, with the speed with which the original integration program was carried out. I have talked to some of the military personnel, and they told me this was one of the major reasons for growing unease on the part of the men who at the time were carrying out the integration program from within the armed forces structure. There was no difficulty in reorganizing the command structure at headquarters, and this was long overdue.

The second phase was a little more difficult, and this was reorganization in the field. The reason it was more difficult than it might otherwise have been was because no guide lines were laid down. The order was merely given to reorganize, to integrate; and hopeless confusion resulted in the field at military bases across the country because the officers commanding in the field had not been properly briefed.

It is ridiculous for the present defenders of the ultimate policy to say that the men serving in the armed forces are happy, or that the commanders in the field responsible for carrying out the confused policy that was referred to by the previous speaker from Kenora-Rainy River have had these terms defined for them, at least up to the present moment. Anybody who visits military bases will understand the degree of confusion that exists and its resultant disenchantment with this policy.

I should like to mention one base I know, the joint air training centre at Rivers, Manitoba. This is the only integrated base up to the present time. The state of confusion, anxiety and unrest there is such that the

minister himself had to make a personal visit to talk to the men in the mess, and not only the serving men, but also the townspeople. Incidentally, they were led by the Liberal member of the Manitoba legislature, Mr. Earl Dawson, in their protest at the lack of definition and clarity as to the ultimate function of the Rivers joint air training centre. This same gentleman, speaking recently from the opposition benches in the Manitoba legislature, carried this theme one step further and was highly critical of the current policies of his Liberal friends in the House of Commons at Ottawa.

• (9:10 p.m.)

I wish to deal with two main points, the first being the rapid acceleration referred to again by the minister in his speech. To be factual perhaps I had better give the chapter and verse reference. At one point in his speech, on page 14433 of *Hansard*, when referring to carrying out this process of reorganization, the minister said this:

> In the process of designing the headquarters organization the staff soon found they could not complete the design until they knew what the field formations would look like and what the command structure would be. The second stage was therefore accelerated. I should like to underline this.

It was at this point that the disenchantment of the chief of the defence staff and all the subordinates around him grew to such an extent that they began to protest. As they protested they were fired, or they resigned prematurely. This was the basic reason for the grand exodus, which amounted to a purge, usually seen only in totalitarian countries. I do not think anything like that has been seen in any other democratic country of the western world.

Not only were those people uneasy, because it placed field operations in such a state of confusion that nobody knew what he was doing, but they felt that this integration-unification cycle, to use the minister's words, amounted to everybody going around in tight circles with nobody knowing where he was heading.

My second point, which I wish to raise before my time expires, is this. This evidence notwithstanding, the Secretary of State for External Affairs fully defended the unwise policy of his colleague, the Minister of National Defence. In spite of criticisms which showed that the present rate of acceleration and the ultimate goal of unification would make it obviously and practically impossible for us to carry out our commitments to NATO, NORAD or even to the United Nations for that matter, he blandly asserted that government policy was unchanged, that we should be able to meet our commitments. He said this in the face of all sorts of evidence by specialists to the contrary. How does that fit in with the reorganization—

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Rinfret): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member to inform him that his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Rinfret): Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Dinsdale: Thank you. I shall not trespass on the generosity of the committee, other than to complete the points I have been making about our international commitments.

I was about to ask, how does the Secretary of State for External Affairs know what our NATO commitments, for example, will be? NATO is in a process of a radical change and transition. It is reaching for a new strategy, and it is utterly impossible at this stage to determine what the ultimate Canadian commitments might be. The necessity for proceeding with this legislation which, as the defence minister said, is unnecessary, becomes all the more difficult to understand.

Finally, the position of our friends in the N.D.P. with respect to our international commitments underlines the credibility gap which now exists. The hon. member for Greenwood has said that the unified force would only operate successfully if Canada withdraws from her international obligations in organizations such as NATO and NORAD. This was confirmed in the committee by General Moncel. Here is a group in the house that is taking its position in opposition, in this debate, on the basis of a situation which absolutely refutes the stand that has been taken by the Minister of National Defence and the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, I say that the important criterion in our armed forces, if they are to maintain the standard of excellence achieved up to the present point, is to maintain unity of purpose and strong, positive motivation. This can be done only by keeping alive that esprit de corps which made it possible for Canadians to stand at Vimy Ridge. It

has been said several times that what happened there laid the foundations for our nationhood, as we understand it, and we commemorate that occasion in this our centennial year.

Canada's reputation as a nation and influence in the council of nations, has largely been established by the sacrifices of the men and women to be commemorated by the ceremonies which will take place at Vimy during the next few days. You can have technological change until you are blue in the face; you can talk about programming—I think the minister must have taken a course in management or business administration because he thinks he can run the armed forces as one can run a house construction firm—but you must have esprit de corps and traditions. It is past understanding why the government persists on its confused course, disrupting the business of this house and disrupting the spirit of unity during our centennial year. Hence our continued strong opposition to this present bill.

Mr. Faulkner: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make some brief remarks, and touch on one or two points which have come out in the debate so far.

The hon. member for Oxford pointed out this afternoon quite rightly that economics is not the sole criteria. Indeed, economics probably is not even the determining factor in a decision on the bill before us. Economics nevertheless is an important factor; it is relevant. It is a factor which, in my view, has been subject to some confusion.

It has been suggested or intimated that the process of integration and unification does not lead to appreciable savings. I should like to deal with some of the factors involved, in making an assessment of this point.

• (9:20 p.m.)

No doubt if one examines the expenditures of the Department of National Defence for the fiscal year 1961-62, comparing them with the fiscal year 1967-68, he could certainly conclude that defence today is costing Canada more than it cost in 1961-62. Such a statement can only be made if certain relevant factors are ignored, for example the fact that dollars do not remain constant over a six-year period. Such a statement can only be made if we forget or ignore the fact that the cost of sophisticated military equipment has increased tremendously over the past five years; it can only be made if we turn a blind eye to the percentage of the total budget which is devoted to defence, or if we ignore the fact that a new system of reflecting increased pension costs has been included in the defence budget. Such a statement can only be made if one neglects to consider the increases in civilian and military salaries over the past six years. Those who ignore these factors are evading the truth and creating a false impression with regard to savings and expenditures.

I should like to emphasize that in the period 1964-65 through to 1966-67 considerable savings were in fact achieved even though the factors which I have just mentioned are ignored. Hon. members should consider for a few moments the effects of inflation upon a relatively constant budget over a six year period.

Mr. Churchill: That is an admission.

Mr. Faulkner: The Dominion Bureau of Statistics has reported that the price index in connection with expenditures in the government sector of the economy rose from 110.3 in 1961 to an estimated 135.4 in 1966—the 1966 figure is based on a nine months period and contains an element of projection. The base year for these figures is 1957, with the index at 100. Now the defence budget for 1967-68, namely $1,688 million, would amount to only $1,375 million in terms of 1961-62 dollars, which is some $251 million less than the actual expenditure in 1961-62. On the other hand, in terms of 1966 dollars the defence expenditure for 1961-62, namely $1,626,104,000, would amount to more than $2 billion.

Perhaps some hon. gentlemen opposite—and this is obviously the case—do not appreciate the relevance of the comparison. But this is not a hypothetical or academic argument. Any statement to the effect that more money or less is being spent today than was spent in some previous year can only be made on a fair basis of comparison, and purchasing power as reflected in the price index is the only reasonable basis for such comparison.

Again it is hardly reasonable to suggest that the government is spending more on defence today than it did previously, when the percentage of the total government budget devoted to the Department of National Defence has declined considerably in the past four years. In 1963-64 the percentage allotted to defence amounted to 24.5; today, the departmental budget amounts to about 14 per cent. Ten years ago, 6 per cent of Canada's gross national product was allocated for defence. Today the percentage is 2.7.

Another factor of importance is that commencing in 1963-64 it has been necessary for the defence department to assume the cost of actuarial adjustments to the military pension fund arising out of pay increases. Prior to 1963-64, these expenditures were recorded by the Department of Finance in the government balance sheet. In the period 1963-64 to 1966-67, these actuarial adjustments have increased total expenditures by the defence department to the extent of approximately $179 million. When this additional expenditure is taken into account it can be seen that defence expenditures from 1963-64 to 1966-67 are all considerably lower than they were in 1961-62.

Hon. members shoud bear in mind, I think, that when the minister forecast savings as a result of integration at the time of the initiation of the program he stated it was his intention to hold defence expenditure at a relatively constant level over a ten year period, and not to reduce it. The savings resulting from the elimination of duplication, and even triplication, within the sphere of overhead and maintenance cost and the application of modern management principles and techniques to certain areas of the services, particularly the support elements, would be devoted to the purchase of new equipment. This has been done. If hon. members are in need of proof of the over-all savings which have been achieved so far, I suggest they consider the percentage of the defence budget which is now being applied to the purchase of new equipment.

Mr. Churchill: Twelve per cent.

Mr. Faulkner: The amount of the budget available in 1964 for new equipment was 42.90 per cent. This percentage declined steadily until it reached 13.6 per cent in 1964. Until the present government took over, there were no plans to change this situation; in fact, if no adjustment or reorganization had been carried out there would not be a single dollar available for the purchase of new equipment in this year's estimates.

Mr. Churchill: Nonsense.

Mr. Faulkner: The downtrend was reversed, however, and in the 1967-68 estimates, 17.5 per cent is allotted for this purpose.

I should like to turn briefly to the question of an increase in the 1967-68 estimates. The blue book indicates an increase of $116 million over last year's figures. Some hon. members opposite, in particular the hon. member for Northumberland, have charged that this is an indication of the failure of the entire reorganization program. I have been informed by officials of the department, and this is borne out by work of my own, that this increase is made up as follows: $49 million for increased military pay and allowances; $8 million for increased civilian salaries and wages and $59 million for consequent increases in government contributions to the Canadian forces superannuation fund. These three increases total exactly $116 million—the precise amount of the increase compared with last year. When we consider this in the light of the fact that there is an increase of 2.4 per cent in the funds available for the purchase of new equipment, it becomes obvious that not only has the line been held but that again this year considerable savings have been achieved in operating and maintenance costs.

Despite all the factors which I have mentioned and which might have increased the defence budget, costs have been reduced and the line has been held. I think there should be no doubt whatsoever that considerable savings indeed have been achieved. There is no question but that the minister already has achieved what he promised in 1964—efficiency and greater savings in the Canadian Armed Forces. This is a point which has been disputed. I do not think, however, if one views the developments in the light of all the facts rather than by taking a selection of the facts that the statement I just have made can be contested.

The other point with which I should like to deal relates to the contribution made by the hon. member for Greenwood yesterday or the day before, and by his alter ego in the defence strategy field, Mr. Gellner. The hon. member for Greenwood was very critical of the role that the Canadian Armed Forces are required to play in NATO. Arguing largely with the views expressed by Mr. Gellner, the hon. member for Greenwood questioned the acceptability or the contemporary quality of the modern NATO strategy both in terms of the type of war we might expect in Europe, or lack of war, and the strategy of deterrence. He questioned the role of the CF-104 in Europe and also I believe the role of the brigade group.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Much of the argument presented by the hon. member for Greenwood makes some sense. I for one would be extremely worried as a member on the back benches of this government if I did not feel confident that our role in NATO is indeed under constant review. The suggestion by the hon. member

for Greenwood, however, was that regardless of the position of the alliance and regardless of the position of our allies, what we should do is take arbitrary and unilateral action on our own part to decide ourselves what our role in Europe should be and then, I suppose, present it to our allies as a fait accompli.

It would seem to me that one of the fundamental conditions of a partnership in any form of alliance is that questions involving the long term strategy and the role of individual members of that alliance should not be questions which are decided by individual members unilaterally or arbitrarily. If alliances are to have any meaning, such subjects as these must be negotiated collectively. It may make for good rhetoric, it may be a popular position to take, and it may have all the attributes of a courageous, independent stand to say that we should develop an individual position here—a unique position, a Canadian position—and that our allies should adapt themselves to our concept of what our role will be, but this is the position which the leader of the French republic has taken and we know what the result has been. This seems to be the approach the hon. member for Greenwood is advocating.

Mr. Schreyer: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member permit a question.

Mr. Faulkner: Yes.

Mr. Schreyer: Is he saying that the hon. member for Greenwood has advocated a unilateral action on our part with regard to our commitment vis-à-vis NATO, because as I understand it my colleague, the hon. member for Greenwood, on several occasions has stated that the policy of the Canadian government should be to put to our NATO allies what we consider to be a desirable role. I believe the hon. member for Greenwood has refuted the idea of unilateral action.

Mr. Faulkner: There may be a question of semantics involved here, because in his concluding remarks at page 14449 of *Hansard* the hon. member for Greenwood made this point:

> In conclusion I would say to the minister that even at this late date it is time to use some imagination; it is time to use something in the nature of a stirring appeal to the people of Canada. Only a truly Canadian defence policy can obtain the support for which the minister asks in relation to his plans for unification.

Although that statement is not directly relevant, it is relevant in part. My interpretation of the remarks of the hon. member for Greenwood is that the Canadian position should be—as it actually is—determined by ourselves, but that his approach seems to have the overtures of a rather self-centred or unilateral position. I do not know whether the hon. member for Greenwood would support a position of withdrawal, assuming he could not persuade our allies. If I have mistated the position of the hon. member for Greenwood, I submit that at least for my benefit he should clarify his position, although it may be presumptuous of me to say this.

This brings me to the final point I should like to make in respect of the position taken by the hon. member for Greenwood and I can only assume also by the group of which he is a member. It relates to this line which appears at page 14449 of *Hansard*:

> Only a truly Canadian defence policy can obtain the support for which the minister asks in relation to his plans for unification.

My interpretation of that is that the position of the hon. member for Greenwood is that unless the Minister of National Defence and the Secretary of State for External Affairs are prepared to accede to the position—which I think is an untenable position and one which is inconsistent with the position of a member of the alliance—which we are presently discussing, his party probably will not lend their support to Bill C-243. In other words, they are not refuting the principle of unification. They seem to be in accord with it; but there appears to be an element of argument they are introducing in which there seems to be a suggestion that they might withdraw their support for the bill if the terms suggested by the hon. member for Greenwood in respect of the position Canada should take are not accepted.

Mr. Schreyer: Would the hon. member permit another question. Is he in fact accusing us of subterfuge because we introduced the question of the relationship of the role our forces are to play in NATO to the issue of unification? Does he not also think that perhaps some of the senior officials in the Canadian armed forces are guilty of the same thing, because more than one has said that unification of our armed forces and the maintenance of our present role in NATO would make it rather more difficult. This is the position that my colleague has been taking as well.

Mr. Faulkner: No. The position of most of the witnesses who appeared before the committee on national defence related directly to the bill itself. I say that the hon. member for

Greenwood has taken the position that in effect we do not have a defence policy, and that we are not presenting a distinctly Canadian position. What the hon. member is saying is that unless we adopt the position he is prepared to support—and this position has been disputed by myself and others, namely that we take a different approach to an alliance by adopting a heavy-handed attitude and negotiate an alliance which embraces our strategic concepts—he is not in agreement. Let me state that we are at this time carrying out negotiations. I do not think the hon. member for Greenwood can reasonably suggest that this government is not negotiating new roles for NATO and possible new roles for Canada on a continuing basis. To introduce this element of argument, when in fact something in this regard is being done, as a condition for support for this bill is unreasonable. I do not wish to overstate the case, but this attitude is something less than a direct confrontation with the issues presented by this bill.

Mr. Winch: Perhaps I could ask the hon. gentleman a question. I listened to his remarks very carefully. Does the hon. member not think that Canada should establish its own defence and foreign policies and institute them on a unilateral basis or in an alliance? I thought I put the position of this party very clearly before the house yesterday. We believe that we should renegotiate Canada's defence and foreign policies with an understanding as to our future role. Does the hon. member deny Canada's right to establish its own defence and foreign policies.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Mr. Faulkner: Of course not.

Mr. Winch: Why does the hon. member continue to express these stupidities to which he has referred in the last five minutes?

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with some interest to some of the remarks made today. Some of the arguments such as those put forward by the speaker who preceded me in respect of savings resulting from unification are absolutely amazing. Some of the figures he used to bolster his arguments are indeed surprising. I am reminded of the very old but true saying that figures do not lie but some liars figure. Obviously some of the hon. members opposite have had access to the services of some very expert liars.

Mr. Faulkner: In view of the statement of the hon. member I think I am entitled to a specific reference to those figures referred to by the hon. member.

Mr. Nugent: I refer not only to the figures but to the manner in which they were presented. I am not in a position to say which of his advisors came up with these erroneous figures, or which of his advisors might be the worst liar or the least reliable so far as the percentages and dollar figures are concerned. Many of the figures given by the hon. member are incorrect, and the manner in which they were presented tends to make them misleading.

Mr. Faulkner: Which ones?

Mr. Nugent: I refer specifically to the last percentage, in relation to money spent on equipment.

The figures themselves do not matter much. They have been quoted so many times and in so many ways I am sure they will be misleading to anyone who reads *Hansard*. They are bound to be confusing, though I venture to say much stress will be placed on them. Obviously it is part of the Liberal game to confuse the issue. The evidence presented before the committee is clear. If there is to be any saving, it will result from integration. The evidence is also clear that no saving will be achieved through unification.

The minister has continually said that integration and unification mean the same thing. Obviously the evidence shows that they are separate and distinct in time and in character. They are not interdependent. If we want to get that distinction clear in our minds the question as to whether integration will or will not save money becomes unimportant. The only question before us whether unification is good or bad. Obviously from the evidence unification standing by itself is of little value.

Let me remind hon. members of the evidence given before the committee regarding the limitation on savings which could be effected through integration. Late in the evening of February 21 Air Vice Marshal Hendrick, who was in charge of Canada's air defence until his retirement in 1964, appeared as a witness before the committee. I had a lengthy question to ask the air vice marshal, but because of the limitation of time I summed it up as follows, at page 1477 of the proceedings:

I have 11 minutes to 10:30 and I would like to thank the air vice marshal for pointing out one thing today that people seem to have lost sight of,

and that is in the search for economy—trying to cut down on administration costs when they seem to be rising—integration is not the only solution; that there are in fact co-operative ways which were described which did have an effect this way. I gathered much comfort from your reminding us that the percentage of the common support service is really very low, and that if integration is to work it is only in such fields as common support or common training ground that it can be helpful.

Mr. Hendrick then said "Right". In other words, he adopted what I tried to sum up as his evidence, that the amount of savings which could be effected through integration was very limited, particularly to the command support services. Some of the savings which could be achieved are similar to those achieved by co-operative endeavours. Some savings are being achieved by both methods.

A great many figures were quoted this afternoon for the purpose of clouding the issues. This has been part of Liberal strategy from the beginning. They have tried to keep the facts from becoming known, and this has been the policy since unification first became an issue in this house. It was mentioned in such a way in the white paper so as deliberately to lead to confusion. Those who drafted the white paper I am sure have found that their conception of unification was not the same as now proposed by the minister. Certainly if the minister was successful in deluding them at that time there is no reason now to wonder why the public is also deluded. I am amazed at the deliberate attempt to keep the public from knowing what is taking place. I was also amazed by a statement made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs as reported at page 14562 of *Hansard* of April 5, 1967. He stated:

I want to say now unreservedly that all of us in this house have every reason, even though all of us might not agree with his views, to have confidence in the capacity of the Minister of National Defence, in his credibility and his integrity.

I felt it was an effrontery on the part of that hon. gentleman to suggest that all of us have confidence in the capacity, credibility and integrity of the Minister of National Defence. First as to his capacity, we will be able to quote some more statements he has made. The minister himself has shown his incapacity so often that it hardly needs a comment. As to his credibility, I have always believed that the test of this is can he be believed, based on the source of his knowledge, his general sagacity, how reliable his advisers are, and so on, but general believability. Certainly no one in this house is going to

[Mr. Nugent.]

believe a thing that the Minister of National Defence says unless they can see it proven three or four different ways, because we have seen so often that he just cannot be believed in anything.

Then as to his integrity. While I find nothing whatsoever to say for his credibility and feel that I must try very hard to say that we have some belief in his integrity, I am afraid that the consistent policy shown by the minister, and the consistent attitude of his supporters both in the defence committee and this house—that consistent policy being to make sure that the facts were not brought to the attention of the public and to try to hide the facts from this house and make sure they are not available—together with the fact that everything the minister tells us we find is not so, leaves a very serious doubt that he has any integrity at all.

• (9:50 p.m.)

When we see the actual situation to be that the minister has limited or no capacity, that the minister has no credibility, and that we have to search very diligently to find any reason to suspect that he has any integrity, we can understand why I felt that the speech of the Secretary of State for External Affairs was pure effrontery when he said that all of us in this house have confidence in the Minister of National Defence in this regard. If there is anyone in the house who really thinks I am being a little hard on the minister, all he has to do is look at the opening words of the Minister of National Defence himself on page 14429 of *Hansard*, the right-hand column. This was about the second sentence he spoke in the debate, and it reads this way:

Every opportunity has been afforded those who are opposed to this concept to make their views known.

We know how much opportunity was afforded those in the services who were opposed. The minute it became known that they were opposed, they were fired. I suppose this was an opportunity afforded them, because once they are fired and their retirement leave is over, they may have the chance to open their mouths. I suppose in that way we can say this minister has afforded them the opportunity. If we are to interpret his words in that manner, I suppose we may have some faith in his credibility. If that is what he means by credibility, and that is his standard of integrity, perhaps we can go along with that a little.

I find it hard to be as charitable about his action with regard to Admiral Landymore's testimony, when he went to the extent of tampering with the evidence of a witness to make sure that we did not get the facts. That action is hardly consistent with saying:

> Every opportunity has been afforded those who are opposed to this concept to make their views known.

I find that hard to believe, in view of the abrupt firing of Admiral Landymore, who made the great mistake of speaking frankly to the defence committee in Halifax, and within five days of answering those questions very frankly he was peremptorily fired, when he thought he had been summoned to Ottawa for a different reason.

I find it difficult to credit the minister with much integrity when he makes that statement, knowing what happened in the defence committee and how we were thwarted, frustrated and defeated in our attempts to get those witnesses we thought the defence commitee should call. Anyone who watched the day-to-day proceedings of that committee and who could see the evidence piling up of just how hollow a sham are the minister's arguments in favour of unification, watched the Liberal members start to panic as the evidence piled up more and more against the minister, and then saw the minister thrown in—and he put his own feet in his own big mouth—will understand why his supporters then really put on the pressure so that we could not call any more witnesses. You do not mean to tell us that the minister was not guiding and directing the members of his party to make sure that no more witnesses would be called.

Anybody who watched the proceedings of that committee and how hard the Liberals fought to make sure no further witnesses could be called, and anyone who looked at the list of the responsible witnesses we wanted to have called and had to settle without, and then reads the minister's statement, "Every opportunity has been afforded those who are opposed to this concept to make their views known", will have to be more than charitable to suggest that there is any justification in the Secretary of State for External Affairs suggesting to this house that we have any reason whatsoever to have any faith in the capacity of the Minister of National Defence, in his integrity or in his credibility.

However, it is not just the credibility of the Minister of National Defence that I attack; it is in fact the attitude of the whole Liberal party, the manner in which the defence committee was run, and the attitude of several members in this house. My seatmate, the hon. member for York-Sunbury, spoke this afternoon and I thought he was very charitable to hon. members opposite. He thought that most of them were taking their duties very seriously and were trying hard to do the right thing. I am afraid I can only come to the conclusion that they are incapable of understanding what is happening, or they have such blind faith in those in whom they should not have such blind faith that they have abandoned their duty to look critically at this question, have accepted without thinking the bland assurances of the minister, and have sat without listening and merely provided bodies, which would give to the public an appearance that some Liberals were interested in hearing what were the facts behind the defence argument.

Mr. Chairman, may I call it ten o'clock.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the government house leader what business the house will be considering tomorrow; and if it is the same bill, could he tell us whether the minister will be here tomorrow and at what period of the discussion of the bill the minister will be able to be here?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, the business we propose submitting to the house for consideration tomorrow is item No. 107 on the order paper, that is, house again in committee of the whole on Bill C-243, an act to amend the National Defence Act, which we have been discussing all week. Then we will deal with item No. 134, second reading of Bill C-278, an act respecting the occupational training of adults, and then the motion for concurrence in the report of the committee that examined into the rules and procedures of the house.

In answer to the second question of the hon. member, as I indicated earlier today, the Minister of National Defence will be here—

Mr. Churchill: At what time?

• (10:00 p.m.)

Mr. McIlraith: I do not think it is the business of the hon. member at what time the minister will arrive back. As I started to say, the Minister of National Defence will be here throughout the whole of the sitting of the house tomorrow. Beyond that, it is not any of

the business of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre when the minister will arrive in Ottawa, nor do I propose to tell him. I think the arrogance of the opposition in some of these matters is getting completely out of hand. I indicated during the question hour today, when hon. members opposite sought to prevent the discussion of the bill today, that the minister would be here tomorrow throughout the sitting. I repeated that tonight. That is as far as I am prepared to go on that subject. However, I hope that hon. members opposite and the committee in general will consider the situation.

Mr. Churchill: Never mind that. We do not want to be lectured.

Mr. McIlraith: I will go on if I wish.

Mr. Churchill: What arrogance.

Mr. McIlraith: We now have had a general discussion for four days. We are not complaining in any way about that. However, I would ask hon. members to consider whether we have not come now to the stage at which we could deal with a clause by clause consideration of the bill. I believe that this would be in the interests of parliament generally.

Mr. Churchill: We have the interests of Canada at heart.

Mr. McIlraith: I am quite prepared to agree with that; I hope the hon. member has. However, I am raising another matter. I believe that it would be worthy of consideration by hon. members to see if we could not proceed to consideration of the individual clauses of the bill so as to make progress. We have been met twice already this week with the demand that we defer the consideration of the bill but so far the discussion has been general. Today the minister has been away on an important duty; yet I think anybody who listened to the proceedings today would agree that the Associate Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) has been able and active in the debate. I think hon. members opposite should be very happy with the circumstances.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, in view of the lengthy speech which the government house leader made in reply to a very simple question of mine I must rise on a question of privilege, based on what he said. I am rather surprised at the arrogance and petulance which the government house leader has demonstrated. We asked him at what time the minister will be here tomorrow. He knew very well that we wanted to know at what stage of the discussion of the bill he will arrive. We are not worrying at what time he will arrive in this building or at what time he will go to bed or have his breakfast, but we want to know at what time he will be here for the discussion of this bill.

However, I am afraid the government house leader went a little far. He has a terrible habit of aggravating people and then admonishing and lecturing them. I must say to him that this government should control its arrogance. Of course the government house leader was in the house during the days when this government could afford to be arrogant, and this has not left him. Once in a while it comes to the surface, and he must display it to the whole house. I must point out to him that he cannot complain about the co-operation I have given him. I asked him a simple, straightforward question, and I hope that in the future he will not exhibit the arrogance which he displays from time to time, but will answer in a nice and simple way for our information.

Mr. Churchill: Just like the chairman of the defence committee. Let the house leader model himself on him.

Mr. Winch: Over a month ago we had a lengthy discussion at the resolution stage of the bill, and then at the introduction and second reading of the bill. We have had 55 meetings of the defence committee, and now we have spent four days on clause 2. Perhaps without undue repetition those who have something to say could do so, and then we could get down to a clause by clause study of the bill and finally either accept, amend or reject it in a responsible, parliamentary manner.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, so inconsequential is this bill that the Minister of National Defence was away all day. Unless he shows more interest in the bill, one could hardly expect the house to proceed with greater expedition.

Mr. Deachman: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. At one stage of the committee procedure we could not find a Tory in the whole house, so I do not think there is anything wrong with a member of the cabinet discharging his duty outside the house.

Mr. Lambert: That is a lot of nonsense.

Mr. Starr: There were only three Liberals.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Patterson: Mr. Speaker, if we are going to engage in a general debate on this issue, perhaps we could get into it as well, instead of having this cross-fire which is going on now.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I rise on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I should like to draw to the attention of the house the fact that there is one particular matter which must be cleared up in connection with the report which was given to the house by the chairman of the defence committee. It was unfounded, untruthful and not supported by his own minister. This is one of the matters which must be cleared up before the house leader can expect to get along with this defence bill. What the chairman of the defence committee reported to this house was certainly far removed from the facts, and until this matter is cleared up either the chairman of the defence committee or the Minister of National Defence is going to have to back water. I suggest it should be the chairman of the defence committee, who lied to this house.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

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

[*Translation*]

TRANSPORT—PROPOSED REDUCTION IN RAILWAY SERVICE BETWEEN QUEBEC AND SHERBROOKE

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, on March 16 last, I had the opportunity to put the following question to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill):

> Has the minister received protests against the elimination of passenger trains Nos. 1, 2 and 4 between Quebec and Sherbrooke and is it his intention, in the public interest, to recommend that the Quebec Central Railway reconsider its decision.

I am pleased tonight to make the following comments on my question. On Monday, March 6, 1967, the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada issued order No. 123,654 relating to the application by the Quebec Central Railway Company for authorization to discontinue operation of trains Nos. 1, 2 and 4 between Quebec and Sherbrooke in the province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, the reasons given by the Quebec Central Railway Company and accepted by the Board of Transport Commissioners go against the public interest in a wide area and do not reflect adequately the tactics used by that company to get rid of that branch line and fail seriously in discharging its obligations toward the public.

Here are the facts:

1. Practically all the localities served by those trains are against their being discontinued.

2. The line on which those trains travel covers a distance of 147.6 miles between Sherbrooke and Quebec city. The industrial centres served by those trains include Sherbrooke, East Angus, Bishopton, Weedon, Saint-Gérard, Black Lake, Dark Lake, Disraeli, Coleraine, Thetford Mines, Robertson, East Broughton, Vallée Jonction, Sainte-Marie, Scott Jonction, Ville-Lambert, Breakyville, Charny and Quebec city.

• (10:10 p.m.)

3. The Quebec Central Railway Company has claimed that the average number of passengers carried on trains 1, 2 and 4 on each trip has fallen off gradually from 68 in 1962 to 26 in 1966. The communities served by this passenger train service represent a population of approximately 65,000, excluding Quebec and Sherbrooke.

The main points submitted by the Quebec Central Railway Company before the Board of Transport Commissioners to cancel the train service are as follows: first, the company reports an annual loss of $54,000; they show a reduction of passenger traffic as I have noted; and finally, they have cited the principle according to which financial loss is taken into consideration as regards the inconvenience caused to the public by abandonment of the operation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I must say tonight in this house that the Quebec Central Railway Company, a subsidiary of the Canadian Pacific, hid the truth from the Board of Transport Commissioners and the Canadian public, since the company has increased its passenger rates which are now double those of the C.N.R. and the best way to reduce passenger traffic is for this company to increase, to double their rates, compared to the Canadian National operating in the same areas.

In addition, that company encouraged a quite unsatisfactory passenger service, often delaying train arrivals and giving traffic priority to freight trains.

We found that on the Quebec city-Sherbrooke route, for at least three years, the

company made every effort to discourage the public from travelling on its trains, by giving preference to junction lines and freight trains, rather than passenger trains.

Finally, the said company has utterly neglected both in the area between Quebec city and Sherbrooke and throughout the province of Quebec, to promote its publicity, in order to discourage passengers from using its railway service.

The minister should intervene and advise the company to maintain its passenger service, to reduce its rates and to increase its publicity in that area.

Trains 1, 2 and 4, operating between Sherbrooke and Quebec city, must be maintained:

(a) Passenger service, Mr. Speaker, affords better security to the public than motor vehicles.

(b) Before deciding upon a location, industries inquire whether there is a railway service to the area.

And surely the whole region between Sherbrooke and Quebec city, through East Angus, Thetford Mines and the other municipalities I mentioned earlier in my speech, need an industrial economic development.

(c) Even if the railway company has a deficit, it can easily be off-set by profits made elsewhere.

In closing, I would also ask the minister or his representative, or his parliamentary secretary, to bear in mind that, at the time of the centennial and Expo, over 200,000 citizens of the province of Quebec will be denied adequate railway service from Quebec city, Thetford Mines and the other municipalities, via Sherbrooke, to go and enjoy the pleasures which the centennial celebrations and the marvelous displays of Expo will offer.

I must say here, with the required emphasis, that the Canadian Pacific, through its subsidiary Quebec Central Railway, does not fulfil the obligations to which it was committed when it obtained its charter, that is to serve the public and give adequate rail service for the transportation of passengers and goods. For several years now, the Canadian Pacific has been accumulating profits to the detriment of Canadian passengers. It invests its benefits not fundamentally and primarily with a view to fulfilling its obligations as purveyor of adequate railroad services, but rather for various reasons contrary to the objectives originally agreed upon, and more specifically that of serving the public.

We see that the Canadian Pacific is building motels and launching all kinds of undertakings. Now, if the Department of Transport and the hon. minister do not intervene in this particular instance, we will soon see the company which is nourished and maintained by public taxes and government assistance, swerve completely from the course it should follow with regard to serving the public.

[*English*]

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I hope that the hon. member for Sherbrooke will not feel that his forceful effort has been entirely in vain. The Minister of Transport planned to be here tonight to deal with this question, but for reasons which I will not take time now to explain, it was impossible for him to be here.

He asked me to say that he is keenly aware of the representations the hon. member made earlier, and that he will be seized of the representations made on this occasion. The minister hopes to communicate with the hon. member as soon as possible.

FINANCE—DRUGS—INQUIRY AS TO REMOVAL OF SALES TAX

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in the budget speech of two years ago, made on April 26, 1965, by the then minister of finance, the present President of the Privy Council (Mr. Gordon), this statement found at page 439 of *Hansard* for that date was made about the sales tax on drugs:

> There has been much concern expressed about the high prices of drugs in Canada and proposals made that they should be exempt from the sales tax, which has always applied to them. The government has considered these representations but does not wish to act on them until the matter has been considered by the special Committee of the House on Food and Drugs.

There was an interruption at that point to which the minister replied. He then went on to say:

> If the Committee comes to the conclusion that, as part of a comprehensive and effective program to reduce the prices of drugs, they should be exempt from the sales tax, I would expect to see this done in a special statute covering all the measures required to give effect to the program, and I am quite sure the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Harley), who is Chairman of this Committee, will see it proceeds with this very important matter just as expeditiously as it can.

That statement, as I say, was made two years ago in the budget speech of that year.

One year ago, as recorded in *Hansard* for March 29, 1966, the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) renewed the undertaking given by the former minister in these words, which I quote from page 3387 of *Hansard* for that date:

> I renew the undertaking given last year by my predecessor, the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Gordon), that if the considerations of the special committee of the house on food and drugs lead it to recommend that drugs should be exempt from sales tax as part of a comprehensive and effective program to reduce the prices of drugs, then the government would be prepared to recommend such action by means of a special statute covering all the measures required to give effect to such a program.

• (10:20 p.m.)

It was on the basis of those two commitments that I put a question to the Minister of Finance on Tuesday, April 4, as reported at page 14485 of *Hansard*. I asked the minister whether in the light of these commitments and in the light of the recommendation by the special committee which has dealt with drugs and drug prices we might expect the promised legislation soon. The minister's reply was to the effect that he had been reviewing the statements made on those previous occasions and that it would be the intention of the government to proceed to remove the sales tax on drugs as part of an over-all effort to reduce the price of drugs. When I asked whether we might expect to have this legislation introduced during the present session his answer was an expression of hope.

It would be unfair of me to say that the minister's answer was unsatisfactory, but I am a little concerned about the open doors which seem to be left in these assurances which have been given to us on several occasions. There are not only the two commitments made in the budget speeches of a year and two years ago, but on several occasions in answer to questions both ministers assured the house that if the special committee made a recommendation calling for the removal of the sales tax from drugs, action to that effect would be taken.

But there is always a qualification. For one, it is to be part of an over-all package. Another qualification, of course, is that the government wishes to take action in a way which will have the desired effect, namely the lowering of the prices of drugs to consumers. I do not quarrel with these conditions but I am concerned lest the desire to cross all the t's and dot all the i's may result in this matter being put off as so many things are put off by the government across the way.

Surely this question has been under study by the finance department during the two years in which it has been before the committee. There has been time to think about it, and if the minister is as convinced as I felt he was by what he said on Tuesday that action must be taken with regard to this subject, I hope this action will be taken soon. I recognize that the parliamentary program always presents a problem to the government of the day, but it does seem to me that this is a very important recommendation which the special committee has made and that in the light of the firm commitments given by two ministers of finance this is a matter which ought to be dealt with expeditiously; I do not think it is good enough to leave it until next session.

The minister still has one other piece of budgetary legislation to put through this session, the one having to do with the 5 per cent refundable tax. Here is something which is, I suggest, more important. The view of the committee has been made clear: The prices of drugs are too high for the Canadian people. I hope that action on this matter can be taken soon. This is my reason for placing this subject on the list for a late show—so that I might prod the minister into doing as soon as possible something which I dare to believe he really wants to do.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has made another fervent appeal for the removal of the sales tax on drugs. It is impossible of course for a minister of finance to forecast tax changes. I can only repeat the assurance I have given, perhaps in a somewhat different form, which may bring some comfort to the hon. member, to the house and to the country at large. The government is interested in seeing that the prices of drugs in this country are reduced.

The government will not hesitate to remove the tax as part of a program to that effect. Needless to say—and I am sure the hon. gentleman who has asked this question will agree—the removal of that tax should be used to give as much leverage as possible to other desirable action by the drug companies to bring about a reduction in the price of drugs to the consumers themselves. It is not sufficient, it seems to me, simply to remove the tax and hope for the best. I believe it ought

to be part of an over-all approach to this matter.

HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS—
LOUISBOURG FORTRESS—RETURN
TO WORK OF MEN LAID OFF

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, on Monday last I directed a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Laing) in respect of the lay-offs at the Louisbourg project. I then referred the matter for debate on the adjournment motion, and on Monday evening the minister took it upon himself to go into the details of the problem I had placed before him. He reviewed the history for my benefit. I did not need to have the history in respect of the initiation of this project brought to my attention. I was aware that it had been carried out on the recommendation of Mr. Justice Rand and had been initiated under the Conservative government.

With the knowledge of what had taken place at that time and how this had developed I drew to the attention of the minister the fact that this has been the only effort made by any government to meet the emergency situation in respect of employment in Cape Breton. Government members like to refer to the fact that a coastguard college was established as an emergency measure, but I should like to point out that this was very meaningless because it followed the closing of a naval base by the same government. Assistance by this government in respect of the economy or the employment situation in Cape Breton has been lacking in many ways.

The minister never got around to answering my question. He said that the salaries had been increased by 50 per cent. That means that the men who are employed there still are almost 50 per cent below the prevailing rates. The increase of 50 per cent still leaves the workers at Louisbourg far below the average wage earners in the Cape Breton area. The minister said that he did think the men could work for a rate of $1.09 an hour. I should like to ask him whether he has made similar adjustments in the salaries of other northern affairs workers throughout the rest of the country, because these men in Louisbourg are still receiving more than some men in other areas. I am not suggesting that this is a justification for the low rate paid at Louisbourg.

The minister also said that this past year, in response to representations made by his colleague, the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen), 44 men were taken on again. Forty four men were taken on after a lay-off of approximately 150 men. As I understand it these men were not taken on as new employees at the project, but were men who were returned to their work as a result of having been laid off a few days earlier. Therefore, in response to a request by his colleague the Minister of National Health and Welfare, the minister did not hire 44 men. All the minister did was take back on the job the men who had been laid off. This is an old Liberal trick—slash here and slash there, and then take them back and make heroes of themselves.

• (10:30 p.m.)

Nothing has been done to assist the economy of Cape Breton by any government since the Louisbourg project was initiated by the Conservative government. Let me call the minister's attention to what he said, as reported at page 14471 of *Hansard* for April 3, 1967:

> We have exhausted the money. We exhausted it on March 31, and we have laid off 44 men.

Thirteen lines later he said:

> We are keeping relatively within our costs, but I want to have something produced.

We all want to have something produced, but why should there be a cutback on the Louisbourg project in that part of the country where unemployment is so high?

Last November the government said there was no more money for the winter works program. The Minister of Labour and the Minister of Manpower and Immigration have repeatedly said that the only alteration to the winter works program was the discontinuance of the $500 bonus paid in respect of winter housing starts. These have nothing to do with the Louisbourg project. Let me remind the minister that some of his colleagues have indicated that winter works projects can be done as well in the winter as in the summer. We now have a denial of this, for the convenience of a minister.

There have been 44 men laid off on this particular project because, as is suggested, this work cannot be done during the wintertime. That is in direct contradiction to what has been said by other ministers on other occasions. Has there been any cutback during the winter here in Ottawa in respect of the arts centre? Originally it was to cost some $12 million. The government is still pouring money into this project and I understand the cost has now increased to about $15 million. Expo started out to be a $20 million project and I understand it is now to cost in the

neighbourhood of $100 million. Let us remember the $10 million to be spent on the film industry.

This minister has said the money so far as the Louisbourg project is concerned has been exhausted. If money is to be spent by this government so easily in respect of the arts centre and Expo I suggest that additional money can be found for Cape Breton.

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): It is pretty difficult to reply to the hon. member's suggestion regarding the last of the big spenders, particularly when somebody else's money is involved. Obviously the hon. member would appeal for any amount of money to assist the people of his area. I suppose he interprets that as his duty as a member of this parliament.

The hon. member has made certain statements tonight that cannot be left unanswered. He has suggested that this is the only program to assist Cape Breton. Let me suggest that the Liberal government would never have started out with a per hour rate of $1.09. I was wrong when I suggested the other night that we had increased the wages by more than 50 per cent: They have been increased by 72 per cent.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): You said something like 85 per cent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Laing: The hon. member refers to this as the only program to assist Cape Breton Islanders. The hon. member is one of the first to agree to the annual allotment of $30 million in coal subsidies.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): That does not all go to Cape Breton.

Mr. Laing: That is the total amount in Canada. A great portion of it goes to Cape Breton. Let me remind the hon. member that this is an investment of approximately $7,000 per miner. I want to take him back again to where this started. It started as a make-work program and was so advertised at the time. We have employed an average of 260 men throughout. In addition to that we gave them trades; we had stonemasons—

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): How many miners?

Mr. Laing: I hope the hon. member will be fair and I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will allow me a couple of minutes extra to reply to him. Most of the men were miners, and with that meticulous care that they have down there, a certain number of them had to come from one little village, a specific number from another, and so many from Sydney, and we had to carry them down by bus.

We introduced schools there and taught some trades. Some men were taught masonry. We found that when there was any improvement in the mining situation, those men we had educated most highly went right back to the mines because they could earn more money in the mines than working for us.

As to the prevailing rates, for every increase in pay that we gave to these men we had representations from the industry in the area that we pay our men too much and are affecting their industry. Therefore I am not able to accept the hon. gentleman's argument. He is making a case for his own riding, and that is all right with me.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): That is not the case.

Mr. Laing: We have a contract—

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): On a point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. A point of order cannot be raised at this particular time.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I look forward to Monday night, because the minister has just made a false statement.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The time allotted to the minister has expired.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.39 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, April 7, 1967

The house met at 11 a.m.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

VIMY RIDGE SERVICE—REPORTED REFUSAL OF FRANCE TO PARTICIPATE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in continuation of the question I asked yesterday regarding the unusual situation created by the Republic of France in failing to provide a guard of honour on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary ceremonies at Vimy, has the government, either through the Prime Minister or the Secretary of State for External Affairs, communicated with the government of France to point out that what has occurred is regarded by veterans and their dependants as a slap in the face to Canada?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the details of the arrangements are being worked out with the French government, as I indicated yesterday. I have nothing to add to what I said on this matter then.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is it a fact that the reason for the stand is as reported in certain elements of the press, namely as a means of indicating to Canada that General de Gaulle does not regard the Queen as Queen of Canada?

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker.

GRAIN

WHEAT—REPORTED AGREEMENT ON FREE WORLD MARKET AFTER JULY 31

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce regarding press reports to the effect that at the meeting in London the wheat importing and exporting countries have agreed by majority decision that after July 31 importing countries will not be required to take a prearranged minimum quantity of wheat, and there will be no predetermined price range.

Since this was a majority decision I take it there was some disagreement. I should like to ask the minister what position the Canadian delegation took, whether Canada voted in favour of this free market after July 31, and whether this is the government's policy with respect to this matter.

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): No, Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned yesterday and as I have said on previous occasions, our major effort is being made through negotiations for a new cereals agreement presently in progress at Geneva. At Geneva we have been seeking a substantially increased price for wheat and an increased price range. Under the circumstances we are unwilling to agree to a continuation of the price and the price range as provided for under the present international wheat agreement. So all we would agree to in the London discussion was a continuation of the framework of the agreement, but not the price structure.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the negotiations in Geneva are not likely to be concluded before the beginning of the new crop year, do I take it that at the London meeting the government voted to have a free market after July 31, and to remove the protective provisions which are contained in the present international wheat agreement?

Mr. Winters: Under the terms of the negotiations at Geneva they must be concluded by mid-year, so it is entirely likely that the present arrangements under the international wheat agreement will be succeeded by new arrangements under a cereals agreement as part of the Kennedy round of negotiations. So anything that is being done in London now does not in any way commit us to a price structure or a marketing arrangement; it simply keeps in being the framework of the I.W.A. and no more.

Inquiries of the Ministry

NATIONAL DEFENCE

NATO—DISCUSSIONS RESPECTING ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEM

On the orders of the day:

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Can the minister inform us whether at the meeting he attended yesterday in Washington any decisions were taken with regard to the installation of an anti-missile defence system?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, there was a wide ranging discussion covering all aspects of the possible use of nuclear weapons and their effects, both strategically and tactically. This included a discussion of an anti-ballistic missile system. No decisions have been taken in this respect, but in view of the fact that the meetings are continuing this morning I do not think I should comment further until a communiqué has been issued officially by the meeting at noon today.

Mr. Harkness: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Who is representing Canada at these meetings now that the minister has returned?

Mr. Hellyer: Our ambassador to NATO, Mr. Speaker.

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ON DAIRY POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. M. Howe (Wellington-Huron): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. In announcing on March 22 the dairy policy providing a total price of $4.75 for manufacturing milk, the minister promised that complete details of the program of the dairy commission would be provided by the commission in a very short time. That was over three weeks ago. I wonder whether the minister can tell us now just when the dairy industry can expect these regulations to be brought down.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I believe the Canadian Dairy Commission issued a statement on the same day I made my announcement with respect to the government's dairy policy, regarding the level of support of dairy products and the question of quotas which, taken in conjunction with the government's policy statement,

[Mr. Winters.]

encompasses the entire dairy policy for the ensuing year, subject to any changes that the dairy commission, on its own authority, may wish to make from time to time.

Mr. Howe (Wellington-Huron): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. In view of the fact that in the 1966-67 dairy year the small creameries were almost wiped out, and in view of the fact that at the present time the fluid milk producers are worried about this dairy policy, will the minister take every possible step to ensure that all segments of this important industry will be given comparable treatment?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I am meeting with the Canadian Federation of Agriculture today, and the cabinet met with the farmers' union yesterday to discuss various aspects of the policy. With regard to the fluid milk producers, they are essentially the responsibility of the provinces. Under last year's agreement the federal government agreed to take responsibility for the support of the manufacturing milk industry. The fluid milk producers, of course, come under provincial quotas and provincial authority where there are provincial boards set up. I believe therefore the question of fluid milk producers is largely one for provincial authorities.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

In view of the general discontent amongst milk producers, can the minister tell us whether he will agree to modify and improve the dairy policy?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I feel that the present dairy policy is the best Canada has ever had. However, I am always glad to meet the farmers and take their suggestions into consideration.

[*English*]

Mr. H. A. Moore (Wetaskiwin): May I ask a supplementary question. Have the agriculture ministers of the different provinces agreed that they are responsible for that portion of milk shipped by fluid milk producers that goes into manufacturing milk?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge in all provinces fluid milk quotas and fluid milk prices are set under provincial authority. I believe it is quite obvious, therefore, that within the constitutional practice as it has evolved the provinces have assumed

responsibility for the price level and support in the fluid milk area.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in view of the self-gratulation the minister has given to the dairy policy and the happiness it has brought to Canadian dairymen and farmers in general, would he let the house know the secret that explains why there is a greater upheaval among farmers today and a greater distrust of this government than ever before?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to hon. members that we are now getting into a debate.

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order—

Mr. Diefenbaker: A point of order?

Mr. Greene: I might point out to the right hon. gentleman that in the four years—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. The right hon. gentleman made an allegation that of course has no basis in fact, as is true of so many of his allegations.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the minister stating his question of privilege?

Mr. Greene: I point out to the right hon. gentleman that during the short time we have been in office we have taken the national average price of manufacturing milk from $2.66 to $4.75.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps I should say now that the Leader of the Opposition has expressed his opinion on the matter and the minister has expressed his, and there appears to be some divergence of opinion between them. However, I do not believe there is a question of privilege, and I think we should go on to another question.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

INQUIRY AS TO BY-ELECTIONS IN HULL AND SUDBURY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): I have a question for the Prime Minister. I should like to ask him if he is prepared to announce the dates for by-elections in the constituencies of Hull and Sudbury some time within the next month or two, so the new members from those areas can participate in the defence debate.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I will be able to do that within a day or two, I hope, but I assume the defence debate will be over long before five new Liberal members can join this house.

HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS

LOUISBOURG FORTRESS—RETURN TO WORK OF MEN LAID OFF

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Having received representation from the Minister of National Health and Welfare, will the government now rehire workers laid off at Fortress Louisbourg?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I wonder whether the question as asked is in order. The hon. member is making a suggestion or imputation. I do not want to be difficult, but I do not think the question as asked is acceptable. Perhaps the hon. member might want to rephrase it.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I will rephrase the question. I ask the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development whether the government will now rehire the workers laid off on the Fortress Louisbourg project.

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I think I have informed the hon. member on a couple of occasions very recently that beginning in May it is our intention to rehire, with first preference being given these people who were laid off.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): As usual the minister has been misinformed. Ten o'clock Monday.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I should bring to the attention of the hon. member that to the best of my knowledge he has already asked this question twice and it has been answered twice. I am not too sure whether the rules of the house allow the same question to come up regularly in the adjournment debates, but I will look into the matter and consider the situation early next week.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact that I have asked a different question on each occasion, and the answers are becoming more confused. I had given notice to debate this question at ten

o'clock on Tuesday, but because one hon. member had made arrangements to use the ten minute period on Tuesday I could not get the floor that night, though there was a ten minute period for discussion. However, I give notice that I will debate the matter on Monday at ten.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member consults the rules he will ascertain that the matter is still in the hands of the Speaker to decide.

PUBLIC SERVICE

STATEMENT ON REGULATIONS UNDER NEW LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer a question which was asked by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre on Monday respecting the regulations of the Public Service Staff Relations Board. Regulations pertaining to certificate applications have been approved by the board and will be published in the April 12 issue of the *Canada Gazette*. Regulations pertaining to dispute settlement specification, grievance process and adjudication procedure, complaints procedure and references on questions of law or jurisdiction have also been approved by the board, and it is anticipated that barring some unforeseen circumstance they will be published in the April 26 issue of the *Gazette*.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the minister will recall that I asked about the regulations under two acts, both the Public Service Staff Relations Act and the Public Service Employment Act. Can he tell me about the latter?

Mr. Gordon: I will have to take that supplementary question as notice.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

REQUEST FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF LIMITS ON USE OF PESTICIDES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Will the government give consideration to establishing statutory safety limits on the use of two specific pesticides, aldrin and dieldrin, so that foods produced with their use may not carry a residue above health safety levels?

Mr. Speaker: Order, this question should be placed on the order paper.

[Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South).]

NATIONAL SECURITY

PROTECTION OF U.S. VICE PRESIDENT ON CANADIAN VISIT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Solicitor General. My question is based on criticism and considerable annoyance expressed by some Canadians and in newspaper editorials with respect to the necessity for two carloads of F.B.I. men to come to Canada to protect United States Vice President Hubert Humphrey on his recent visit to Canada.

My question is this. Will the minister inform the house whether in his opinion it was necessary for the F.B.I. to come to Canada on this occasion? And would the minister inform the house whether he considers that our own R.C.M.P. are not just as capable of protecting any distinguished visitor to Canada as imported bodyguards?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. No doubt the Solicitor General would like the opportunity to reply at least to the second part of the question, but I suggest to the hon. member, with respect, that the question is not in order.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Arising out of that question I ask the minister this. Is it a fact that because of an unprecedented influx of mafia gangland thugs into Canada, at the present time United States officials and those of the R.C.M.P. are meeting with a view to arriving at some plan that will control this kind of immigration that Canada does not want?

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept as a fact the preliminary part of the question. I will say, however, that the R.C.M.P. are co-operating closely with law enforcement agencies in the United States to keep crime under control.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I ask specifically whether at this very moment and in the last week there have been meetings between the R.C.M.P. and United States officials of the F.B.I. and the like, to prevent or do something to prevent the influx into Montreal and Toronto of United States mafia figures.

Mr. Pennell: Mr. Speaker, if the right hon. gentleman is referring to a press report that appeared this week in one of the daily newspapers, I am informed that the reference was not to R.C.M.P. officials but, I believe, to

municipal officials who were visiting New York state.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am referring to the New York *Times*, which refers to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Mr. Pennell: I thank the hon. gentleman for bringing to my attention the reference in the New York *Times*. I was also referring to the same press report. It is my understanding that the reference was to a municipal police force and not to members of the R.C.M.P., though the report referred to them as being of the R.C.M.P.

I wish to reassert my original statement, that the R.C.M.P. are in continuing close co-operation with law enforcement agencies in the United States. It is my understanding that there has been no significant increase in organized crime since I assumed my responsibilities. I say this being well aware of the serious nature of crime, but the fact is that crime has been held under control owing to measures which have been taken over the past 18 months.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Herridge: As the right hon. Leader of the Opposition by an ingenious method has brought this topic to the attention of the minister, could the minister now answer my question which would appear to be in order?

Mr. Pennell: If the answer to one question can bring the answer to another in order, I am pleased to say, first of all, that I have every confidence in the ability of the R.C.M.P. to discharge their duties in this and every other matter. The presence of persons accompanying distinguished visitors to Canada is a matter of liaison, and arrangements are reciprocal in visits of this kind.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Since when did the Canadian Prime Minister have that protection in his visits to the United States?

Mr. Matheson: He wouldn't need it anywhere in the world.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES—CONTRACT DISPUTE WITH SCHOOL TEACHERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. J. Orange (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. As yesterday was the deadline date set by teachers in the Northwest Territories in regard to their contract commitments with the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, can the minister say whether a decision has been reached by the government with respect to these demands? If so, have the teachers accepted the government's offer?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to hear the use of the word "deadline", because I do not think there is a serious core of acerbity between the teachers and the department at the present time. With respect to the teachers in the Northwest Territories during the past year, there has been agreement to improvements in the terms of their employment. One item involving a small amount of money and reducing the contract period from 12 months to 10 months remains outstanding. This will be taken care of quickly, to the satisfaction of the teachers.

INQUIRIES OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs based on a report that the United Nations mission to Aden is to be withdrawn. Has there been any suggestion from any source that the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs should use his good offices in this troubled area, or has be been overlooked by his friends in international circles?

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence whether he will be giving us some time today any instructions which he may have received from Mr. McNamara.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

POLLUTION

REQUEST FOR COUNTRY-WIDE SHOWING OF FILM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources arising out of his sponsorship of the showing last night of a very interesting film on pollution on parliament hill.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Barnett: I should like to ask whether arrangements are being made through the council of resource ministers or otherwise to have this film shown in various centres across the country.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I suggest this is a question which should be placed on the order paper. The information should be obtained in some other way than by asking a question at this time.

AGRICULTURE

POTATOES—INQUIRY AS TO ASSISTANCE TO PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND PRODUCERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): I have a most important question for the Minister of Agriculture related to similar questions asked by my hon. friends from Prince Edward Island. Has the minister yet received a resolution unanimously adopted by the Prince Edward Island legislature urging an improved program for dealing with the current potato surplus? If so, is he giving favourable consideration to this reasonable request of the legislature?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): The resolution which was forwarded to me indicated that the Prince Edward Island legislature supported the appeal of the province of New Brunswick with respect to a program of relief in connection with the heavy surplus of potatoes in those provinces. Such a program has been evolved, and we are considering representations made by various organizations to determine whether an improvement can be made in the program which would make it more satisfactory in those areas.

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

REQUEST FOR NIGHT TRAIN BETWEEN MONTREAL AND QUEBEC

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport.

In view of the fact that Expo '67 will open in a few days and also that the legislature of my own province, a great number of members of parliament and even Expo's General Commissioner have asked the C.P.R. to operate a night train between Montreal and Quebec City, could the minister tell us if he has been asked, in the last few days, to do something to secure that service during Expo?

[Mr. Barnett.]

[*English*]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): To the best of my knowledge I have not received any such requests recently; at least they have not been brought to my attention. But I have listened to the hon. gentleman's question, and in view of the urgency which he feels should be attached to the matter I shall be glad to bring it to the attention of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

AIR CANADA

PROSPECTIVE DELAY IN COMMENCEMENT OF TORONTO-LOS ANGELES SERVICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Revelstoke): My question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Has the minister any comment to make on reports that a United States air line will gain a big lead over Air Canada in developing the Toronto-Los Angeles route because of delay in aircraft deliveries to Air Canada?

Mr. Speaker: Order. If the hon. member is asking for a statement by the minister, this is not a question which can be permitted at this time.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might try to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. When will Air Canada begin flying the route between Toronto and Los Angeles?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): The latest target date I heard was some time in August. However, as a previous question—one which was indicated as being out of order—did suggest, there is a problem in connection with delivery of aircraft which is having an effect upon all these plans, I regret to say; it is not peculiar to Air Canada but it is being experienced by virtually all air lines with expanding traffic.

Mr. Knowles: Can the minister now indicate the precise date?

Mr. Pickersgill: It is some date in August, and if the hon. gentleman will put the question on the order paper I will be able to ascertain from Air Canada precisely what it is.

Mr. Speaker: Order. It seems to me that the answer given by the minister is indicative that my suggestion that the question should be placed on the order paper was a correct one. We should go on to another question.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

INQUIRY AS TO TENDER CALLS FOR NEW DESTROYERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. At an earlier date the hon. gentleman advised the house that his department expected to call tenders for the four new helicopter destroyers in March. I wonder whether the minister can now tell us when he expects tenders to be called for these ships.

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Some time later this year, Mr. Speaker.

REQUEST FOR SALARY ADJUSTMENT FOR MEDICAL OFFICERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey North): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. When will the medical doctors in the army receive a pay adjustment which would be commensurate with their skill and which would at least bring them the advantages now being enjoyed by the dental officers?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question should be placed on the order paper.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

CONSIDERATION OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RESPECTING ESTABLISHMENT OF BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): I should like to adress this question to the Prime Minister. Having in mind the recommendation of the committee on justice and legal affairs calling for the establishment of a federal board to promote motor vehicle safety in all its aspects, can the right hon. gentleman say whether consideration is being given to this recommendation?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was discussing this matter with some of my colleagues yesterday.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REPORTED UNSATISFACTORY SERVICE BETWEEN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND MAINLAND

On the orders of the day:

Mr. David MacDonald (Prince): I have a question for the Minister of Transport. In the light of the fact that at the present time mail is travelling by ice boat between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, does the minister think this situation reflects satisfaction with the quality of the service provided by the Canadian National Railways.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): No, sir, but I will pray for sunshine.

DRUGS

BENEFIT TO CONSUMER OF REMOVAL OF SALES TAX

On the orders of the day:

Mr. John M. Reid (Kenora-Rainy River): My question is directed to the Minister of Finance and it concerns the recent proposal to remove the 11 per cent sales tax from the cost of drugs. Has the minister in mind any way of ensuring that this 11 per cent saving will be passed on to the consumer?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would think this is a question of a general nature which cannot be asked at this time.

[*Translation*]

GRAIN

QUEBEC—POSSIBLE SALE OR LEASE OF ELEVATOR

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Would he assure the house that the grain elevators in the city of Quebec will not be rented to foreigners?

[*English*]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I think this question should be regarded as urgent, because the matter is under discussion at the present time. I do not think I can give an assurance in exactly the form desired by the hon. member, but I can give an assurance that this elevator will not be leased to anyone unless adequate provision is made for the proper handling of domestic grain for the farmers of the Quebec area.

• (11:40 a.m.)

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

AMALGAMATION OF NAVY, ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The house resumed, from Thursday, April 6, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act

and other acts in consequence thereof—Mr. Hellyer—Mr. Richard in the chair.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Richard): When the committee rose last evening clause 2 was under discussion.

On clause 2—*Canadian forces, Canadian Armed forces.*

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to pursue much further the few comments I made yesterday as to the inaccuracy of the statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs concerning the confidence which the House of Commons should have in the Minister of National Defence. Today I intend to proceed with a few general comments as to what the position is in this chamber now with respect to this bill, particularly in view of the apparent confusion in the mind of the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River, and in the minds of some other hon. members as to what are the issues before us that we should consider.

First, of course, I am aware that we are in the awkward position that the house gave this bill second reading and then held committee hearings to determine whether the house should pass the question of unification in principle. Having held many committee hearings and having had the benefit of the advice of the best and most senior military minds in Canada, most of whom unfortunately were prematurely dumped by this amateur minister, I think we should now consider the evidence we have obtained. We must approach this on the basis of the evidence itself, the credibility of the witnesses, their experience and the sum total of all evidence on each point that may be in issue when we are considering whether we should adopt any clause of this bill on unification.

There was much comment in the House of Commons and in the defence committee, while we were trying to get more witnesses who could give more valuable information, to the effect that we had heard enough witnesses. I heard Liberal members on the defence committee suggest that we were getting one for one on each side, and that it seemed to be balancing out.

Liberal members seemed to have the feeling that if they could call one witness from within the Department of National Defence who would follow the minister's instructions, this would balance off the testimony of another witness who had the freedom to speak and give that committee the benefit of his experience and knowledge as one who had no motive but his own wish to assist his country by expressing his views. Those witnesses called who were no longer in the department were motivated only by a desire to bring to the attention of the committee all the facts and information and knowledge they had accumulated, the benefit of their years of experience and wisdom, so that we in the House of Commons and in the defence committee might be in a better position to judge the facts and decide on the basis of expert military testimony what was best for us to do with this bill.

Having pointed out the position of those people, and having mentioned the position of the Liberals on the defence committee—that it was a case of one from each side—I think we should now refer to the evidence of General Allard, particularly his opening statement which gives the House of Commons its most valuable indication as to the strength of the evidence presented by various people. If my hon. friends on my right would continue their conversations behind the curtain, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could make myself heard in this chamber.

We first became aware of how difficult this problem was in the Landymore incident when I charged the minister with tampering with the evidence. You will recall that at that time the minister said or gave the impression that he felt that because this witness was a serving officer responsible to the minister he, the minister, had the right to review his evidence; that the witness was appearing as a representative of the minister; that that made the minister responsible for his evidence and therefore that was the only kind of evidence that could be given. I believe each witness who has appeared from the defence department has believed in this course of conduct. I believe that if a serving officer feels—

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Richard): Order, please. I would appreciate very much if hon. members who are in this chamber or close by would refrain from loud conversations so as to give an opportunity to the hon. member who has the floor to make his remarks, and so that at least some of us may hear what he has to say.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nugent: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I may carry on with what I was saying, it is not a case of numbers of witnesses on each side. It is a case of looking at each witness, his ability to speak not only from the point of view of his experience and general knowledge

but whether he is giving us the benefit of his experience and whether he is speaking freely for himself.

It is my contention that the witnesses who appeared on behalf of the Department of National Defence—all of them—were acting under the restraint of their positions and mainly following the official departmental line, and therefore not one of them can be counted on as an officer of experience in that position who has given us the benefit of his own personal opinion and personal experience.

Mr. Hellyer: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I think it is quite irresponsible on the part of the hon. member to reflect on members of the armed forces who are not able to come into this chamber and defend themselves. I think he should withdraw any allegation he has made, or any suggestion whatsoever that anyone who appeared before that committee and who is presently in uniform said anything other than the absolute truth as he believed it to be, and I would urge the hon. member in the name of human decency to withdraw the suggestion he has made.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nugent: Considering the behavior of the Minister of National Defence concerning those under his power and the way in which he has treated them, I consider the minister the oddest source from which any appeal to human decency can come. Not only that, Mr. Chairman; it is I think evident from the remarks I have made—and if the minister will allow me to continue—that I have been very fair to those individuals. I have not suggested in any way for one minute that any one of them has lied to the committee. What I have suggested is that they had a duty to the department—and that is the way they seemed to believe it—to give to the committee that viewpoint which represents official departmental thinking, and that they are not permitted to say otherwise.

Certainly the Admiral Landymore case was a classic example. The minister changed the testimony. Admiral Landymore, being duty bound to follow the advice of his minister, found himself unable to challenge the authority of the minister to do this because he had to be guided as to the authority of the minister by the minister himself. But that did not stop him from feeling resentment and later on, when he was attacked by the minister, revealing the facts.

• (11:50 a.m.)

I was going to quote from the testimony of General Allard who gave us a very clear warning as to the limitation on his ability to speak before the committee. This quotation appears in volume 27 of the minutes of proceedings and evidence of the standing committee on national defence at page 1759. I shall read the whole paragraph because I think it is worthy of consideration by this house in respect of the credibility, importance and weight that should be placed on the evidence given by various witnesses. General Allard said this:

> It is with mixed feelings that I appear before you today. I say this because although I know this will make no difference to the prerogatives and privileges of this committee—nor should it—I personally think that some of the practices and methods of operation are paradoxical. On the one hand, there are called before you officers of the forces, like myself, who are responsible for the organization, efficiency, and morale of the forces for your defence, and who can speak only within the bounds of these responsibilities under the policies set forth by the government.

Perhaps I should repeat that last sentence, because it represents in essence the attitude taken by General Allard and the other witnesses from the defence department who appeared before the committee. It gives us a clear indication of the limitation on their evidence and the extent to which we are able to find out the personal feelings of those testifying. Let me repeat the last sentence, or the last part of it:

> —who can speak only within the bounds of these reponsibilities under the policies set forth by the government.

General Allard then continued:

> On the other hand, other people are called before you, who have no responsibilities to anybody but themselves, and therefore can make statements on matters for which they bear no responsibility.

I pointed out to General Allard at the time that as a gentleman he might like to change those last words by saying instead of "no responsibility", responsibility only as to themselves on their honour as gentlemen and former officers. If we ever lose sight of this limitation on the ability of serving officers to speak when assessing the evidence given before the committee we will fail to recognize the value of that evidence.

General Allard gave a clear warning in that statement. That is quite different to what the minister said I was suggesting, that officers were not being honest before the committee. The general's statement indicates that he has gone as far as he can to tell the committee

how his evidence must be read. The treatment of Landymore is an indication of how careful we must be in reading the evidence of those witnesses who are under the thumb and direction of the minister. The minister's attitude has been consistent in this regard. I suppose he still feels he had the right to tamper with the evidence of the witnesses, to keep witnesses from giving their own personal opinions and to restrict them to giving the official party line.

I still contend that he has no right to do that. General Allard has told us clearly and simply that he accepts the minister's direction in this regard. It is my submission that if the chief of staff accepts that direction, then every officer under him and the minister must accept it. For that reason the skill and experience of an officer who has given testimony is of assistance to us only in understanding his technical knowledge and thorough appreciation of his department's work. The evidence gives us no clue whatsoever as to the personal feelings or beliefs of those officers who testify.

In view of the clear warning given us by General Allard I submit we do not obtain his personal opinion at all from the answers he gives to questions regarding the practicability of unification and whether it will work. He indicated that his job when testifying was to present official government policy. Therefore it was his duty to answer in the terms he did. In support of this submission I suggest we have the testimony of others, including retired officers, to the effect that as long as they maintained their positions they had to accept direction. They have said that when they found they could no longer go along with policy they had to resign. For this reason the first lesson to be learned from the committee hearings is how the evidence must be weighed.

The suggestion by members on the Liberal side that the evidence of one group of officers to the effect that unification will work balances the evidence of the other group who said it will not work is pure nonsense. The only indication we have had that unification is good has come in statements put into the mouths of certain officers by the Minister of National Defence. In my submission those statements are completely worthless as evidence. Therefore the only statements we can count on as representing the experience and honest opinions of the gentlemen giving evidence are those statements of the officers who were in a position to speak freely and honestly without restriction and without fear of reprisal. Those gentlemen were not compelled by a sense of duty to say certain things in order that they might remain in their positions.

Having made those remarks, let me say it is the duty of all members of this house to examine very closely the evidence given by those honourable gentlemen who appeared before the committee. Admiral Landymore presented two very excellent briefs. He was torn between the conditions of his service and the resentful position he was put in by the minister. Whether he liked it or not he found himself in the spotlight of a mounting quarrel.

None can doubt Admiral Landymore's excellent service to this nation over the years. Certainly his promotions over the years to the position he held in the navy, together with the evidence of other people as to his military ability and the way he handled himself before the committee, bear testimony to his integrity. I am sure we were all impressed by his general demeanour and bearing during the time he appeared before the committee.

Admiral Landymore and many other witnesses made a clear distinction between integration and unification, and this brings me to the second point I wish to touch upon. Perhaps I will go into it in detail on another occasion, but at this time I will indicate the nature of this point. The committee in considering this bill, must clearly understand that integration is one thing and unification is another. Unification is another entirely different concept, and until we learn to distinguish between the two we cannot properly understand this legislation.

Mr. Haidasz: Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to make a few observations during this debate, which I consider to be one of the most historical in which we have had the opportunity to participate. At the outset in speaking on Bill C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts consequential to it, I should like to pay tribute to the forthright and courageous Minister of National Defence.

It is my belief that over the years the defence policy of this country and all its very complicated aspects have been allowed to slide. Very vexing problems have arisen but they have now been faced courageously by the present minister who has brought forward solutions.

• (12 noon)

In following the proceedings of the committee and the debates in the chamber we have witnessed democracy in action. I do not doubt the sincerity of hon. members opposite in the remarks they have made in participating in this debate. It is their duty to find out whether the legislation placed before them can be improved. However, I feel that at times some of the remarks made my hon. members opposite verge more on personal invective rather than constructive criticism. I believe the role of the opposition is to improve legislation, rather than trying to damage those people who are trying to bring forth legislation which they are convinced is the right thing for the country.

Mr. Lambert: Physician, heal thyself.

Mr. Haidasz: I know hon. members opposite are in a very difficult position. The record of the Liberal administration of the right hon. Prime Minister is an enviable one.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Haidasz: It is an outstanding record which has met with the support of the majority of the members of this house and the majority of the Canadian people. I am also convinced that the defence policy of this government will eventually meet with the approval of the majority of the members of this house and the majority of the Canadian people.

Mr. Nugent: Party discipline is like military discipline, isn't it?

Mr. Haidasz: May I also say without reservation that I have confidence in the ability, the integrity and the credibility of our Minister of National Defence.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Haidasz: I also have confidence in this legislation to integrate and eventually unify the armed forces of our country. It has been clearly explained and effectively defended by the minister, by the associate minister and by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I am also convinced that the defence policy of this government is in the best interests not only of our national security but also of international peace.

In the press last week there was a great hubbub about the remarks some people had made with regard to Air Chief Marshal Miller's testimony before the standing committee on national defence. Some people said they found his testimony very interesting. I should like at this moment to bring some of Air Chief Marshal Miller's testimony to the attention of this committee. One of the more interesting aspects of that evidence is the fact that this former chief of defence staff contradicted his former vice chief, Lieutenant General Moncel, on at least three occasions. The first contradiction is the following. General Moncel claimed that he had written four plans for unification, and that the one the minister had selected was one he had "rejected out of hand." The following exchange took place in the committee on national defence, as recorded at page 2299 of the committee's proceedings. The hon. member for Vancouver East asked:

> Did you, as chief of staff, ever see the four plans on unification drafted by General Moncel?
>
> Air Chief Marshal Miller: No.

A little later on Air Chief Marshal Miller stated:

> As far as four plans prepared by General Moncel are concerned, I am not aware of four formalized plans put up for comparison.

Next the hon. member for Hamilton West intervened by saying:

> If there were they would have gone through you as chief of staff, would they not, sir?
>
> Air Chief Marshal Miller: Normally, yes.

Air Chief Marshal Miller's answer corroborates General Allard's statement to the effect that in so far as he knew, no such plans existed. They existed perhaps only as a figment of General Moncel's nimble imagination.

Mr. Churchill: Will the hon. member accept a question? Is the hon. member suggesting that General Moncel lied to the committee?

Mr. Haidasz: The second contradiction is the following—

Mr. Churchill: That is disgraceful.

Mr. Haidasz:—and it can be found on page 1309 of the proceedings where General Moncel claimed that we required a force of 150,000 men and a budget of $2 billion to meet our commitments. When asked about that Air Chief Marshal Miller replied:

> I do not know where he got those figures; they do not ring any bells with me—

The third contradiction—

Mr. Lambert: Is that a contradiction?

Mr. Haidasz:—is the following. With regard to communications the following exchange

took place between the hon. member for Edmonton West and Air Chief Marshal Miller, as reported at page 2323 of the proceedings of the committee. The hon. member for Edmonton West said:

> General Moncel has indicated that he felt one of the difficulties encountered was a breakdown in communications between headquarters and field commanders.

Air Chief Marshal Miller replied:

> I do not agree with that; that is conjuring up a drastic picture that I do not think ever existed.

This is absolutely contradictory testimony as between the chief of staff and his vice chief. We saw no such exhibition with those officers presently serving. A great deal of talk has also centred on unification as a prime reason for a decrease in morale and subsequently a problem in recruiting. In the April, 1967 issue of *Saturday Night*, in an article entitled "Mr. Hellyer and the officers. Why unification is not the issue," James Jackson, I believe an ex-wing commander, states the following at page 23 of the magazine:

> While unification may bother those for whom the colour of their uniform or whether they call the place they drink in a mess or a wardroom are articles of faith, it isn't in itself an issue worth serious consideration. The United States air force, after all, changed both its name and its uniform after world war II. Members of the United States marine corps wear a common uniform and operate land, sea, and air weapons systems.

Mr. Churchill: What sea weapons?

Mr. Haidasz: The article continues:

> Neither body has suffered noticeable loss of morale as a result. The true defence crisis of 1966-67 is not an integration crisis. The true crisis is that the Canadian military community—particularly at the medium and senior levels of the officer corps which should provide its main vitality and direction—has almost completely lost its moral coherence. And this disintegration has in fact been going on since 1945, the year Canada ended its last war as a colonial participant and began unsuccessfully to act as a national military power.

Mr. Jackson goes on to say in this article:

> To blame Mr. Hellyer for destroying morale is in fact ridiculous. It has been destroyed by a succession of defence ministers and governments since 1945 who failed to provide intelligent policy direction. It has been destroyed by senior service officers incapable of giving sound advice or of implementing sound personnel policies. Mr. Hellyer has aggravated the problem, but he is not solely responsible for it. Today's irony is the spectacle of ex-ministers and retired ancient militarists furiously condemning Mr. Hellyer for a state of chaos they themselves were busy creating while he was still a backbencher.

Mr. Churchill: Nonsense.

[Mr. Haidasz.]

Mr. Lambert: What are this man's qualifications, other than the ability to write with a facile pen?

• (12:10 p.m.)

Mr. Haidasz: Air Chief Marshal Miller concurred with this view when he stated, as reported at page 2293 of the committee's proceedings:

> First of all the diagnosis (that) was causing this—

He was referring to the recruiting problem.

> —was basically the time away from home, pay of the people who were separated from their families, shore-sea ratio; all these problems existed and required rectification. We could not do all the things to repair them as we wanted to do, but quite a bit has been done for the man in the navy now to make his lot a little happier one and therefore make it easier to recruit people into the navy.

To me this is an indication that the Minister of National Defence is carrying out his responsibilities, and is taking the necessary steps to ensure that the Canadian servicemen will have the best possible environment in which to perform their duties.

Much of the committee's time was spent on the subject of the operational effectiveness of the services, and I believe the quotation I have just read leads nicely into this subject. I should like to quote an exchange on this topic between Air Chief Marshal Miller and some of the committee members at page 2306, where Air Chief Marshal Miller and the hon. member for Edmonton West spoke about the drop in numbers in the air force. It reads as follows:

> Well, through the natural process of growing older, our forces were largely world war II forces—the officer category, and the NCO category—and there was going to be a bust of releases starting about now but going on for the next four or five years in which there will be a real bleeding-off of skilled people through normal retirement.
>
> This was a worrisome thing and one of the things we had to look at was to try and string out the younger group coming along, because there was a period there from about 1945 to 1950 where an increase in new people coming into the forces was very very small indeed.

At one point in the questioning the hon. member for Hamilton West and the air chief marshal explored the question of the actual effectiveness of the forces. I will read from page 2322 where the hon. member stated the following with regard to the navy:

> We would have greater fire power with the new equipment and with reduced personnel. It does mean to say that we are less effective by having reduced personnel.

At another point the hon. member for Hamilton West asked another question. He

asked whether in the opinion of the air chief marshal the operational effectiveness of our land contribution to NATO has been enhanced since 1962, to which the air chief marshal said it has. The hon. member for Hamilton West asked him in what way, to which Air Chief Marshal Miller replied "more modern equipment in practically every phase of it. The hon. member for Hamilton West then asked:

> Would not this more modern equipment and increase in aircraft make us better able to carry out our assignment to the UN, should they come to us for additional commitments?

The air chief marshal replied:

> I would be of the opinion that it would, certainly.

Then the hon. member for Hamilton West asked "are we better off operationally today than we were in 1962? Air Chief Marshal Miller replied: "Yes". Later on the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek asked the following question:

> Now in answer to Mr. Macaluso's question, you said that the Canadian forces have greatly increased their combat effectiveness—all the services—in the last phase since 1962 to 1966, at the time you retired. Did I understand correctly that you felt there was quite an increase in the combat effectiveness of the Canadian troops?
>
> Air Chief Marshal Miller: Yes; I had a little joust with Mr. Macaluso on that.

Earlier in the deliberations the air marshal had stated "Certainly the quality of weaponry in all three services is better than it has been in the past." The air chief marshal concurred also with the article he had written while chief of defence staff. He said the following, as appears at page 2294 of the committee's proceedings:

> —throughout the period of reorganization we have maintained our operational capability. There has been no loss of efficiency, no cutting of commitments. Indeed, we have accepted new responsibilities and taken them in our stride.

I believe the air chief marshal's assessment corroborates the picture presented to us by the defence, staff, that Canada has never had a more effective force for the money being spent. With regard to our commitments, the air chief marshal and the hon. member for Greenwood exchanged the following opinions, as reported at page 2330 of the committee's proceedings:

> Mr. Brewin: Is it a fact, then, that within the existing budget limits you are saying that you can put more emphasis on both a mobile intervention force with greater transportability and carry out the existing commitments?
>
> Air Chief Marshal Miller: Yes, because you do it with the same force.

Therefore it seems that once again the air chief marshal and the defence staff concur in the opinion that our military force is in excellent shape and that we are effectively and efficiently meeting our commitments and fulfilling our roles.

With regard to the planning for unification the air chief marshal said the following, as appears at page 2296 of the committee's proceedings:

> Yes, there certainly had been discussion on it—

Later the hon. member for Kootenay East asked the following question, as reported at page 2302:

> Air Marshal Miller, is it your understanding that the government policy outlined in the white paper is one of ultimate unification of the forces? Is that a fair statement?

Air Chief Marshal Miller replied:

> Yes, that is what the white paper says.

There was certainly no doubt in Air Chief Marshal Miller's mind as to what the end result was to be. Again, much ado was made about the stage to which integration had progressed. When the hon. member for Simcoe North stated that he understood it was "just now getting into the clear planning stage", Air Chief Marshal Miller corrected him by saying the following, as reported at page 2304:

> Well, we are fairly well down the road on integration.

I believe my time is almost up, Mr. Chairman, but I will take only a few moments to finish my presentation. I should like now to quote one more passage from Mr. Jackson's article which appeared in April, 1967. It reads as follows:

> Mr. Hellyer may be far from solely responsible for the military community's predicament. But he is responsible for resolving it. Over-ridingly, this calls for national military aims clearly related to foreign policy, and for military rules that make sense in terms of weapons and force assigned. More immediately, swift and decisive action is needed in personnel policy. However unpalatable the final criteria for promotion, rank structures, retirement ages, and terms of employment generally, the chief immediate need is that they be promulgated in specific detail. The date of 1970, which Mr. Hellyer has set for unification becoming a "total reality", is far too remote.

Mr. Jackson summed up the situation rather nicely. The Minister of National Defence, the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the whole cabinet and its supporters know their responsibility to the Canadian people. Major evidence was presented by the defence staff. It is definitely an

argument in favour of unification. The Prime Minister and his supporters will fulfil their responsibility to the Canadian electorate.

Mr. Chairman, may I appeal to the members of this house that without further delay we get on with this legislation to unify the Canadian armed forces, which I believe will be in the best interests of national security and international peace.

• (12:20 p.m.)

Mr. Harkness: I regret that the hon. member who has just taken his seat has seen fit to cast doubts on the honesty of General Moncel and the correctness of the testimony he gave before the committee. General Moncel was one of the most distinguished officers during the last war, and has been so since. I do not believe the hon. member adds anything to this debate or to his own stature by casting such doubts on General Moncel's honesty.

Mr. Haidasz: I rise on a question of personal privilege, Mr. Chairman. If any remark I have made casts such doubt on the integrity of General Moncel I wish to say that such was not my intention, and I withdraw any such allegation.

Mr. Harkness: I am glad the hon. member has withdrawn the allegation or the implications of the remarks he made. I might point out to the hon. member that the so-called contradictions which he mentions as between the evidence given by General Moncel and that given by Air Chief Marshal Miller are not in actual fact contradictions at all.

General Moncel said he had prepared four plans. Air Chief Marshal Miller did not for a moment say General Moncel had not prepared four plans; he merely said they had not come to his attention. This is a different thing altogether. In so far as the estimate of the number of people that would be required is concerned, General Moncel gave his opinion of the size and cost of the force necessary to meet our international commitments. Those were General Moncel's calculations. He was asked for them and he gave them. Air Chief Marshal Miller did not agree that as many men would be required or that the cost would be as great. There was a difference of opinion between the two in their judgment on that matter. However, this was not a contradiction in the evidence given; it was a difference of opinion as to the cost. Air Chief Marshal Miller did not for a moment say that more men than we have at the present time were not required. In fact I think had he been asked a question in that form he would have said that certainly we require more people than we have at the present time.

I also deplore the fact the hon. member attempted to give the impression that Air Chief Marshal Miller was in favour of the bill we are discussing and in favour of the unification plans of the minister. He was asked a specific question with regard to that, to which I will refer later, and his reply indicated he was not in favour of this unification plan. After the questioning was over Air Chief Marshal Miller made a submission in the form of a plea to the committee and to the government not to proceed with unification at this time. This plea is found at page 2342, and I should like to read a portion of the evidence on that page to indicate that the general impression the member has tried to give that Air Chief Marshal Miller is in favour of this unification bill is contrary to the facts:

> I feel the next step that was forecast in the white paper, that of doing away with the services, will cause the loss, against this business we have been discussing recently, of a lot of people we cannot afford to lose and that we will not get very much of a benefit from this single service proposal. Maybe after the lessons of integration have been learned and the team has worked out—and they are not through the integration learning process—the follow-on then of a single service will be a natural and non-argumentative course.

He says "perhaps", of course.

> But I make a plea for you to interpret my position as being in favour of integration as we have it now, as it is developing. I am not closing the book at all on some future unification but would not want a disruptive influence such as unification to be thrown into the machinery at this time. That is my personal view and I want to make it and leave it very clearly with you.

Mr. Chairman, the Associate Minister of National Defence and a number of other Liberal speakers have all made the plea that we should now get on with the business of getting this bill through. Last night the Minister of Public Works spoke along the same lines. These people leave out of their consideration the fact that the government itself has initiated a general defence, and to some extent even foreign affairs, debate on this particular bill. During his long speech the other day the minister spent most of his time on what I might call general defence policy, equipment matters and things along those lines. Under those circumstances I think it is only proper that all members of the house who are interested in these matters should have an opportunity to express their views, not only on the matter of unification itself but on all these other matters which have some

relationship to it and which have been really injected into the debate by the members of the government.

When I was speaking earlier in the week I was dealing with some of the things the minister had said in his speech which in my view were incorrect, and upon which some comment needed to be made. The last of them was in regard to equipment. Following that the minister went on to say something about the equipment and the situation of the navy. This is a matter which has been the subject of argument between the minister and myself as well as other members for some considerable time. The minister has continued to maintain that the anti-submarine capability of the navy is the greatest it has ever been in history. I and a number of other people have maintained the opposite.

Without actually saying so the minister has implied, and the hon. member for Lincoln devoted his whole speech to this, that the evidence given before the committee supported his view. Mention was made of only one witness, and that was Commodore Porter. The allegation was that our anti-submarine capability now is greater than it has ever been. I feel, Mr. Chairman, there is no question but that is not the case. As a matter of fact the witnesses we had before the committee who were in the best position to give evidence on this matter told us that the anti-submarine effectiveness of the Canadian navy and the maritime command—it is not only a matter of the navy but of the navy and the air force —had considerably declined. This was the evidence of Rear Admiral Brock, of Rear Admiral Landymore and Vice Admiral Rayner.

These three senior officers have all been in command of maritime command or of Pacific-Maritime command as it used to be. In the case of Vice Admiral Rayner, he was in addition the last chief of the naval staff. I should like to put on record some of the evidence given by these officers. I will not read too much, although there was a great deal of it, but I want to indicate that our anti-submarine effectiveness has materially declined. On page 985 of the committee evidence, when Admiral Brock was on the stand, I find this:

Mr. Harkness: On Thursday the minister informed us in answer to questions that we now have 28 ships in commission, 8 of which are under refit, and of the 20 remaining, 16 are ready for immediate operations. Now, in spite of that the minister stated in this committee, and he stated repeatedly in the House of Commons and other places, that our anti-submarine capability is greater now than it ever was at any other time in Canada's history. What would be your comment on that?

Rear Admiral Brock: Balderdash.

Mr. Harkness: I ask you this particularly as one of our—I think everyone will admit—chief experts as far as anti-submarine warfare and general fighting naval operations are concerned, and I take it from your answer that you believe there is no validity in that contention whatever.

● (12:30 p.m.)

Rear Admiral Brock: Mr. Harkness, I would have to examine very carefully the words of the minister because, as I was trying to explain this morning, there is a difference between the fighting effectiveness of just a single unit and the capability of the whole.

Mr. Harkness: Well, following this up, of these 28 ships which we still have in commission, how many have been completed as new ships since you first took over command in 1963?

Rear Admiral Brock: Well, none. Some have been modified. There are modification programs and some of them have been completed. I do not think the whole program is yet complete. Again, better testimony on this subject is available from other more senior officers recently connected with the service.

Mr. Harkness: In effect, your evidence is that these 28 ships are the same ships that were in commission in 1963?

Rear Admiral Brock: Oh yes, indeed.

Then the admiral went on to deal with the amount of time it takes to lay down a ship. I continued:

Mr. Harkness: The minister's contention is that the present ships are so much more modern, so much more up to date, that the total anti-submarine capacity is greater than it was before but, in effect, these are the same ships. Now, what improvements have been made to them, to your knowledge, which would make them much more effective?

Rear Admiral Brock: I do not know of any improvements that have been made that had not long since been planned.

Mr. Harkness: I think this is correct. Helicopters have been added to some ships which is a program that was under way at that time. Improved sonar has been added which was another program that was in hand at that time. Have there been any other improvements in their anti-submarine capabilities that you are aware of?

Rear Admiral Brock: Not that I know of. It may be helpful to have colonels in command, but there is nothing else I know of now.

Mr. Harkness: As an expert in this field, then, you would say the contention that our anti-submarine capability is greater than it has ever been before just will not stand up to examination?

Rear Admiral Brock: It does not appeal to my judgment.

Mr. Harkness: I say that as an expert in this field you would say that is just not the case: that the present 28 ships which are the same ships with, in some cases, some improvements cannot do nearly as good a job as the 45 to 47 that we had in the beginning of '63?

Rear Admiral Brock: That is so, yes.

Mr. Hellyer: The admiral is a year out of date with his information.

Mr. Harkness: The minister can complain about that as much as he likes, but one of the great difficulties in dealing with him in the past has been that he keeps reiterating the same story no matter how often it is disproved. One of the advantages of the committee was that we were able to get the views of experts such as Rear Admiral Brock, Rear Admiral Landymore and Vice Admiral Rayner. We asked them specific and direct questions about the effectiveness of the anti-submarine role of maritime command and the navy at the present time, and their evidence was that it had very definitely declined, which is quite contrary to what the minister has maintained and is still maintaining, in spite of the evidence.

Mr. Hellyer: Their evidence is quite wrong.

Mr. Starr: Everybody lied but the minister.

Mr. Harkness: This shows the hopeless mess of the situation when dealing with the minister, Mr. Chairman. He is not an expert on maritime warfare or any other type of warfare. When we have the evidence of perhaps our three greatest experts on anti-submarine warfare in the committee, the minister simply says their evidence is wrong and he is right, in spite of the fact that he has no experience whatever in that field. Vice Admiral Rayner gave evidence on this same question, and his evidence is to be found at page 2029 of the committee reports.

Mr. Hellyer: He is even further out of date.

Mr. Harkness: Well, Mr. Chairman, the minister says he is even further out of date, but Rear Admiral Brock, Rear Admiral Landymore and Vice Admiral Rayner all said—and nobody said anything to the contrary—that all of the improvements which have been made in our ships since the minister took over his present office were already under way, had been planned for and were already being put into operation at the time the hon. gentleman became minister.

Yet the minister still says these people were out of date. They have only been out of naval service for two or three years, and in the case of Admiral Landymore he had only been out of the navy about a month at this particular time, or even less than that. The minister still says they are out of date and do not know what they are talking about. I believe the members of this committee as well as the Canadian public will know whose judgment and evidence to accept in this matter. I think very few people will accept the judgment of the minister as opposed to that of these three senior naval officers who have devoted most of their lives to this particular form of naval operation. As reported at page 2006 of the committee report Vice Admiral Rayner stated:

> I believe that a strong Canada requires a strong Canadian navy. Although the Minister of National Defence has issued reassuring statements concerning the navy's anti-submarine capability, it cannot be denied, that the navy has been reduced in size and effectiveness since 1964.

I asked the admiral a number of questions about that, but I am not going to take the time to put them on record. They indicated how the effectiveness of the navy had been reduced. As reported at page 2030 of the minutes I asked this question:

> Can you give us any estimate of the extent or the percentage which in your view the effectiveness of the navy has declined?
>
> Mr. Rayner: I do not think I could give you a figure for that. I can only say that the personnel have been reduced by about 20 per cent and in quality I would say that they have been reduced by more than that, much more than that.

That is the evidence of two of these officers. I am not going into Rear Admiral Landymore's evidence, but it is along the same lines. Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely no question but that the anti-submarine effectiveness of our navy has very materially declined.

Mr. Hellyer: That is not true.

Mr. Harkness: The minister says that is not true, but I have just put on the record the evidence of the experts in this field.

Mr. Hellyer: That is not evidence, that is opinion.

Mr. Pickersgill: Would the hon. gentleman let me ask him a question?

Mr. Harkness: Yes.

Mr. Pickersgill: I listened attentively to the extracts the hon. gentleman has just read to us, and they were new to me. However, they appear to me to be merely assertions of opinion. There was not one piece of hard statistical evidence among them. Could the hon. gentleman read us not the opinions of Vice Admiral Rayner but the actual evidence on which he claims to have reached these opinions?

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Chairman, I could take the rest of today's sitting reading the evidence given in this regard by these three gentlemen.

Mr. Pickersgill: Just give three examples.

Mr. Harkness: I think the evidence given was quite hard evidence. These are people who know. If the minister wants an opinion about the ability of the Canadian Pacific Railway to move a certain amount of freight, he goes to the head of the Canadian Pacific Railway and asks him.

Mr. Pickersgill: I would expect him to be biased.

Mr. Harkness: The minister would ask him whether he could move it or not. That is the only way he could get an opinion, from people who are experts in that particular line and know what they are talking about. As far as this matter is concerned, that is the situation. Apart altogether from that—

Mr. Hellyer: The director general of maritime forces said the capability is better now, and he is very expert.

Mr. Harkness: If you read the director general's evidence, he was very careful in what he said. He was also under the direction of the minister and was brought in for this specific purpose. He has never been a maritime commander, though I am not casting any doubts on his knowledge and so forth.

• (12:40 p.m.)

Mr. Hellyer: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman says he did not cast doubt on the testimony of Commodore Porter, but he has just done so. He said the commodore was not a maritime commander, and that in presenting to the committee evidence that our maritime force was now as good as or better than it had been at any time previously the commodore specifically presented a view that had been prepared in conjunction with the present maritime commander, who is the most up to date and most knowledgeable person in the anti-submarine business in Canada today. The hon. gentleman therefore cast reflections on that evidence. I think that is not justified.

Mr. Starr: The minister cast reflections on everybody else's evidence.

Mr. Harkness: This evidence was presented under the direction of the minister. Naturally one would not expect it to be contrary to what the minister has been saying. One would not expect it to contradict the minister's repeated statements that the anti-submarine capability of the navy has increased.

Mr. Hellyer: One would not expect a serving officer to give evidence that was not true. It was true, and I resent these constant suggestions from hon. members opposite that the serving officers did not put the facts before the committee.

Mr. Churchill: Can I get in this fight, too?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No, I think you had better not.

Mr. Harkness: I think the minister has made a very serious error in bringing serving officers before the committee. This was referred to by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona. The minister has had serving officers come to the committee to give evidence on essentially political questions, and questions of policy. It is in order to bring officers before the defence committee to give evidence on purely technical matters, for example on how maritime command operates, on how air defence command or any other command operates.

Mr. Hellyer: On the effectiveness of maritime command.

Mr. Harkness: To do as the minister has done, to bring in officers to give evidence to back up statements he has made about matters which are politically controversial is completely unfair to those officers. It puts them in a hopeless position, and I hope this will not be done again in future.

Mr. Pickersgill: Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask my question now?

Mr. Harkness: No. I have a limited amount of time, and the question the hon. gentleman tried to ask was not a question at all. It was just a means of trying to interfere with what I was saying, and to delay proceedings.

An hon. Member: The minister can make his own speech.

Mr. Harkness: The minister gave figures before the committee of the number of ships in commission and in operation serving in the anti-submarine role. The number of those ships is very much reduced from the number in commission three or four years ago. At the present time we have only 16 ships actually in operation. Another four could be in operation had we sufficient crews to man them. Another eight are being refitted; were they not being refitted they would not have crews to man them. With only 16 ships in operation now our anti-submarine capability is materially reduced.

These are the same ships that were in operation four or five years ago. They are not new. They have been improved by adding helicopters and variable depth sonar, programs which were in operation when the minister took over, but I get very tired indeed of the minister continuing to reiterate something with respect to this matter that is directly contrary to even the most casual examination and application of common sense to the question.

I turn to another matter. On page 14436 of *Hansard* for April 3, 1967 the minister said:

> The advantages which would result from the passage of this bill have been stated.

I do not know when they were stated. They had never been stated in a definite or clear form. Certainly I defy anybody on the other side of the house to state in any short and comprehensible form what are the advantages of the bill. I continue quoting:

> Perhaps, however, I should go over them again today. The first is identification. All these people working together in the headquarters and in the unified commands will be identified with the force as a whole. There are some very serious disadvantages in doing it the other way. If people are in unified staff organizations as representatives of different services, the service representation becomes the significant factor in the choice of personnel. It becomes a matter of the ratio of personnel between one service and another, the balance of people by colour.

In any unified staff organization such as we now have at national defence headquarters it is not a matter of ratio, per se, among the three services. In any staff, particularly in one which deals with combined operations or with operations in which more than one service is involved, there must be representatives of all three services, to have available the expert opinion required to make the operation reasonably possible.

Whether or not all people serve in one uniform, there must be on national defence headquarters staffs or command staffs, officers from the sea element, as the minister prefers to call it, the land and the air elements; otherwise there will not be the expert and balanced advice and judgment which is essential in deciding a large number of matters. This matter of identification has no validity whatever. It does not matter whether the staffs are in one uniform or in six different uniforms, there must be experts from each branch of the service in any staff for it to operate effectively. On the next page the minister goes on to say this:

> The other side of this coin relates, of course, to career opportunity. The more staff jobs that are opened up to qualified people from all specialities the more opportunity there will be for employment for gifted people who want to progress, who are well motivated and have the necessary qualifications. Therefore there will be broader employment opportunities and consequently greater chances for the kind of person who should be advanced and should have greater responsibility in an integrated force of this kind.

The minister cannot have it both ways. He has argued that this measure will cut down the size of staffs. He is combining the navy, army and air force staffs into a single staff, thereby saving manpower and reducing the number of staff jobs. If he reduces the numbers of people holding staff jobs it is evident that he is reducing the opportunities people will have for those jobs. Completely the reverse of what he argues will happen in fact; there will be fewer opportunities for staff jobs.

Personally I think the staffs are too big. When I was minister of national defence I undertook a considerable number of measures to cut them down. This part of the minister's program I agree with; but the argument that by cutting staffs he will create more opportunities for staff jobs does not stand up to scrutiny. It is like saying that by reducing the number of ministries you allow opportunity for more people to become cabinet ministers. The reverse is true.

My next quotation follows immediately after my last one:

> • (12:50 p.m.)
>
> Next let me refer to adaptability of change, and this is related to the other two. When roles and missions change, and this will be of interest to hon. members of the New Democratic Party, it will be much easier to meet government requirements with a single force.

Well, I think the exact reverse is the case, and in my opinion the balance of evidence we heard in the committee was to this effect. Instead of this unified force having greater flexibility, as the minister has maintained, it will have less flexibility. This is one of the arguments a large number of people have used against the single unified force; it will not be able to meet the roles laid down by defence policy.

Mr. Herridge: Does the hon. gentleman not realize that our argument was based on the fact that in the opinion of this group unification does not make sense unless Canada is willing to change its role with respect to defence?

Mr. Harkness: Yes, I understand that argument perfectly, and if I agreed with the premise I would agree with the argument. I believe the argument is correct. If it is desired to get rid of some of these present roles, as the members of the hon. gentleman's party wish to do, the formation of a single unified force might make sense. But if these roles are to be maintained a single unified force is not capable of discharging them successfully.

The Chairman: Order. The time allotted to the hon. member has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

The Chairman: Does the committee give unanimous consent to the hon. member continuing?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Harkness: The Secretary of State for External Affairs said yesterday that in his view if unification is permitted to develop as planned it should in no way hinder our ability to fulfil our foreign policy commitments. I pointed out that all the senior retired officers who appeared before the committee and gave evidence in this regard disagreed with this opinion. The Secretary of State for External Affairs went on to say it was a fact that all the leading officers in the department at the present time took a different view.

I do not think this is the case. As a matter of fact I know a considerable number of officers now serving who have indicated to me the reverse. They are not likely to come out publicly, of course, and I have not asked them for their opinions; I have been careful since I ceased to be minister of defence not to ask serving officers to express their views on any matter. However, a number of them feel so strongly on this issue that they have volunteered information, and there are to my personal knowledge a considerable number of serving officers who disagree completely with the idea of unification and who believe that if it is put into effect Canada will not be able to effectively discharge the roles which the objectives of defence policy impose on the armed forces.

There is only one other matter I will mention at this moment because I see we are due to adjourn in a very few minutes. As reported on page 14438 of *Hansard*, the minister said:

> The suggestion that Canada cannot meet its commitments is not true. Again, evidence has been provided to the committee which indicates specifically that we can meet our commitments—

Mr. Harkness: This is simply not so. I defy the minister to cite evidence which was adduced to show that we can meet our commitments. There was no evidence given along that line whatever. Once more I take objection to loose, general statements of this kind. As reported on the same page the minister stated:

> The suggestion has been made that we shall have to resort to compulsory service to maintain this kind of force. I think this is absolute nonsense.

The minister may think it is nonsense, but a number of responsible people think the reverse. Brigadier Malone who is vice president, manager and a director of F. P. Publications Limited, feels so strongly about it that he wrote an editorial on the subject which appeared in the Winnipeg *Free Press* of February 22; and I do not think he is one the minister will accuse of talking nonsense. He states:

> Of all the damaging consequences of Defence Minister Hellyer's proposed program for all out unification of our armed services, this conscription issue is almost inevitable, if and when unification becomes law in Canada.
>
> This consideration alone, apart from all other errors in Mr. Hellyer's plan, should give parliament serious reason to pause and consider before blindly endorsing his amateur military fantasy.
>
> In passing on the Hellyer legislation now, members must recognize their subsequent responsibilities for providing, by one means or another, for maintaining our national defences and defence treaty obligations at an effective level.
>
> It would be foolhardy in the extreme to blandly assume that recruiting, poor as it already is, will not drastically deteriorate further under unification of the regular services. Our reserve or militia formations of army, navy and air force, as well as our various volunteer cadet services, will in the future have little if any recruiting value for any amalgamated or unified regular force where all unit and service identification has been lost.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. gentleman's time is not limited any longer, and perhaps he will permit me to ask him a question. Does he suggest that his opinion, my opinion, Brigadier Malone's opinion or the opinion of the Minister of National Defence on whether conscription is likely to result from a certain course requires military expertise? Is this not a matter for a purely political judgment?

Mr. Harkness: It is not a question of a purely political judgment. Brigadier Malone bases this assumption on our present ability to recruit as a result of the existence of the militia, cadet forces and so on. The point is that these units will now be divorced from what one might call the general military organization. While there will continue to be a navy, an army and an air force as far as the

reserve units are concerned, in effect there will be only one single force as far as the regular services are concerned. The view of Brigadier Malone and of others with great experience in connection with the militia is that as a consequence there will be a drying up of recruits, an inability to recruit. Thus if we are to meet our commitments it will be necessary to put into effect some form of conscription.

I am not even saying that I agree with Brigadier Malone in this regard. Nevertheless I am bringing to the attention of the committee that a great many responsible people are thinking along these lines.

Mr. Pickersgill: There is a further question which with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I might direct to the hon. gentleman at this time. He suggested that the testimony of certain serving officers was coloured by the fact that they were still serving. Does he really mean to tell us that in the committee certain officers failed to give honest testimony uncoloured by any association with the administration? If so, would he name the officers against whom this serious allegation is made?

• (1:00 p.m.)

Mr. Harkness: I did not make any allegation. What I said was that an officer, a serving officer, being brought before a committee and required to give evidence in regard to what are really political policy matters, is in an extremely unfair and impossible position, and I hoped there would be no repetition of this. The whole history of Admiral Landymore's appearance here, last June I think it was, and the fact his testimony was actually altered by the minister or the minister's officials before he was allowed to give it, indicates the position an officer is in. He is not, by the whole traditions of the service and the position that he is in, able to do anything but support the policy laid down by the minister and the government whether he personally believes in it or not. It is not a matter of his personal belief; it is a matter of the system being such that he has to support it.

When I was minister of national defence I expected the officers to support the policies I was following, which they did. It was their duty to do so. I expect them to support the policies the present minister is following because it is their duty to do so, but that does not mean they cannot have their personal views. However, when they appear before a committee they cannot, by virtue of the system we work under, express their personal views.

[Mr. Harkness.]

The Chairman: Order. It being one o'clock—

Mr. Hellyer: On this very interesting point would the hon. member allow one quick question?

The Chairman: Order. An order of the house was made yesterday that the sitting would be suspended from one o'clock to two o'clock. I suggest the sitting be suspended now.

SITTING SUSPENDED

SITTING RESUMED

The committee resumed at 2 p.m.

The Chairman: Order. When the committee was suspended at one o'clock the hon. member for Calgary North was speaking on clause 2. I understand he now wishes to continue his remarks.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Chairman, before the luncheon recess I had been dealing with matters which arose during the debate and with certain remarks made by various other speakers. I should now like to deal directly with clause 2 which contains the most important concept of this bill.

Part I contains the material matters of the bill but the matter giving us most concern is the proposed amendment to Section 15 of the act. The proposed amendment reads as follows:

> The Canadian Forces are the armed forces of Her Majesty raised by Canada and consist of one service called the Canadian Armed Forces.

The act now states that the armed forces consist of the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force. The basic purpose of this bill is to replace these three services by one unified service. All of the arguments we have heard in this regard and most of the testimony given before the committee have related to this concept. Most of the remaining clauses are consequential upon that concept or involve other matters being dealt with at the same time.

What we are trying to decide at this time is whether a unified force is desirable. The weight of the evidence given before the committee was in opposition to unification at this time. I do not think there can be any question in that regard. There appeared before the committee 12 senior, retired officers, all of whom had very extensive and wide experience. The evidence of nearly all of them was completely against unification. They did not

believe it was a good concept. They believed it would impair the efficiency of the forces. They believed it would put us in the position of not being able to carry out our defence roles effectively, and so on.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Nearly all those who were not completely against unification said that it should not be proceeded with for at least three to five years, that there should be a period of delay of at least that length of time to enable the integration processes which have been set in motion to be completed, to be modified as experience shows modification is necessary and to get the whole system really working properly. They said that after that had been done was the time to make an assessment of the situation and decide whether or not to proceed with the concept of unification.

The only evidence in favour of unification heard by the committee was given by the minister and the officers that he brought in to support his position, plus the evidence of a Mr. Patrick from Montreal who I believe was concerned with supply matters in the R.C.A.F. during the second world war. But as I say, all of what one might call the expert evidence, apart from that given by the officers serving at the present time, was very much against unification. Practically all the senior, retired officers were asked what advantages, either financial or military, would be gained from putting unification into effect. The reply in all cases was "none" or that the advantages would be minimal, that no significant advantages would be gained either from the financial point of view or the military point of view. On the other hand, they all saw very great disadvantages from the military point of view if unification were put into effect. As examples of their attitude on the financial and military aspects I will quote the evidence of only two of these officers. First I quote the evidence given by General Fleury, which is to be found at page 1506 of the committee proceedings. I asked him this question:

As Comptroller General you were, of course, particularly concerned with the financial end of things, and in your view and in the light of the experience that you had in that position, do you consider that there are any financial advantages to be gained by doing away with the navy, army and air force as separate services and combining them into one single unified force?

Mr. Fleury: I cannot see it.

Mr. Harkness: In other words, any financial advantages that could be gained would come entirely from the integration process which has been going forward?

Mr. Fleury: This is the way I saw it.

Mr. Harkness: Do you think there are any military advantages to be gained by the formation of this single unified force?

Mr. Fleury: Not with the defence roles being what they are now.

Then we come to the evidence of Air Chief Marshal Miller. I asked him the same question, and the evidence in this case is found at page 2296:

I do not know whether or not this is a fair question, and if it is not, of course do not answer it. Did you or the other chiefs of staff advise that unification should be proceeded with? I make the distinction here between unification and integration.

Air Chief Marshal Miller: I do not think there was any advice of that sort given.

Mr. Harkness: Have you any knowledge as to any plan that was produced in regard to unification, say, at the time the white paper was produced or shortly thereafter?

Air Chief Marshal Miller: No, there was no plan.

Mr. Harkness: Was there any plan, to your knowledge, produced subsequently?

Air Chief Marshal Miller: I would say that there was no comprehensive plan.

I put that evidence on the record because it has been said that expert advice was given to the minister in regard to unification. In actual fact we had no evidence, none whatever, that the minister received any advice from his senior officers that unification should be proceeded with. In fact, all the advice he received was the direct opposite, that unification should not be proceeded with. Following that I asked:

Do you, yourself, see any financial advantage accruing from the proposed scheme of unification?

Air Chief Marshal Miller: There are no significant financial advantages whatsoever as far as I can see.

Mr. Harkness: Do you see any military advantages flowing from it?

Air Chief Marshal Miller: Again, there are no significant military advantages.

I could go on and quote the evidence of other witnesses who appeared before the committee but I think that is sufficient to establish the fact that those who were in the best position to give evidence in this regard were definite that there was not only no financial advantage in putting unification into effect but also no military advantage. If that is the situation, that there is no financial advantage and no military advantage in putting unification into effect, why should we proceed with this bill?

On the other hand, the same gentlemen were asked what financial or military disadvantages there were in unification. They were

asked particularly about the military disadvantages because as they had said definitely there were no financial advantages there was not much use pursuing that question. A good deal of evidence was given by all the witnesses who appeared before the committee in regard to the military disadvantages of unification, and they were very numerous. Every one of these witnesses pointed out disadvantages from the military point of view of proceeding with the plan of unification.

The reasons for their believing there were military disadvantages can be grouped under several headings. First, they nearly all believed there would be a decline in morale, that the decline in morale which has already taken place would be accelerated and as a result recruiting would be difficult.

Second, their evidence was that there would be an inability to meet the roles laid down for the Canadian forces, those which our defence policy provides as being necessary and with which I agree, that is, the defence of Canada itself, our NATO obligations and commitments, the air defence of the North American continent under NORAD, and assistance to the United Nations. Practically all these people gave as their view that a single, unified force would not be able to meet all these commitments, or meet them effectively. This is the direct contrary, of course, of the belief expressed on Wednesday by the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

The third general heading under which they thought there were military disadvantages in unification was in regard to our ability to co-operate with our allies. They said that with a single, unified force, and with all the allies with whom we have to work who have their forces organized on the basis of a navy, army and air force, co-operation with our allies would be much more difficult and much less effective than has been the case in the past.

• (2:20 p.m.)

The fourth general group of reasons could be put under the heading of a decline in expertise. Nearly all these people believed that with the disappearance of the three separate services there would be a gradual decline in the amount of expertise in naval, land, and air warfare and as a result a gradual decline in the general effectiveness of the forces.

The fifth of these general military disadvantages was that insufficient expert knowledge would be available to the minister in national defence headquarters and on the staffs of commands. Those were the general areas of military disadvantage which all these people thought would result from unification.

Once more I should like to refer to some of the evidence given in that regard. First of all I will refer to Air Chief Marshal Miller. After asking him whether he saw any military advantages in unification I went on to ask him the following question:

Do you see any military disadvantages flowing from it?

He answered me in this way:

The disruption is an unknown factor, and one which I have always rated rather highly. I did not want to have anything occur that would cause disruption in the services. I felt a lot of careful planning was necessary, and that probably time to educate people was required before the next step of unification was taken.

Then the following exchange ensued:

Mr. Harkness: We have had a considerable amount of evidence here in regard to the amount of time that will be required to fully integrate materiel commands, the technical services and various others of the functional commands, and it has been raised that this will range from three to five years.

In your view, do you think there should be a period of something like three to five years to consolidate the integration measures before any further steps could logically be taken?

Air Chief Marshal Miller: That is my feeling completely.

Mr. Harkness: In other words, there should be a pause at the present time.

Air Chief Marshal Miller: Let us get the integration process further along the road before we rock the boat.

I could go on with more along that line but I will leave it at that point. The evidence is absolutely conclusive. It was the opinion of Air Chief Marshal Miller that unification should not be proceeded with at the present time. In view of the position that he occupied for so long and in view of the fact that he was the chief architect under the minister's direction in putting integration into operation, I think we have to pay very serious attention to what he has said. I think members of this house should be very wary of proceeding in disregard of his advice and his evidence.

I asked General Fleury the same question, namely:

Do you think there are any military disadvantages in the formation of such a force?

He replied:

I do indeed, and I think I have already outlined some of them. How we are going to operate in conjunction with our allies in the future is certainly one that looms very large in my mind. I do not know that this is going to have nearly the impact, in this and other areas, on the army and the air force as it will on the navy. I cannot for the life of me see how the navy, which has

traditionally and of necessity worked much more closely with allied navies than it has with either of the other Canadian services, will be greeted when they put into port A or port B or port C.

He goes on to describe what he envisages is likely to be the embarrassing position and the difficulties which will ensue if unification is proceeded with and the naval people are put into a uniform which has no connection with the sea. Then I went on to say:

I must say that I agree with you. You consider that there would be a decline in the specialized military expertise of people in the sea environment, the land environment and the air environment once you had this unified force?

General Fleury then said:

Well, this is one of the areas I cannot see my way through at all. We have not yet recruited into the armed forces, as I see it, the calibre of genius who can command a squadron of fighter-bombers, a flotilla of destroyers and a regiment of tanks. Obviously, you are going to have to have a great deal of specialization, therefore what do you accomplish by insisting that everybody sort of looks alike and belongs to one force? Even in the army, I need hardly remind you, we never insisted that everybody be called "private". We had privates and we had drivers and we had gunners and we had sappers. They were all paid as privates and they all looked like privates, but they carried a variety of titles and names. If this works in a single service I cannot for the life of me see why it should not work with three services.

I think I have perhaps trespassed long enough on the time of the committee so I will conclude my remarks by saying that with the great bulk of the evidence being against unification, and particularly against unification at the present time, I appeal to the government and to members of the house to pay due attention to the opinions of men whose lives have been dedicated to the service of their country and who spoke with great feeling and conviction on these matters. As General Fleury said, I do not think there is any advantage whatsoever, and certainly none has been demonstrated, in doing away with the three services by unifying them into one. On the other hand, there are all the disadvantages which have been brought out. I think it would be doing a grave disservice to Canada's armed forces and to Canada's security to proceed with this measure and therefore I hope that the bill will be withdrawn.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, anybody who hears me speak today on the subject of the armed forces might perhaps say "he should be certified" as I have had no military experience since the days in 1922 when I was in the officers' training corps at the University of Manitoba before many of the members of the house were born. I have never had any doubt that a great strategic career in the armed forces was thwarted by the obsolete and ridiculous rule which the war office had in those days that one ought to be able to hit a target with a Lee Enfield rifle or one was not fit to command troops. I could not hit the target at the old St. Charles range in Winnipeg so I was wiped out of the armed forces and denied the possibility of having as distinguished a career in the last war as has the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, the hon. member for Calgary North.

I will not presume on my experience in any war to express any views on this matter. I cannot forbear from pointing out, that on the basis of the standard on which the hon. member for Calgary North put this matter, next to the Prime Minister I am probably the greatest expert in this house on the relations between politicians and officials, because he and I have both been officials and politicians longer than anyone else in the house and, if expertise depends upon length of service, and even in the case of the Prime Minister upon distinction of service, this constitutes a qualification. Of course I do not accept the view of the hon. member for Calgary North on this point. I think that the fact that somebody has sat in a chair in a particular position for 20 years may have the exact opposite effect from the one that he seemed to suggest. It seems to be his view that nobody who did not fight in the last war is entitled to have any opinion about how one should organize the defence forces which now, as I understand it and as I have understood ever since the North Atlantic alliance—

• (2:30 p.m.)

Mr. Harkness: You are putting words into my mouth.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. member says that I am putting words into his mouth but he is so good at putting words into his own mouth there is no necessity for me to duplicate the process.

Mr. Churchill: Words are better than a foot.

Mr. Pickersgill: I hope the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre will listen to me with the same respect and attention as I always listen to him.

Mr. Churchill: I seldom learn much but I will listen.

Mr. Pickersgill: It is good exercise, especially when, like me, you have only one

good ear. However, I rose to say something about the rather extraordinary position taken by the hon. member for Calgary North about serving officers. He suggested that serving officers should not comment on policy. He referred to Admiral Landymore, and I must say I do not have the rather low view of Admiral Landymore the hon. member apparently has, when he suggests the admiral stayed in the service when his testimony was being changed. If that is his view of Admiral Landymore he is entitled to have it. However, it is not mine. I do not mean to cast aspersions on any officer.

My view is that we would be a lot better off in this house if we assumed that there was the same high sense of duty, the same honour and the same honesty in the service witnesses, both those who have retired from the service and those who are still in it, that we assume about ourselves in this house. Instead of casting reflections and indulging in personalities during this debate we should assume, unless there is concrete, detailed evidence to the contrary, that all of those who have given evidence have done so honestly according to their lights.

I must say I agree with the hon. member for Calgary North completely in what I take to be his view, namely, that witnesses who are officials are to be expected to provide evidence when they are called before a parliamentary committee on questions of fact but not on questions of policy.

Mr. Harkness: That is my position exactly.

Mr. Pickersgill: I think that applies equally to any official who has recently left the service if he has been in a confidential relationship with a minister. It is surely just as wrong for someone who has recently retired and who, as in the case of some of these witnesses, is still on retirement leave, as it is for serving officers, to express views about policy merely because he disagreed with the views of the minister. Otherwise, of course, you simply stack the cards totally against any policy. You say that anyone who is retired may disclose all the secret discussions that took place in the formulation of policy, but someone who is still serving must do nothing of the kind. If this rule is followed you will inevitably get a preponderance of evidence on one side, but that will mean absolutely nothing.

I take the view, and in this respect I am perhaps more conservative, with a small "c", than the hon. member for Calgary North—I

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

was going to say a British view but that is an old fashioned word—

Mr. Churchill: A Liberal cannot use that word.

Mr. Pickersgill: Well, I have pretty good titles as a Liberal, and I use British in a certain sense as opposed to other forms of democratic government. I take the view that officials should be seen but not heard on questions of policy. However important it is to have expert advice before a decision is made, once a decision is made that decision is the minister's. A minister who is not capable of making a decision should not be a minister. The idea of parliament prying, probing and trying to get at the advice the minister received instead of discussing the question on its merits, without any of these personalities and without any of these comparisons, some of which are rather odious, of one person with another, does not seem to be an effective way of reaching a conclusion.

In so far as the question of unification is concerned, I have listened carefully to most of the citations of the evidence before the committee given by the hon. member for Calgary North and I must say that most of it was sheer opinion.

Mr. Harkness: You should read it all; it would do you good.

Mr. Pickersgill: If the hon. gentleman has read all the evidence before the transport committee or is willing to read it over the week end, I would make a bargain with him. Otherwise, I do not intend to. Many hon. members voted on the transport bill without examining all the evidence in the committee and many members, including me, are going to vote on this bill without examining all the evidence. This is inevitable under our parliamentary system when complex questions are before us.

All I am saying is that I believe that if we are going to have recently retired senior officers who have advised the minister in a confidential way exposing this advice to the public gaze and we are going to say at the same time that no serving officer shall express any view about the policy he is directed to carry out, then we are weighting the scale predominantly on one side. This is all I am saying.

It seems to me this fact has escaped the notice of many hon. gentlemen opposite. However, I suggest that it does not matter vitally. This is not a question, really, of expert military knowledge at all. I believe that

with respect to integration it may well be that it is quite important—

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): What are we on?

Mr. Pickersgill: For whom the bell tolls.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Are we talking about transport now? Have I missed something.

Mr. Pickersgill: I am just speaking as an ordinary member of this house—

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Very ordinary.

Mr. Pickersgill: —trying to restore the balance a little bit.

Mr. MacEwan: Every inch a sailor.

Mr. Pickersgill: That is right. I must say one does not necessarily have to wear a blue uniform to be a good sailor. I know something about that.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): As one landlubber to another.

Mr. Pickersgill: The point I am making is that in so far as the progress on integration is concerned, that has been going on for three or four years and the evidence of military experts is, of course, of great relevance. However, in so far as unification is concerned it has no relevance whatever. I want to repeat that. The evidence of experts is of no relevance whatever because there are no experts. There never has been, under modern conditions at least, a unified military force. It is like every step forward, and I believe this is a step forward; it is a step into something in which nobody has any experience. I suggest that generally we are apt to get the most imaginative views from young people who have a sense of adventure and not from people who fought the last war, however gallantly. I say that as one of those who, like the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, is rather a "has been". I recognize that I, like the hon. gentleman, who was born like me practically in the 19th century, have moved steadily more slowly, and as in the case of the hon. gentleman sometimes even backward.

• (2:40 p.m.)

Mr. Churchill: I do not turn somersaults though.

Mr. Pickersgill: It is well known that there were colonels, brigadiers and even generals who were in their thirties in the last war. Why was this the case, instead of taking the people who had fought in the first world war? It was because they wanted youth, they wanted imagination, they wanted people to be looking forward. For that same reason, sir, I suggest—

Mr. Churchill: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Will he name the most successful generals, British and American, in the second world war and tell me whether or not they fought in the first? Now, come on, you are a military expert.

Mr. Pickersgill: If the hon. gentleman would arrange with the C.B.C. or C.T.V. to conduct a quiz program on which both of us would appear, I would appear with him at any time and answer his irrelevant questions. All they indicate is that he is moving further backward all the time. Like every military critic who has opposed every advance, the hon. gentleman wants to fight the last war or the war before the last.

Mr. Churchill: You are just so ignorant, that is all.

Mr. Pickersgill: I suggest that we do not want—

Mr. Churchill: Let me ask the minister another question. He is having a lot of fun making fun and casting supercilious remarks about people who participated in warfare.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: I can stand a lot of this nonsense and I am not thinking of myself, but there is a limit to this. Was it my good fortune or was it my ill fortune to serve in two world wars? I could have sheltered in a university in the first world war and I could have sheltered at home because of age in the second world war. Let us get away from this nonsense, this casting of aspersions on people who were fortunate enough to survive. I did nothing of any extraordinary capacity at all; I just happened to survive. But is that something that is wrong? I am fed up with this stuff from non-combatant people who are making fun of fighting men.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I think that what the hon. gentleman has just said is the best argument I can think of for the point I was making, which was that we should keep personalities out of these debates and that we should discuss this question exclusively on its merits. I am not going to defend my lack of

record in the first world war and I am not going to defend it in the second world war. I made one or two jocular references to my experiences in the O.T.C., and it is my misfortune that I could not hit the target and the hon. gentleman could. I know that the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre had one of the most distinguished military records in the second world war.

Mr. Churchill: No, not distinguished; I make no such claim.

Mr. Pickersgill: I have never questioned and I have never intended to question his devotion and service to his country. If I said anything, in a somewhat facetious and jocular fashion, that implied this, then I withdraw it unreservedly and I apologize to the hon. gentleman because there was no such thought or intent.

Mr. Churchill: I thank the minister very much. But when I spoke in rather a personal fashion I was not speaking for myself, because I do not care much what is said around here. However, I am disturbed about the attacks that are made upon men who served much better than I did in both wars. People are making scurrilous remarks about them, talking about them as being out of date and all the rest of it. They are attempting to pretend that these men were not good servants of their country, and that is what I object to.

Mr. Hellyer: Not at all.

Mr. Churchill: I want to defend them in this house.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. gentleman may object if he likes, but there is nothing that I said along that line except a rather jocular reference to him personally. If it was misinterpreted I withdraw it unreservedly. All I was saying was that when there really was a war on there was very rapid promotion of young people because it was felt that in battle, notwithstanding the hon. gentleman's record, young, vigorous and imaginative people were needed—and I do not think anyone questions that.

Mr. Harkness: It was a question of endurance to a large extent.

Mr. Pickersgill: Maybe it was. Perhaps this is not a very good or strong argument, but whatever it may have been it does go back to the point that I have been trying to make all along, that I suggest the subject of unification should be divorced from all these questions about whether this expert is better than that expert or the other expert and looked at on its merits as a possible course of action in itself.

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

Mr. Harkness: That is what we have been doing.

Mr. Pickersgill: We should not say that my hon. friend the Minister of National Defence, who although he was very young in the last war did serve in the forces, is incompetent and incredible, as I think some hon. gentleman said, merely because his age was such that he could not become a general or even a colonel during the last war. It seems to me that that is totally irrelevant; and I hope that members on both sides of the house will cut out all this kind of thing from now on and concentrate on the point.

The point is really a very simple one. The point is that, having regard to the conditions in 1967 and the conditions we envisage until 1972 as far as we can envisage them by trying to penetrate the mists of the future, would it be a good idea or would it not be a good idea to have a single, unified armed force instead of three services? That is the sole question involved in this debate. Ridiculous considerations such as the colour of the uniform and even the titles of the ranks seem to me to be totally irrelevant to the basic question which is: Will it be better to have one unified force or will it be better to continue to have three services?

On this question, Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to have any views that are worth contributing to the committee and therefore I am not going to express any views on that subject. But this is the question that we have to settle. That question, I repeat, under our British parliamentary system, is not to be settled by generals, however eminent, or admirals, however distinguished their service, or civil servants. It is to be settled by politicians, and by politicians who were elected by the people. That is the way our British system works. The decisions have to be made by the government of the day and the government has to stake its reputation and life upon them.

If the minister accepts the wrong advice and adopts the wrong course, of course he should be defeated. But we should not confuse the issue and avoid discussing the issue itself by engaging in this measuring of the evidence of this witness or that witness who may or may not have given a piece of advice.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Pickersgill: The really important thing is whether, on balance, in the judgment of those in this house who have to make the decision, our proceeding with another stage of this policy is the right decision or is not the right decision. I noted the words of the hon. member for Calgary North.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Would the hon. minister permit a question?

Mr. Pickersgill: No.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. member for Calgary North took some words from the evidence of Air Chief Marshal Miller who said that we should consider everything carefully before we took the next step. I do not know whether that was just a *lapsus linguae* on the part of Air Chief Marshal Miller, but the next step is not a step that you do not contemplate taking. I wondered whether by saying "the next step" Air Chief Marshal Miller was not admitting that in fact unification was the next logical step but that it was merely a question of timing. That might be so. There may be many different views on that point, but that is not the point of the bill.

Everybody knows that, if this bill passes, there will not be any change from yesterday to tomorrow and that the process of unification will be a slow one. It will take several years. The minister has said that on several occasions. It should not be assumed that the minister or any member of the government is trying deliberately to decrease morale or to make the armed forces less effective or anything of that sort. All I say is, let us try to look at this question on its merits, without personalities colouring it, and let us assume that we all are anxiously trying to reach the best possible conclusion for the Canadian people in this difficult aspect of our public affairs.

This is perhaps a more difficult measure in many ways than any other. All other activities of government are, so to speak, civil activities. This is an activity where a certain line is drawn between military and civil life, but in all British countries and in all free countries, civil primacy has always been a requirement. I am sure no one on the other side of the house has any more desire to change that situation than has anyone on this side of the house. I am not suggesting that anyone has that desire. All I am saying is, let us look at this question on its merits. Let us try to forget our emotional feelings about it and let us see whether this objective is not a sound one. If it is, then let us have whatever safeguards are necessary for there to be the time required to reach that objective. If, as Air Chief Marshal Miller suggests and as has been suggested by others, timing is important and if all we are debating is the time at which we should take the step, it seems to me that much of the feeling generated in this debate is rather misplaced.

Mr. Harkness: I should like to ask the minister a question. As I understood the proposition he put, it was that no senior retired officer, civil servant, official or other person who has been in a confidential position should be free after retiring to express his personal views in regard to matters or to give evidence with regard to them? Is that the proposition?

Mr. Pickersgill: No. I think the hon. member has overlooked a subtle difference. I did not question their right to give evidence. I think what I said was that if those who have retired gave evidence opposed to the policy and if serving officers were not able to give evidence in support of the policy there would be a preponderance of evidence opposed to the policy. That would not prove anything except that the serving officers could not give evidence and that those who had retired could. I did not question the right of retired officers to give evidence. I merely questioned the effect of their giving it upon the preponderance of military evidence. That is all.

Mr. Harkness: May I ask the hon. gentleman if his proposition is not directly contrary to what has been British practice for the last 150 years? Sir Winston Churchill, Lord Alanbrooke and goodness knows how many other prominent people who took part in the first and second world wars have published books and reminiscences giving details of discussions that went on. At the same time it has been completely accepted that serving officers and civil servants shall not under any circumstances be called on to express views about a policy being followed by the government.

Mr. Pickersgill: I do not question anything the hon. gentleman has said. I go back to my original point. If you have a controversy about policy and if certain officers or officials because they disagree with that policy retire and express their disagreement, with those

still in the services being inhibited from expressing their agreement—

Mr. Harkness: That is our system.

Mr. Pickersgill: I am not questioning the system. All I am saying is, if you have a lot of evidence on one side and no evidence on the other that proves nothing. That is all I am saying. I am not saying whether this is a suitable or good rule.

Mr. Harkness: Is the minister maintaining that the evidence does not prove anything?

Mr. Pickersgill: I am maintaining that if the witnesses on the one side of the case are allowed to speak and the witnesses on the other side are inhibited by the rule from speaking all the evidence will be on one side. That is all I am saying.

Mr. Nugent: Inasmuch as the witnesses on the one side are all witnesses who have retired recently because of their disagreement, would the minister not say that their evidence should carry weight and that it proves their case?

Mr. Pickersgill: By the same token I would say that because all the officers who are now in the forces have remained in the forces, whether they give evidence or not it shows that they are all in favour of the policy. That argument would be about as logical as the argument of the hon. gentleman, and just as unimportant, I might add.

Mr. Lambert: But the minister was never a prisoner of his pension.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Could I put a question to the minister? I cannot help saying that I am surprised at the minister, a historian, taking such an unhistorical position. The minister is now forming a coastguard training school and is trying to interest people to look toward the sea in its many aspects. As a Newfoundlander does he not feel that the submerging of the identity of those who serve at sea will be a retrograde step? I appreciate what the minister said about young people but surely in wiping out the separate identity of the navy an obstacle to the minister's intentions is being created.

Mr. Pickersgill: Perhaps the hon. gentleman should not have included his preamble because he may get a speech in return.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): That may have been my speech in this debate.

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

Mr. Pickersgill: I remind the hon. gentleman that history would be very dull if it were nothing but repetition. It is because, once in a while, something new is done that history is interesting. I say this just to deal with the hon. gentleman's preamble. No, I do not, of course, agree at all with the view of the hon. gentleman. If I did agree with it I would not be in the government and I would not be supporting my hon. friend, the Minister of National Defence, in his bill. I believe quite strongly—and I say I believe because I have no expert testimony—that it will be just as easy to have pride in belonging to a single, unified Canadian force as it would be to have pride in belonging to the Canadian Navy, Army or Air Force. I believe that quite strongly. I also believe that in the absence of the artificial boundaries which now exist between the services—and we know that many people do not choose their right calling at the beginning—there will be better scope for the most effective use of the manpower required by the forces because there will be the widest possible field of choice open to those who are recruited.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Then why do we need a coastguard training school for young fellows going to sea?

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Richard): Order. The time allotted to the hon. gentleman expired a while ago and unless the hon. member for Queens wishes to relinquish his time—

Mr. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Chairman, I will not be diverted for long by what the Minister of Transport has said. I found his comments interesting, humorous in some places and in others perhaps ill-considered. But with regard to the evidence given by serving officers before the committee it is obvious that it was limited to evidence which does not contradict government policy.

Generally speaking, and I am sure this applies to the Department of Transport, if a senior official of a department appears before a committee with regard to something which involves government policy it can be assumed that he was asked for his advice on the technical considerations which led to a decision as to what policy should be followed. But this has not been the case in connection with this legislation. This is why senior officers are disturbed and unhappy. This is why 79 officers of senior rank got out of the armed services before the normal retirement age.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Many of them young men.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): That is true. This is why we on this side of the house have such grave reservations about this legislation and about this policy.

I was shocked to read some of the evidence which was given in the defence committee with regard to the question of advice. I shall refer to one passage in this connection, to be found at page 2328. The witness on that occasion was Air Chief Marshal Miller, the chief military adviser to the government until a very few months ago. Here is the extract from the evidence that I should like to read:

> Mr. Churchill: Did you have an opportunity as chief of the defence staff to discuss with the defence committee of the cabinet, or with the Prime Minister, the proposal with regard to unification?
>
> Air Chief Marshal Miller: As far as I am aware —and I would not absolutely swear to this without checking records—I never discussed the problem of integration with the cabinet defence committee or with the Prime Minister.
>
> Mr. Churchill: And unification? You say integration.
>
> Air Chief Marshal Miller: Integration or unification.

So the chief military adviser to the government, according to his own evidence, was not asked to discuss this most important change in policy with the cabinet before the policy was ennunciated, a shocking situation.

Mr. Hellyer: On a question of privilege, I think I should set the record straight once again on this matter. The white paper on the policy of integration-unification as envisaged at the time the white paper was published and presented to the House of Commons, was discussed on two occasions by the cabinet committee on defence and the cabinet took a decision with respect to the total policy after hearing the views of the chiefs, Air Marshal Miller and the senior staff at headquarters when he was chief of defence staff. He did not discuss this present bill with the cabinet committee on defence. That was done later by the present defence staff, because the bill was prepared subsequent to the changes in personnel which took place last summer. The concept of unification-integration—and both words were used in the white paper as was pointed out by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre—was referred to the cabinet committee on defence and discussed there and the decision was taken after hearing the views of the chiefs, and I can assure the committee that their views were expressed in some depth.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): I might say first of all that this is not a question of privilege. In the second place I should like to point out to the minister that Air Chief Marshal Miller was chief military adviser to the government at the time the white paper was produced.

Mr. Hellyer: And his views were heard.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): I have put the evidence on record as it was given.

Mr. Hellyer: Then you might put the correction on the record too.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): I am not responsible for the evidence given before the committee.

I was interested in the proposition put forward by the Minister of Transport that we should examine this issue in an objective manner, weighing the merits of the case. I agree with the hon. gentleman 100 per cent and I should like to say that this is the very argument the opposition has been making right from the start of this discussion. My view of the supporters of the government is not so low as to think that if this question had been discussed in caucus, and the pros and cons of it evaluated before the policy was announced, this bill would have ever seen the light of day. This was not the sequence of events.

My reason for rising at this time is to make my own position clear. I said during second reading that it would have been better if the subject matter of the bill had been referred to the committee so that it might have been studied in an objective way before the minister and his supporters locked themselves into and inflexible position laid down in black and white in this bill in terms from which in his judgment there could be no retreat. Speaking on second reading, as reported on page 12544 of *Hansard,* for February 1, I said:

> All the opposition ask in connection with this very important matter of unification is that it be thoroughly examined, that we have the evidence of witnesses, without prejudice, without trying to force the outcome one way or the other. If unification has the merits the government claims for it, it will stand up under that examination. If it has not, it should not be perpetrated upon the Canadian people.

I still maintain that position.

• (3:10 p.m.)

When the defence committee, after the House of Commons committed itself to accept the principle of unification, considered the question, the evidence given to it was overwhelmingly against unification. I do not think

any objective person can quarrel with that statement. I am not saying that all the evidence was against unification, but the great preponderance of it was. The evidence presented by expert witnesses has demonstrated that unification does not have all the merits claimed for it. It will not produce the economies claimed, and I could quote much evidence to that effect if I wished to take up the time of the committee. I shall just give one short quotation to this effect, to be found at page 1452 of the evidence:

Mr. Harkness: Would you agree that in order to carry out the roles at present laid down for our defence forces, a navy, an army and an air force of some sort is required, whether you call these forces by that name or not?

Mr. Hendrick: I do, indeed, I believe that the existence of fighting forces in the media of the army, navy and air force, by any name, which are unique and trained and not interchangeable with the others, will always be necessary in a military force.

Mr. Harkness: Do you see any advantage in doing away with our present three forces and putting them into one force called just a defence force?

Mr. Hendrick: Not the slightest bit; it baffles me completely. I think the economies could be achieved by much more simple means and I do not understand the advantages of this proposal at all.

Similar evidence was given to the effect that unification will damage morale and there is evidence in the bill itself to this effect; otherwise clause 6 would not be included. If this bill were as popular with the armed forces as the minister claims, our airmen, sailors and soldiers would be only too anxious for the day to come when they could rejoin the unified force. There would be no need for compulsion. They would be itching to become "unimen", or whatever you want to call them, and cease being sailors, airmen and soldiers, but there seems to be some suspicion that this may not be the case because there is a clause in the bill that says they have no choice. There is going to be compulsion in that the bill says: "Bingo, as soon as this becomes law you are in a unified force whether you like it or not, regardless of what service you joined when you became a serviceman." The bill introduces a form of compulsory service which has been traditionally alien to our armed forces except in one or two cases of dire national emergency.

There is also evidence, which I could quote at length but I will not, to the effect that unification of our armed services will increase the difficulty of working smoothly with our allies in military combination because our system will be entirely different from that of

[Mr. MacLean (Queens).]

any other ally with whom we are associated. In this connection the evidence given by General Moncel is interesting. I was a member of the defence committee at the time he was giving evidence and I asked him this question, as recorded at page 1320:

Do you believe that our opportunity to gain from the experience and resources of our allies, which you mentioned some time ago in reply to a previous question—chiefly, Great Britain and the United States—will be lessened if we have an entirely different organization in the form of a unified force?

Mr. Moncel: Of course, it will. I will give you an example. When I was vice-chief there was a large and important conference down in the United States, which the vice-chief of the air staff would normally have attended. I went off and I was greeted extremely politely by the U.S. Air Force. I knew a lot of them by name, but we could not talk business.

Now, if I had not gone myself, as the vice-chief, who was I going to send? My next available senior air force officer was an air commodore and he would not have cut much ice in that league.

There is evidence of other examples along the same line but I do not want to take up the time of this committee putting them on the record.

I am greatly concerned about the ill effects that the policy of unification will have on our armed forces and on the return which the Canadian taxpayers will get for the money they spend. But I have a deeper concern, of which this procedure is symptomatic, because in this situation we have a government which has proven itself to be completely devoid of objectivity, unaffected by logic, and has not listened to expert advice when forming its policy. We see a government locked on a course which General Moncel has described, I thought extremely well, as follows:

The conditions which I specifically refer to are as follows. At this stage of the operation, the lines were pretty well drawn and its was abundantly clear to me that we were going to force ahead with this process of unification which, to me, appeared to be moving on an uncharted course at a very, very high speed toward a very, very dim destination —

That is the evidence of the man who when he was in the armed services was responsible for planning for the services.

Recently I read a newspaper article which said steps were being taken by the Liberal caucus to allow its backbenchers to become more involved in and informed on government policy before it was announced. If that is the case I only wish it could be made retroactive because I am sure that if the implications of unification had been thoroughly understood by Liberal members this bill

would never have been introduced in its present form. They would have realized that this policy is unwarranted.

Many expert witnesses agree with me that unification will be destructive to morale in the armed forces, thus causing the Canadian taxpayers to get a lesser return for their defence dollar. I am somewhat disappointed at the interventions of government supporters in this debate, not because they have intervened but because more of them have not intervened. The course this debate has followed indicates that many supporters of the government are not enthusiastic about the government's policy, and those who have intervened have found it very difficult to provide substantial evidence to support the policy. In many cases they have embarked on sophistry and rhetorical quackery to divert attention from the real crux of the matter.

I am not taking objection to the speech of the hon. member for Hamilton West, at least no more than I do to other speeches purporting to support government policy, but let me take an example from that speech to indicate what I have in mind. That hon. member said that the official opposition is not looking for a pause of three to five years but rather for a permanent halt to the modernization of the Canadian military establishment. Because this step is new he ascribes to it the very attractive advertising term "modernity" and says that if one belongs to the forward looking generation it should appeal. The hon. member equates newness with merit. Obviously there is not necessarily a connection between the newness of a thing and its value. As a matter of fact, all the grave mistakes of history, and there have been many, were as modern as tomorrow the day before they were made. I believe we are making yet another grave mistake at this time.

• (3:20 p.m.)

We are now engaged in a program which will provide a unified force with everyone serving in that one force wearing the same uniform. We have yet to hear any compelling or convincing argument why this should be so. As a matter of fact witness after witness, all senior officers when this whole matter was being considered, has said that they were completely at a loss to know why we were embarking upon this policy. Let me quote from only one of these witnesses. The evidence is to be found at page 1452 of the proceedings of the defence committee. This is what was said:

Mr. Harkness: What are some of the disadvantages that you see in it?

Mr. Hendrick: First of all, if you preserve the fighting forces in the shape it is suggested you are going to, I do not see why you should change their identifications, their appearances and their symbols. There is a lot to be said for loyalties and traditions and the things which motivate men to go and take hazard. This is a long, historic thing and everybody, I think, will accept it and there is no reason to change these motivating things.

I think it is also essential for the fighting man to have a leader—someone he can look up to—a leader whom he knows has been through the mill; somebody who he can identify as part of his team. That is why the chiefs of staff being done away with for an army, a navy and an air force is such a sad thing, in my view. The junior officer, the airman, the soldier or the sailor does not have his outfit that he can look up to and, if he is an officer, even aspire to succeed. All this is part of having a viable force that has an esprit de corps and a purpose. It has been done this way for many, many years and there are very good reasons for it and I do not see what we gain by upsetting it.

I agree with that point of view and I am at a loss why we should have—I was going to say a navy but that will be lost—men acting in the role of sailors who will be different from sailors of any other navy in the world. Sailors of every navy I know of are recognized immediately as sailors. There may be a difference in the details of their uniforms depending on whether they are French, British, Russian, Japanese, German or Chinese, but they still wear navy blue. That seems to be traditional and these men can be immediately recognized as sailors. They take a pride in being seamen.

Ordinarily when the electorate puts a government into office, regardless of the party constituting the government it has the right to expect that when important decisions are made all the evidence will be carefully weighed and the whole situation will be looked at objectively. The electorate has the right to expect its government not to fly in the face of reason against the overwhelming weight of evidence. The electorate which put this government into office has misplaced its trust in this regard.

We are now embarking upon a tremendously important policy but this government has not recognized the right of the electorate to have the matter looked at objectively as to its merits and demerits. National defence is a very expensive proposition. It should not be a toy to be played with by one man or a group of men without all the technical and expert advice obtainable. In round figures Canadian defence requires the expenditure of $1½ billion per year. If one says a billion dollars fast most of us associate the figure with a million

dollars. A billion dollars is a tremendous amount of money. Perhaps I can illustrate what I mean by something said by a United States congressman. He suggested that if someone gave his wife $1 million and she spent $1,000 per day she would be back for more in three years but if someone had given his wife $1 billion in 500 B.C. and she spent $1,000 per day from then on she would still not be back for more. We sometimes forget that $1 billion is one thousand million dollars.

This is the time we should consider the gravity of what we are doing. There is a great deal of evidence to indicate that what we may be doing is spending $1½ billion half as effectively as we should. The expenditure of that much money places a terrible onus on parliament and it should be taken seriously.

Mr. Hellyer: It is being spent about 10 per cent more effectively.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): The minister suggests that it is being spent 10 per cent more effectively. That is the kind of statement we hear from time to time without proper substantiation. As I said, the evidence, as I understand it, is contrary to the minister's statement. No evidence has been given that unification, even in a theoretical sense, could be advantageous. It is true, of course, that articles in the press have said that the Minister of National Defence is an activist who likes to get things done. He introduced integration which was in process anyway. We agree with integration, and always have. But I think this notion of his being a great activist always doing something spectacular has perhaps gone to his head a little. The minister has taken this as a compliment and it is not necessarily so. Even a bull in a china shop is an activist. It depends on whether what you are doing makes sense. That is what qualifies one to take spectacular action.

• (3:30 p.m.)

I can see the minister, in the competitive atmosphere in which he finds himself, picking up the morning paper and discovering, or perhaps knowing beforehand, that the Minister of National Health and Welfare, for example, is going to introduce a minimum income bill. I can imagine the minister saying to his executive assistant: We have to do something spectacular today to get the headlines, to stay in the news. Let's scrub the navy today, abolish the army tomorrow, have a general or an admiral for breakfast every day in the process and eventually do away with the air force.

[Mr. MacLean (Queens).]

I think this matter is too important to treat in this way. If the minister wants to be an activist we could find him some type of activity that would not be so expensive to the taxpayers. I have nearly finished my speech, Mr. Chairman; I suppose my time has almost expired. We could find the minister some activity which would be less damaging and less costly to the Canadian taxpayer. Perhaps this week he could climb Mount Kennedy in a green uniform and next week he could set out from Halifax to Esquimalt, sailing preferably around the Horn, in a green uniform if he likes. But let him not indulge his whims in regard to something that is costing the Canadian taxpayers $1½ billion a year without his being prepared to accept the best expert advice available and to convert it into policy in the interests of the Canadian people.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Langlois (Chicoutimi): Mr. Chairman, one of the starting points of the integration and unification program of the Canadian armed forces is the creation of a distinctively Canadian force.

Canada is a young country. In the past we have had the good fortune of obtaining from our founding nations all sorts of information and knowledge which have accumulated through the centuries. But, in the life of every nation there comes a time when things past are no longer suitable or sufficient, where the umbilical cord must be severed. Our armed forces are one aspect of our foreign policy, and our foreign policy differs from that of other countries in the word. So why should this not be reflected by our armed forces?

In the last few years Canada has proved great efficiency through its contribution to maintaining peace and order in the word. This was made possible through our participation to alliances and peace keeping operations. We have examples of such operations in places like Suez, Cyprus, Yemen, Kashmir and the Congo.

As our country grew, particular interests and new requirements developed. Canada acquired a unique gratitude almost everywhere in the world. African, Asian and South American peoples know that we have no territorial ambition and that our only interest, in wanting to keep the peace, is to offer an opportunity to men of goodwill to work toward the solution of the problems of sickness, poverty and illiteracy facing humanity.

So why maintain armed forces that look like foreign troops? Why should we not have armed forces that would be really Canadian in really Canadian uniforms, and that would meet Canada's real needs?

As Canadians and taxpayers, we want our armed forces to really represent Canada, ourselves and our interests, and I am sure that many Canadians share my opinion.

[*English*]

During the hearings of the defence committee some hon. members asked: Why should Canada unify her services when no other country has done so? I should like to ask these people: Can Canadians not do something that they need without the assistance and the guidance of a foreign country? Can they not stand on their own two feet or are they still unsure of themselves and their rightful place in the world community? We have the experience, the training, the intelligence and the men to reorganize our forces to suit our requirements to lead the world in defence organization. Why should we hesitate to grasp this opportunity? Why must we always follow and not for once lead? Our participation in two world wars, in Korea and in peace keeping operations has given us as much experience as other countries of the kind that will be useful in the future. We have the calibre of people. Our troops in NATO are recognized as one of the best trained, if not the best trained, contingents within the alliance.

We have the men, men of the calibre of General Jean-Victor Allard, a most distinguished soldier who has been awarded the C.B.E. and four foreign decorations as well as his gallantry awards. He was the first Canadian officer to command a British division, a former vice chief of the general staff, a qualified jet pilot, fully bilingual, a true Canadian, an experienced and loyal officer, as well as a man of foresight and imagination. Any country would be fortunate to have such a distinguished gentleman as the head of the armed forces. We have units such as the famous Van Doos, to name only one—a regiment with numerous battle honours and a record second to none. I believe that the calibre of Canada's armed forces as a whole is second to none but their effectiveness depends on their organization.

It is the intention of the minister and the defence staff to provide the Canadian forces with the most streamlined, efficient structure. There are a number of hon. members who oppose this bill in spite of its obvious benefits. I can understand, even if I do not agree with it, opposition to this program when it stems from emotion. For some hon. members who have served in the forces it is a matter of sadness to see the disappearance of the services, and I appreciate that for some it is a matter of genuine regret. But time waits for no man and progress can only be achieved by recognizing problems and producing solutions to fit them. As the minister wrote in November, 1966 in an article in the magazine *Saturday Night*:

• (3:40 p.m.)

> When tradition overshadows effectiveness, it is time to draw the line. When tradition overburdens our forces so that they cannot be properly equipped we must take another look and decide which is more important. We will continue to retain as many worth-while traditions as possible but not to the detriment of the force as a whole.

Opposition to this bill on emotional grounds is understandable but I cannot condone it. Opposition on logical grounds indicates a lack of information, but opposition to this program when hon. members have had as much information and evidence as has been presented to them by the standing committee on defence is nothing short of obstruction and is a reactionary attitude.

Hon. members should think back to the flag debate. As bitter and acrimonious as it was the result was the production of a national symbol which is appreciated and respected from coast to coast and has become in two short years a symbol of Canadian unity. The same members who opposed the flag are now opposing the unification of the forces, and for the same reasons. They are rooted in the traditions of a foreign country, but I suggest that they are out of step with the times and with the vast majority of Canadians. I predict that the unification of the forces will become a matter of pride to all Canadians in the near future. It will become a symbol of all that is youthful, vigorous and progressive in our country. When I say "progressive" I do not mean Progressive Conservative.

I have one further point which I wish to leave with hon. members opposite for their consideration, and that is the question of expenditures. There have been considerable savings as a result of the integration program, whether or not hon. members choose to recognize it. The fact that we have been able to hold the line in defence spending despite rising costs, particularly in the military field, is a remarkable achievement. We have been assured by the minister, by the chief of the defence staff and by the vice chief that

unification will result in an even more efficient organization. As members of parliament we have a direct responsibility to ensure that public funds are spent in the most effective way. I suggest that to ignore the advice of experts as to ways to save money and make this country's armed forces more effective is a very serious dereliction of duty.

I look forward to the passage of this bill because I believe that the unification process will produce a force which will be recognized throughout the world as Canadian, and not just by two-inch shoulder flashes, a force which recognizes and welcomes tradition but is not blinded by it, a force which will create new traditions, new precedents and world leadership in the science of military technology, a force that will be second to none in its ability to change with the time, a force whose uniform will denote members of the most modern up-to-date force in the world, and a force which will be distinctively Canadian and designed to meet future Canadian needs.

[*Translation*]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to quote a very brief excerpt from a statement made by the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Pearson), during the debate on interim supply, on November 10, 1966:

> We are sincerely convinced that the policy of this bill is a wide policy for Canada in connection with defence matters in the future. We are staking our existence as a government on this policy.

Mr. Chairman, that statement made by the Prime Minister reflects the opinion of the members of our party, and you may rest assured that we all stand behind the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Langlois (Chicoutimi): Now, Mr. Chairman, the speakers who preceded me, on the opposition side, have attempted to make us believe that, during the sittings of the committee on national defence, which I attended, the only witnesses in favour of unification were those from the department, and that all the other witnesses, that is former members of the armed forces, former senior officers, were all against the unification bill, that is against the Bill No. C-243.

I should like to remind members of the opposition that retired military men appeared before the committee mainly at the request of the opposition members and not of the government. Second, that they were anxious to tell us at the outset of their testimony—and they were the ones to say it, not we—that they had left the armed forces because they did not approve the unification project. In inviting these military people to appear before the committee on national defence, it was obvious that they would say: We did not approve it. Naturally, since they had retired on that account.

Mr. Chairman, this closes the few remarks I wanted to make.

[*English*]

Mr. Ormiston: Mr. Chairman, normally I would not make any comments on the remarks of a previous speaker but I would like to comment on one sentence in the speech made by the hon. member for Chicoutimi when he said that the arguments of the opposition were rooted in the traditions of a foreign country. This seems absurd to me. Possibly the hon. member might learn a lesson from one of the members of the front bench, the Minister of Transport, when he praised British justice and British attitudes. There is nothing more detrimental to co-operation among the people of Canada than to demonstrate such an attitude in a debate.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Having said that, I should like to remind the Minister of National Defence that he and I have more in common than would meet the eye. Neither of us has achieved field rank in the army but we have been closer to the rank and file, to the N.C.O.'s and the junior officers, than most of those who have taken part in the debate. While it is fine to rely on the remarks of serving senior officers who have presented their opinions before a committee of the house, we seem to forget the thousands in other ranks who are seldom identified but who have minds and wills of their own. I suppose that when ex-servicemen of the second world war get up to speak on unification they might well be accused of letting sentiment overrule common sense. However, I do suggest that in connection with the unification program there has been indecent haste. There may have been political motivation, but certainly we can think of other situations in which speed is detrimental. I do not suppose there is very much connection between unification and agriculture but when one enters upon the process of changing a dry land farmer into an irrigation farmer one finds that it takes many years. The human element and human nature require a bit of processing. I believe the same situation applies to unification.

Naturally, for the best efficiency of commands I think it is necessary that they be

collectively organized at the level where people can work together. When the minister introduced his bill I wondered whether some of the experiences of the past had been analysed sufficiently. Those of us who served in the second world war can recall the innovation of combined services. Certainly this had not been tried to any extent before but it was carried out on many occasions. The three forces worked very well together, and I imagine that today there is a projection of this scheme in the battles being fought in Viet Nam. With the rapid changes being made in the conventional type of fighting, I wonder whether it would not be a good idea to have an observer in Viet Nam at the present time? This might, of course, violate Canada's role in so far as the truce team is concerned but certainly with so much at stake it would seem that the experience Canada might gain through having an observer on the fighting lines would be of the greatest importance when we are in the process of changing the structure of our forces.

When the minister says there is such enthusiasm amongst all ranks, I sometimes wonder what those who have no oppportunity to voice their opinions would say. It is obvious that the junior officer has a great deal at stake. He may feel it is necessary, in order to preserve his position and his pension, to go along with unification. As one who has tried to keep in contact with the forces during the past few years, I can say honestly that I have found all this talk of integration is welcomed. I can recall visiting some of the forces, various branches of the army and navy, and there was no conflict at all. On the other hand, I sometimes wonder about the position of all those officers who are forced into new positions and who are at the same time giving advice to officers under them. They are placed in a position of trying to act with experience and intelligence in that office to which they have been called. Those who are trying to adjust to this new type of unification must find it most difficult. We must commend them for their initiative and for their perseverance.

The minister has made a great deal of the fact that there will be many economies because of unification. I recall one instance where an alleged economy was simply a bookkeeping entry. My mind goes back to the time when the armed forces were relieved of the task of looking after the northwest highway system. Here was a task the army could use to train personnel to handle materials at their command and whereby the troops who were employed could operate under various climatic conditions.

In the last few years the northwest highway system has been under the jurisdiction of public works. I remind the minister that in that area there is a great deal to be gained by having the army operate the highway system, in fact just as much as from operating the facilities at Churchill. Much of the defence of Canada lies in the northern area and the ability of troops to operate under severe temperature conditions could be tested very easily on the northwest highway system. It seems ironical that with all the facilities available in that area the work has to be done by public works because the army could be used to the best possible advantage in training troops to work under conditions which might prevail in many parts of northern Canada whenever they might be called upon to defend our country. This is only one area in which I think there might be some improvement. Needless to say, there are others.

I feel that the haste with which the minister is pressing this bill is against all normal requirements. The attitudes which we become aware of in discussing the matter, particularly in so far as junior officers are concerned, are not conducive to promoting the unification of the armed forces at the moment. Integration has been accepted by all and sundry. Certainly a waiting period, possibly longer than the minister has indicated, would be of considerable advantage if the unity of the armed forces is to be maintained.

• (4:00 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks on Bill C-243, I should like to state right away that I believe in three or four basic principles. First of all, I should say that parliament is for debating, the opposition to oppose, and that it can be done sincerely on both sides.

Considering this whole debate as objectively as possible, I believe that we have sufficiently debated both sides of the question and that we have had enough opposition. At this point, everyone is thoroughly convinced that nothing would be gained by continuing the debate since all members of the house have already made up their minds and to continue this discussion indefinitely will simply confuse the issue still further. So, the purpose of my contribution will be to call on the good sense of all my colleagues. The government seems determined to stand on their

position. To my mind, they have already accepted some amendments suggested by the opposition. The opposition seems determined to back the government against the wall.

In any case, the question will be settled on division.

Listening to many speakers who preceded me, I was thinking that most of them have repeated things that have already been said a hundred times over, have been printed in the Debates and in the proceedings of the parliamentary committee.

I was recalling, in jest, some sayings in French which are rather concise and pregnant with meaning for instance the following: "Silence is golden." I heard from the government side as well as the opposition side speakers who tried very hard to oppose the evidence given by some senior officers before the parliamentary committee by taking a few words here and comparing them with a few there in order to prove that the statement was illogical or did not make sense. Both sides played that game and it could go for a whole year.

Mr. Chairman, those who are used to debate know that one can get a man hanged by lifting a few words out of a statement and giving it some fancy interpretation; explained by five different speakers, they would mean five different things. That game does not lead anywhere.

I also recalled that other saying to the effect that "Silence is golden". It is a fact that during the present debate, silence would be golden, speech only silvern and that it is costly for the taxpayers. As a matter of fact, when I add up the number of days taken to repeat the same things, the tons of paper used to report and publish our discussions, I feel it is getting to be costly for the country to settle nothing, because I would be most surprised to find one member who has not yet firmly made up his mind and is not ready to vote.

I was also thinking of another English saying: "Too many cooks spoil the broth". If we have too many defence experts who come and express, *ex cathedra*, their own views on the method that should be used in 1967, 1970, 1975 or 1980, I am sure we will find a great many contradictions, and if the government allowed itself to be stopped by such things it would never manage to find an acceptable solution. I think the question is simply being buried under a deluge of words. It would therefore be wise for everyone to exercise a little self-discipline and say to himself: Fine, we will stop all this, ask for a division and settle the question; if the government is wrong, it will take the consequences.

I heard things which I find a little childish coming from serious minded people—and I think all the members of this house are serious minded—such as: "Who thought of this plan", insinuating thereby that one fine morning, after a lovely dream, the minister decided to introduce this sort of plan in the house.

Those who have observed the public scene for many years realize that integration and unification have slowly been taking place since the last world war, through natural evolution. The times call for it, Mr. Chairman. It is somewhat childish to ask such questions. Everybody knows that the ministers of this government, as did those of previous governments, are not bringing in such a revolutionary bill without having consulted all the experts at their disposal who, after all, are not all talking through their hats.

And, a little further on, this: This plan should have been prepared by competent people. Mr. Chairman, it is unbelievable that such remarks should be made after all that has been said on the matter. I am referring, for instance, to the statement I made last April 4, as reported on page 14516, speaking of the war service and the vast experience of the commander in chief of our armed forces, Mr. Jean Allard. I outlined an impressive picture, and it is there for anyone to read. Besides, it is an official statement. Mr. Allard is only the spokesman for the whole general staff which includes a lot of experienced officers. Now, to insinuate that they support the government because they do not want to compromise their future, their promotions in the army, is, I think, doing them a great injustice which they do not deserve. Most of them have risked their lives on many battlefields. They have surely proven that they are not faint-hearted; besides, they are about to go on retirement. I mentioned the case of Jean Allard because I have known him personally for over 30 years; I know he has the intestinal fortitude to resign rather than advocate measures in which he does not sincerely believe—as others did. But it is permissible to hold different views in such a case, and I say that if the minister—as I said earlier—has relied on the advice of experienced people like Jean Allard and those about him, one can say that his intentions are well motivated.

It was said, a little further, that the minister was being stubborn. Well, Mr. Chairman, this is a vicious circle; if the minister was not

stubborn in defending his bill, he would be charged with a lack of leadership, with back tracking. He would never be able to satisfy the opposition. I believe, and I speak in an independent way, that he made several concessions to the opposition. He listened patiently to them and I think he deserves a special reward for the virtue of patience which he displayed in listening to everything which is said about him. I saw him squirm in his seat two or three times only. If I had been in his place, I confess that I would have jumped up two or three dozen times to protest.

What is called stubborness is, in my opinion, steadfastness which a leader, in government as ours, should have, which he should display before the nation. That is what the nation expects from its government: leadership and determination displayed by those who have character and know where they are going.

But I did not find it so nice, Mr. Chairman, when they started questioning the integrity of the minister; when they suggested that he was not honest, that he was making false statements. I believe that it is to demean oneself to say such things in this house.

Well, I, for one, Mr. Chairman, would be horrified to hear some day, for instance, that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) is not a man of his word, that you cannot trust his words, and that the same applies to any other party leader or any crown minister. It would be insulting. Now, then, to hint such things in the course of a debate is to degrade oneself in the eyes of the public, and it is far from enhancing the prestige of this parliament in the minds of those Canadians who are following our discussions.

I like very much how many hon. members opposite have spoken on that bill. Several have maintained the tone of the discussion on a high level; they have brought forward some serious arguments which they sincerely believe. Personal attacks merely contribute to bring discredit not only on those who launch them but also on parliament.

It was stated yesterday, Mr. Chairman, that not one shred of evidence had been brought forward to the effect that the bill would be beneficial. On the contrary, it seems to me that tons of evidence have been brought forward for people of goodwill. The question was asked: "What will happen in the future?"

• (4:10 p.m.)

We know certain hypothetical circumstances cannot be foreseen with mathematical precision, but if the action we propose through this measure is based on the evidence of those who are competent in military matters, who apply their knowledge to our needs in our relations with other countries, I feel we can say that we are adopting a progressive measure.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, this is not new. Since the beginning of time, upheavals have led to change. Let the students of history recall, for instance, how when cross-bows, arrows and spears were replaced by the blunderbuss, by firearms, one would have thought the world was coming to an end. Of course, parliaments in those days did not have as today transcriptions systems to enable the citizens to read in the archives of the heartbreak of those who opposed the change. But history ever repeats itself.

For instance, when the decision to abandon the cavalry was taken, some generals and marshals threw their uniforms away and resigned from the army, with tears in their eyes, their hearts broken, because they realized that another era was disappearing. Periodic evolution is the most normal thing since the beginning of the world.

When the Maginot line was invented, for instance, and troops were forced to dig themselves in like rats, it was such a novel method that governments were brought down. It proved efficient for a time, and then they came up with mechanized war. In fact, one remembers what trouble General de Gaulle stirred up when he tried to explain to a great number of his colleagues, French officers and parliamentarians, how much mechanized war was a necessity. It took him years, and there again governments were defeated. The world finally accepted what was evident, that mechanized war was a must, something essential.

The same thing happened in the field of aviation, Mr. Chairman. Indeed, it is said that Marshal Pétain himself did not believe that aviation could be efficient, and this gave rise to homeric debates in the French parliament of that time.

We have the same process today, except that the revolution is deeper. This is the age of nuclear or atomic war; we are in the age of electronics to the extreme and we must give the Canadian army people whose competence will exceed everything we have imagined to date. We will have to co-ordinate the services, to unify them into a central administration, if our armed forces are to give maximum efficiency.

It seems to me that it is obvious, Mr. Chairman, and it seems to me also that those

who oppose the bill are dead set against it. In any case, even if those who oppose the bill are convinced that some things are not as they should be, why prolong the debate? Everyone knows that the government will introduce the bill as amended. Everyone knows also that some opposition members will oppose it. Everyone will know what the score is when a vote has been held on the matter. Let us take it as quickly as possible and go on to something more constructive.

Some basic truths should be recalled. The government is there to govern. It must govern. And to govern it must decide what legislation is called for. It comes to an opinion after hearing its experts, its department heads, also the opposition. It seems to me that it has been listening to the latter with great patience but, sooner or later, it must decide that the debate has been going on long enough and put a stop to it. I feel that enough has been said on that matter. Parliament speaks, it is the right of parliament to discuss and that of the opposition to oppose, but the debate must end, especially when it is obvious that it does not lead anywhere.

I do not think that deep down any opposition member feels that at this stage of the proceedings he will be able to bring the government to agree to any major amendment, except possibly on some details, when the bill is considered clause by clause.

Mr. Chairman, if the government is making a mistake, after getting advice from all its experts, after reading the evidence for or against the measure, after taking into consideration advice given freely by the opposition, there is a tribunal to which it will be accountable in the years to come. The electorate is, in short, the court of last resort.

Now we have told the government everything we had to tell them, I think it would be only fair to let the government implement its legislation.

Moreover, I do not think we are asked to implement unification overnight. It seems that this process which began spontaneously before the passing of any legislation, simply by the pressure of things, some time after the last war, and which unfolded itself normally, will have to go on unfolding itself and will not be completed before five, six, seven, eight or ten years.

But the government must be authorized by Parliament to go ahead and implement everything involved in this bill on unification and integration.

[Mr. Mongrain.]

Mr. Chairman, I do not want, once again, to challenge the sincerity of those who are opposed to the bill and lengthen the debate; I merely want to point out that by attacking personally the minister, they take an unjustifiable attitude.

Personally I am not under any obligation to any party, to anyone in this house. I must say that I respect most members of this house, at least those I know, and among them, to a high degree, the Minister of National Defence. I admire his frankness, his honesty, his firmness and his patience in spite of all the criticism heaped on him for many weeks.

It is time, in my opinion, to put an end to those endless discussions and ramblings and take some positive action, that is vote, so that we may study the bill item by item and perhaps suggest some minor amendments which will probably be well received, and then proceed with some other piece of legislation.

If I rose today, Mr. Chairman, it was to appeal to all men of goodwill in this house. As a matter of fact, I know that all men of goodwill realize that everything worthwhile has already been said and that not one iota will be changed by extending the debate for hours and days. On the other hand, this will simply help to discredit Parliament a little more in the eyes of the public, at a time when it has managed to rehabilitate itself somewhat through the constructive work done in the last few months.

Even the opposition has been doing constructive work these last few months. Parliament has been rising in the esteem of the public. We should not destroy these achievements by interminable discussions, personal attacks and theories built on perhaps doubtful competence.

As we were saying, now that everything has been said, let us act, let us vote, and the electorate will judge whether this government is right or wrong.

[*English*]

Mr. Schreyer: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if by having the unanimous agreement of the Progressive Conservative party that I have the floor my credibility will be impugned. I was moved to speak in this debate by statements made earlier by the Minister of Transport, who exhorted hon. members to deal with this matter on its merits. I thought everyone was trying to do so. Judgment on the merits of the legislation differs, that is all.

I want to begin by saying that integration, so far as it has progressed, seems to meet with the almost complete support of most people who have considered defence policy and organization. The emphasis on mobility and the acquisition of new ordnance—hardware, as the Minister of Defence calls it—in support of a mobile role has received general and wide approbation.

From my study of defence policy and organization I think what has been achieved in the department during the last three years is commendable. Where commendation is deserved it should be extended: I extend it to the minister here and now.

The acquisition of *Provider* class vessels for logistic support; to supply our mobile forces with vertical envelopment capability, was logical. I have not heard of anyone in a command position challenging this kind of development. It is a pity, with the consensus which has been reached about integration thus far—

Mr. Hellyer: Could I ask my hon. friend a question?

Mr. Schreyer: Yes.

Mr. Hellyer: My hon. friend stated to the committee that there seems to be a consensus that most of the things we have done in the last three years have been good, that integration is a good idea that it is producing a more effective force, that it is in the interest of this country, and that we are moving in the right direction. If that is the consensus, and if that is the view held by so many people in hindsight three years later, why would the hon. member now think that our judgment is incapable of producing in the future the kind of progress that we have achieved in the last three years? I say this particularly in view of the fact that some people who are now so strongly in favour of integration and of everything which has been accomplished in the last three years, were not at all in favour of it at the time we began it.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Schreyer: Rather than attempt to reply briefly to the minister I would ask him to bear with me while I try to answer that question in the course of the next 20 minutes. If he is interested in obtaining a reply from me in this connection I will really try to give him one. But it cannot be done in a few sentences or a few minutes.

I say it is a pity that this consensus seems to be disappearing, but there are good reasons why this should be the case. I, for one, like many members in this quarter of the house, feel myself to be in a very uncomfortable position. We have been placed in that position by the insistence of the minister and his colleagues on proceeding at this time with the bill now before us.

I support the proposition that unification of the armed forces is desirable. However, I must admit that this support is based on incomplete knowledge of the situation; so it has to be qualified, particularly because some of the testimony of the experts in this field has been divided. There is obviously a good deal of disagreement among the experts, and this should be a signal for every one of us in this house to proceed with prudence and caution with respect to this phase of armed forces reorganization. The ordinary mortal when confronted with conflicting testimony by people who presumably are in the know would wish to proceed in a careful, pragmatic and experimental way. The logical course of action when confronted with conflicting testimony would be to proceed step by step, with measured pause and with measured pace. This is a concept which I believe is often popular among certain members of the front bench.

But when it comes to this particular measure hon. members opposite do not seem interested in proceeding with measured pause and measured pace. The Minister of National Defence has left the impression that he will not proceed step by step in the same way as ordinary mortals, but that he had decided to make a great leap forward. Beyond him he has supporters who are making blind obeisance to his command. It is not asking too much to urge this government not to place parliament in the position of becoming a rubber stamp and blindly approving the final phase of this reorganization process without having before it all the available evidence as to the progress made in the initial stages. Unless the minister is prepared to say that integration has proceeded through all its phases and that all the information is at hand for evaluation, he should be prepared to hold this legislation in abeyance until such time as integration has been completed and information has been collected on the basis of actual experience.

Though I support the concept, I still cannot bring myself to approve the pace with which the minister and the government are trying to put this legislation on the statute books. I do not feel there is any great degree of urgency

attaching to it. I cannot escape the impression that this measure is being introduced prematurely. The Minister of Transport admonishes us to be dispassionate in our analysis of this legislation and to deal with it on its merits. I ask how this can be done when the merits of the policy cannot be determined with any degree of unanimity by those who are in the best position to know, namely, the senior service personnel.

How can we deal with this legislation on its merits unless we are in a position to analyse all the facts—and we do not have all the facts in our possession because, as I have pointed out, integration has not yet been completed in all its various stages? There is no need to use the language of overstatement; there is no need to impute motives or question the loyalty of career personnel in the armed forces, as has been done. There is no need to talk about the credibility of one officer as compared to that of another. Yet I did hear one hon. member opposite doing precisely this. Unless I am placing a connotation on the word "credibility" which is not warranted, I think the use of that word with regard to evidence given by senior officers who appeared before the committee is altogether unfair.

I wish to join with others who have spoken in this debate in imploring the minister to reconsider this legislation. I ask the hon. gentleman's colleagues to use their influence to this effect. I do so, not because the objective is something with which I disagree but because it would seem to me that the wiser course of action would be to hold this legislation in abeyance for a year, 18 months, or some such period.

Mr. Hellyer: Why?

Mr. Schreyer: There are at least two reasons I can think of. One is simply that there is no urgency about this bill. Unless the government of Canada is considering changing its defence role or trying to renegotiate its commitments within the alliances, there is no urgency. If it is the intention, as I gather from the minister is the case, to maintain unchanged our existing role and our existing commitments, there is no urgency.

• (4:30 p.m.)

One senior officer who appeared before the committee said that the maintenance of our existing commitment and role within NATO would be made more difficult by unifying our armed forces. Unlike other hon. members I do not intend to make specific reference to many of the statements made by senior officers appearing before the committee. That would be fruitless in this debate because in many cases the statement of one senior officer or retired officer is cancelled out by contradictory and opposing statements of opinion by another. But I would like to refer to the argument advanced by the minister, that there is no need to delay unification until integration has been effected, and that unification is not to be regarded as subsequent to integration but really as part of the same cycle.

This argument gets us bogged down in a war of words, in semantics. It is pretty ingenious to say unification is really part of the same cycle as integration, and should not be regarded as coming after it. I can see the minister making that argument, because it was a particular point of emphasis by members of the official opposition. But I think he is really trying to kid us, because even if one wants to use a word such as cycle, as opposed to sequential, the fact remains that cycles do have a sequence. I maintain that with integration, which is presently being worked out, it is no more than logical or reasonable to wait for a period of time to see if it turns out to be as effective as all indications show at present.

On repeated occasions the minister has stated that unification will bring about some economies and savings to the taxpayer. I agree with that statement, but in my opinion the savings that can be realized through unification will not be of the same magnitude as the savings achieved through integration. To suggest that unification will effect savings of comparable or equal magnitude to those effected by integration is overstating the case by a long shot.

There can be only one overwhelming argument in favour of unification and the passage of this bill now, and I digress to say we are proceeding with this legislation in a rather unnatural way. We are proceeding with it at a forced pace. It is legislation that has been introduced prematurely. It offends one's sense of what is logical and reasonable. Therefore any argument in favour of it would have to be very powerful, such as one suggesting that the government had decided on a foreign policy-defence policy combination to the effect that we should re-evaluate and renegotiate our existing military role and commitments. In that case it could be said that it was urgent to proceed with changing the organic structure of our defence forces. However, although the minister has said this may be a possibility at some future time, the

fact remains that our policies are the same as they were three years ago.

I believe it was General Moncel who testified that if a political decision were taken by the government to adopt a different role within NATO then a unification policy would make sense, but unless such were the case he could not find any merit in this proposition. I think I have already said that some other officers when testifying said that if we were going to maintain our present role within NATO, then unification would cause difficulty in organization in the sense that it would make it that much more complicated to relate our forces within NATO to those of our allies in that organization.

The other day the Secretary of State for External Affairs said that the military planning committee of the NATO council was in accord with the Canadian policy of unification, and that unification would not impinge upon the contribution of Canadian forces to the NATO commitment. That minister is not in the chamber now, but I would like to know from him, or some of his colleagues, on what basis he made that statement? Did he make it on the basis of some documentation, on an exchange of notes, or on the basis of an impression which he somehow gleaned when speaking to the officials of our allies in NATO, or to officials of the NATO command?

Was the Secretary of State for External Affairs just indulging in some wishful thinking? I do not think we need accept an important assertion like that from him without some indication as to the basis for it. Is it his mere *ipse dixit* that this is the attitude of our allies in NATO? It is of crucial importance to our understanding and attitude toward this legislation that we know how the officials of the NATO alliance feel about it. If this or any other minister makes the statement that this policy has the support of our allies, he should be a little more specific and indicate the basis for such a statement.

• (4:40 p.m.)

This fact brings me logically to a reference to a speech the other day by the Associate Minister of National Defence, who exhorted and pleaded with us to have faith in the policy of this minister and this government. It seems a bit strange that the associate minister should advise members of the opposition to have faith in this legislation, since it is our prime responsibility to evaluate legislation placed before us to the best of our ability on an analysis of related opinions, data and facts. We have not been given very much in the way of hard facts by the minister. He has spoken at great length and at times even with eloquence about changes taking place in the Department of National Defence. He has waxed very enthusiastically about some of them, but most of his remarks have related to integration.

The minister has not explained why it is absolutely imperative to pass this legislation now. He has not satisfied me as to the urgency of this matter. Without such an explanation and unless we are changing basic roles, what possible argument could be made for passing this bill this spring, this summer, or even this year? The minister of defence and other ministers have suggested that unification is something which cannot take place overnight. They ask us to pass this legislation now, in order that full planning for unification can take place, with complete unification being implemented in something like seven, eight, or nine years. That request undermines and defeats their own position and their desire to pass this legislation now. Unless I am drastically wrong in my understanding of how government departments operate, it seems that the department of defence can now engage in contingency planning. Perhaps that is not the jargon of the defence department but it seems to be an appropriate term.

It is my belief that all government departments are engaged in contingency planning every day of every month. Surely they do not require legislation before engaging in planning in respect of hypothetical circumstances. It would not be a violation of the law of the land or the chain of command if the department of defence engaged in planning for unification within a number of years. They are engaged in that kind of planning now. If I am wrong in that regard I hope someone with an intimate knowledge of what takes place within departments of government will correct me.

Surely the United States department of defence is engaged in formulating long-range plans for any possible contingency of hypothetical circumstance. That department must be actively engaged in planning for the future. The formulation of the framework within which unification will fall can properly take place now. At the present time integration is being implemented at various stages and the department can profit by the experience gained as integration takes greater effect.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Richard): Order, please. The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Schreyer: Mr. Chairman, with the indulgence of the committee I could complete my remarks in two minutes.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Richard): Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the committee to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Schreyer: In conclusion, let me say I accept the statements of hon. members opposite that the morale of the armed forces is not low. I am not in a position to say that it is high, but I will accept the assertion that it is good. For that reason, I cannot understand why this bill must be passed immediately. Surely it cannot be argued that we must pass this bill quickly because of a state of uncertainty which is causing some disquietude. Either the morale of our forces is good, or it is bad. If it is good, in spite of the so called period of uncertainty which has existed in recent months, why is there a necessity to put this legislation through at this time?

One is placed in a difficult position in supporting the objective or principle of this legislation, when that support must be based on incomplete evidence. For that reason it is logical and prudent to oppose the immediate passage of the bill until some further evidence in support of the measure comes to light. We should not be asked to support this legislation with a blindness to the differences of opinions and judgments expressed by those who are technically competent to judge. I plead with the minister to make a more comprehensive and conciliatory statement regarding this measure than has been made in the past few days. I do not do so with stubbornness, but with the interest of the nation in mind.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, my remarks this afternoon will be parochial. I should like to ask the minister, in the two or three minutes of my time I shall leave to him to tell me why there will be no undue effect in the Halifax-Dartmouth area as a result of base consolidation. I ask the minister to answer that question, in light of the assurances given to the house and the standing committee, as well as to community leaders in Halifax and Dartmouth, by the minister and the associate minister. I want to tell the minister, in case he does not know—I am sure he does—that the people of Halifax are very much concerned about this matter. The minister wonders why at times we question his credibility. This afternoon Fairey Aviation, E.M.I. Cossor, Sperry Gyroscope, and indeed every technical undertaking in Halifax that has civilian employees at H.M.C.S. *Shearwater* advised that by April 17 they are to remove these workmen. Mr. Minister, what in the name of all that is holy and good are you doing under the base consolidation program? Air Marshal Sharp, as reported at page 540 of the defence committee proceedings of February 8, answered a series of questions from myself about base consolidation. I said:

> I have drawn the inference that the minister has suggested that indeed a base consolidation program is under study.
>
> Air Marshal Sharp: Yes, sir.

On page 542 we got what we thought were some comforting words from you, Mr. Minister. Referring to a statement that had been made by the associate minister, the minister asked me:

> Which statement is this?

I replied:

> It was the statement—and I can only paraphrase it—in which he gave assurances to the civic community leaders that there would be no undue economic impact from base consolidation in the Halifax area.

Your reply, Mr. Minister, was:

> I think this is the fact. It is perhaps not fair to single out Halifax and say, "You are all right" and leave the impression that some other areas are not, but, as I have indicated, because of the singular nature of the Halifax area and the proportion of the fleet which is stationed there, I think that is a fair statement.

I would like to ask you, Mr. Minister—and if you can answer it I am sure I will be grateful, and so will a lot of other people in Halifax—why it is that we have a creeping and very apparent move on the part of the Department of National Defence to remove all the civilian employees from H.M.C.S. *Shearwater*, or I suppose I should dignify it and call it C.F.B. Shearwater. Why have you done this? Why are you continuing to do it? You said you were not going to do it. Why are you pussyfooting on this question and not coming out and telling us that you are going to close the base? Late last fall we had the spectacle of all the civilian firefighters, some of whom had been working there for many years, being transferred to other centres in the maritimes or to Dockyard. We were told this was a continuing pattern of change within the military concept. It had the effect of removing that phase of civilian employees from the base. And now we have this program which involves over 100 men.

Is the minister suggesting that it is more efficient to bring the aircraft and pieces of

equipment that need work done on them down to the civilian plants in order that these repairs may be carried out? Will this bring about greater efficiency and save money? If that is what you are after, Mr. Minister, you had better stand up and tell us, because that is not the impression we have. Indeed, I think any study ever undertaken by any military group in any of the western countries has shown that work contracted for by civilian personnel under an on-base contract is a lot cheaper than when it is carried out by the military people themselves.

We have had the removal of the firemen, and now the removal of all the technical people employed by the various firms at this one base in the Halifax area. What makes this a matter of very grievous concern is the fact that there have been persistent rumours for many months that the balance of the civilian employees will be removed from Shearwater. I am referring to carpenters, plumbers, and electricians. The rumour is that they will be sent to Dockyard and brought back to the base at Shearwater as and when required.

I can tell the minister—he knows it and should not have to be reminded by me—that a very serious economic situation is developing in the Halifax area. There is a great deal of uncertainty, confusion, and indeed disgust on the part of the military people. They are fed up, and indeed they would like to see the minister go on with his unification program. Even hell is better than this uncertainty. Stand up and tell us now what is going to be done in this area. Stop pussyfooting. Tell us what bases you are going to close, when you are going to close them and what you are going to do about the civilian employees and the economic imbalance that will be left. You know that 30 per cent of our economy is dependent on these bases, and yet you do things like this.

What are the 100 families going to do? We will lose them from our work force. What will happen to the helicopter work at Fairey? It will wind up at United Aircraft, Montreal. We have had the phasing out of the Neptune program; there are plans for the replacement of the Argus; there have been vague promises that some time later in the year you, Mr. Minister, will call tenders for the first of the new D.D.H.'s. This is already five years too late. I suggest that if the minister had the courage of his convictions, Mr. Chairman, he would stop acting like Hitler did. I say to him, don't be afraid to admit that you have made a mistake once in a while. If you admitted this, perhaps the people in Halifax would be happier and your program of nonsensical unification could be accomplished.

I will leave you for a minute, Mr. Minister. I hope you will give me some answer. The people of Halifax are very anxious to have an answer as to what you intend doing with these bases.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, I do not really think this intervention has been worthy of the hon. gentleman, and I do not think a reply at this stage of the bill, on something of this nature, would be worthy of me.

Mr. Forrestall: I will call it five o'clock, Mr. Chairman; but the minister has not heard the last of our objections to his constant, continual pussyfooting.

Progress reported.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The house will now proceed to consideration of private members business as listed on today's order paper, namely public bills and private bills.

Mr. McNulty: Mr. Speaker, may we, by unanimous consent, stand public bills under items 1 to 10 inclusive, and may we consider now item No. 11, Bill C-46 in the name of the hon. member for Carleton?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous agreement to standing orders Nos. 1 to 10 and proceeding with order No. 11, Bill C-46?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES ACT AMENDMENT

CHANGE IN DESCRIPTION AND TENURE OF OFFICE

Hon. R. A. Bell (Carleton) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-46 to amend the Parliamentary Secretaries Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill has a simple and direct purpose. It seeks to enhance and enlarge the role, status and prestige of parliamentary secretaries. It would try to restore the positions to the influence and authority for which they were originally designed, to the attainment of which they had made substantial progress by 1957, but from which they were reduced by negative action in 1958 and by legislation in 1959.

Parliamentary Secretaries Act Amendment

I welcome the opportunity of expressing my views on the subject prior to the introduction of the government bill of which notice of resolution has recently been given. Perhaps the debate today may influence the nature of that bill. However, I wish it to be remembered that the bill now under debate has been on the order paper since January 24, 1966, almost 15 months.

It is based upon long personal experience as a parliamentary assistant and later as a parliamentary secretary, and this experience included the performance of the work and duties of the office for more than 21 months, from February 1, 1958 to November 18, 1959, without official appointment, recompense or other recognition.

The bill seeks to do two things which in effect undo the legislation of 1959. First, it would restore the old name of parliamentary assistant, the name used for 16 years, and second, it would change the term of office to "appointment during pleasure" instead of "annual appointment". I submit there are valid and substantial reasons for both changes, and the result would be a great improvement in the public interest.

Although there were three positions described as parliamentary under-secretaries toward the end of the first world war, the practice of making such appointments ceased at the end of that war. The first formal action to establish the role of parliamentary assistant was taken by Mr. Mackenzie King in April, 1943 by the inclusion of an item in the estimates. The present Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) was one of the first appointments.

It is clear from the discussion which took place that the establishment of parliamentary assistants had a twofold purpose: first, to grant relief to ministers in the performance of their duties, and second, to provide a system of apprenticeship for future ministers. On these two grounds there have been varying degrees of success, and I want to analyse them and to discuss them in detail, if I may.

May I deal first with the question of the relief of ministers. I think the complexities of modern government place an almost intolerable burden upon some ministers of the Crown. Not all ministers, however, have the disposition or the capacity to delegate. My own view is that the role of a parliamentary assistant should be that of a genuine assistant to his minister, taking from his shoulders the burden of routine work and freeing him for the consideration of vital policy matters. I think it is clear that this is what Right Hon. Mackenzie King had in mind when the system was first introduced.

Because his words uttered on April 20, 1943 are still as valid today as when they were spoken and constitute the best compendium of the duties of a parliamentary assistant, I propose to quote them, quoting perhaps at greater length than I would normally do, from pages 2366 and 2367 of *Hansard* for 1943. This is what Mr. Mackenzie King said:

> Other duties of assistants to ministers would be to assist the minister in parliament, to answer questions—not all questions—and also to take part in departmental debates so that the house may be given fuller information in regard to some matters than it otherwise would. To assist in the explanation of the estimates. I can conceive of occasions when an assistant to the minister might relieve the minister entirely of a large part of the explanation of the estimates. To appear before house committees, on behalf of the minister, participate in interdepartmental committees on behalf of the minister, to keep the house itself informed more promptly on matters which may arise in the course of debates; to assist in the planning of some of the post-war work of the government which will have to be done under the direction of the minister, but which the assistant to the minister, giving his time to it specifically, could do to good effect.
>
> Also to receive deputations—the ministers are beset with deputations—they cannot possibly see many of them. An assistant to the minister could see them and I should hope be able to be of real assistance in seeing that their representations were carefully considered.

Then there was an interruption by the then leader of the opposition, Mr. Graydon, after which Mr. Mackenzie King went on to say the following:

> Then there is the matter of a link with members of parliament. I am sure I express the view of many as to the inevitable difficulty of members having a chance to take up matters with ministers direct. It is impossible for a minister to meet members in the corridors and hope to settle different questions at a chance moment. An assistant to the minister will be mixing with members generally and will be able to bring to the minister many matters that otherwise could not possibly be brought to his attention.

Things do not seem to have changed in the intervening years. Mr. Mackenzie King went on to say:

> Then there is deputizing for the minister on different occasions, fulfilling specific duties. The duties will vary between one department and another, one minister may wish his assistant to perform certain duties and another other duties. Then there is the signing on behalf of the minister of many documents that otherwise would require his signature. There is the supervision of officials in some branches where an assistant minister can be of great help. The assistant to the minister can be of great help in regard to outside engagements as well as engagements inside the house. Almost any service that will help relieve the minister of a burden and give the

House of Commons and the public more information with regard to the public business is the kind of position which the parliamentary assistant to the minister will be expected to fill.

Those original words with which the positions were created are words which I would wish to be read by all present and potential ministers and by all present and potential parliamentary assistants. I have read them for that purpose.

A rather vivid description of the life of a parliamentary secretary at Westminster is given by Herbert Morrison in his delightful book called "Government and Parliament", at page 66. Mr. Morrison, later Lord Morrison, said:

The life of the parliamentary secretary can be interesting and fairly full, or, on the other hand, uninteresting and rather empty according to the attitude of the minister and, to some extent, the higher civil servants. If, departmentally, he is left out in the cold or given little or nothing to do it is, I think, cruel, foolish, and unfair. It is cruel because it will develop unhappiness and bitterness in the heart of the parliamentary secretary; it is foolish because the parliamentary secretary of today is a possible minister of the future and it is desirable for him to learn all he can, including the taking of responsibility; it is unfair because, apart from creating a feeling of frustration, it makes a fool of the parliamentary secretary when he hears through other channels of things he ought already to have known about, and is driven to tell inquiring MPs that he is sorry but he knows nothing about it. Nor should it be forgotten that he has important duties to discharge with and for the minister from the treasury branch. Moreover, there is the important consideration that the proper employment of the parliamentary secretary can lighten the burden of the minister.

One can see that these words, written by Mr. Morrison, could well have been written about situations that have happened in this parliament. My own view is that the increasing professionalization of public life and the rapid progression toward baffling complexity in governmental administration demand that ministers of the Crown should delegate more and more to parliamentary assistants. Unless they do so, administration will suffer.

• (5:10 p.m.)

As to the other side of the coin, the other aspect of the role, apprenticeship for future ministers, how has this worked out? The question of the utility of the role of parliamentary assistant or parliamentary secretary as a training school or apprenticeship for the ministry is the subject of a most interesting article by Professor Denis Stairs of Dalhousie University, which appears in the second edition of Professor Paul Fox's excellent compendium "Politics—Canada" at page 216. Professor Stairs' statistics are as of January, 1964, and I have tried to bring them up to the minute, right up to this date.

The situation, sir, is that since the system of parliamentary assistants was introduced on April 29, 1943 until today, April 7, 1967, approximately 24 years, 101 persons have been appointed parliamentary assistants or parliamentary secretaries. Of these, 35 persons subsequently attained cabinet status, including the two parliamentary secretaries promoted to the cabinet this week. Of the 101 persons, 66 did not achieve cabinet status.

But that figure, of course, is deceptive since for example it includes 14 persons serving at present as parliamentary secretaries and two others who are still members of this house on the other side who served previously. It includes as well nine members on this side of the house who served as parliamentary secretaries without later attaining cabinet status, but most of whom would likely have that opportunity immediately after the next election. In order to achieve a fairer comparison, these 14, two and nine persons respectively or a total of 25 should be eliminated from consideration. On that basis, 35 former parliamentary assistants or secretaries attained ministerial rank and 41 did not.

A short table will show the position clearly. For each ministry, the table collates the statistics under four heads as follows:

Administrations	Total Appointments	Attained Cabinet Status	Did not but still in Commons	Did not and out of Commons
King-St. Laurent	38	19	0	19
Diefenbaker	36	9	9	18
Pearson	27	7	16	4
Total	101	35	25	41

This figure of 41 includes six who died, two while in office; three who were appointed to the Senate and are now serving there; four who were appointed to the bench; two who were appointed respectively to the Canadian Pension Commission and the Tariff Board, and nine who retired voluntarily from public life. Consequently, 24 of the 41 finished their public careers as indicated. The remainder suffered electoral defeat, but a number are still active politically and some may well return to this chamber for another chance at ministerial promotion.

A somewhat different approach to the appraisal of the role and value of apprenticeship as a ministerial assistant may be undertaken by an examination of cabinet appointments since April 29, 1943. During that period of

almost 24 years, 95 persons have been appointed to the cabinet for the first time. This figure excludes senators appointed to the cabinet. Of the 95, 35 had had previous service as a parliamentary assistant or parliamentary secretary and 60 had not. At first, these figures appear to discount the value of apprenticeship as a parliamentary secretary, but it must be remembered that it would have been impossible for any of the original ministry formed by the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) to have served as a parliamentary assistant, and several of the original members of the present ministry equally could not have so served. As well, in the Diefenbaker ministry, three successive deputy speakers were advanced—I will not say promoted—to the cabinet. With the exception of one who is now in the Senate, it was less than a successful experiment.

However, as a consequence upon consideration, there should properly be omitted 21 persons appointed to the original Diefenbaker cabinet, seven members of the original Pearson cabinet who never sat in the House of Commons during a period when they might be appointed as parliamentary secretaries and the three former deputy speakers to whom I have referred, or a total of 31. As a result, in a fair contrast, we observe 35 appointments to the cabinet since 1943 from the rank of parliamentary secretary, and 31 who did not have that service but who could not in the course of events have had it, as well as 29 other appointments to the cabinet.

In this latter category of 29 are such persons as a former Speaker, Mr. Speaker Glen, the present Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), the first minister from Newfoundland, Mr. Bradley and his successor, the present Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill), two former provincial premiers, Mr. Garson and the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming), General McNaughton and a number of others, the reasons for whose appointment to the cabinet are less obvious.

May I put this in summary form by offering this table:

Appointments to cabinet (excluding senators) of persons appointed thereto for first time, since April 29, 1943.

Administrations	Total	Previously served as parliamentary assistant	Did not previously serve as parliamentary assistant
King-St. Laurent	27	14	13
Diefenbaker	36	9	27
Pearson	32	12	20
Total	95	35	60

Now, sir, I have put that background on the record so that we may see the two basic reasons for parliamentary secretaries and what the result of their appointment may be.

I should like now to return to the two basic purposes of this bill. First, as I have indicated, it would restore the old style and title of parliamentary assistant. The intention of that proposal is to upgrade the office. I served under both names and I must say that I believe the introduction of the new name in 1959 very definitely downgraded the office. I found thereafter that most people thought my function in life was to write Don Fleming's letters, and I was never able after 1959 to be as useful to the Minister of Finance as I had been previously.

It is quite true that at Westminster the terms used are parliamentary secretary or parliamentary undersecretary. But the atmosphere is different there and indeed most are actually members of the ministry, though not of course of the cabinet. In earlier days in Canada, the term "secretary" was used for the senior administrative officer of each government department. This was changed to deputy minister, and the term survives only in the Department of External Affairs and in the Department of State. In my view, the public generally in Canada do not understand what a parliamentary secretary is. They believe him to be a mere scrivener of some sort. The name "parliamentary assistant" which was used for 16 years is more readily understood and much more correctly describes the role.

The second feature is to restore the term of office to "during pleasure" which it was for 16 years. If the positions are to achieve the purpose for which they were designed, annual appointments are ridiculous. It would be as sensible to reduce ministerial tenure to annual renewal.

The annual appointment was introduced as a technique of parliamentary discipline. The house is not unaware of my views that the powers of the Prime Minister have increased, are increasing and ought to be decreased. If parliamentary assistants are to be mere sycophants seeking always to court the Prime Minister for renewal of the mandate, the office should be abolished. I know of no other area of government where appointment is on an annual basis. Our tradition of appointment is during pleasure and this tradition, I submit, should be restored.

It is on the basis of these arguments, sir, that I commend this bill to the house. The

government has a resolution now on the order paper and I suggest for the reasons I have outlined they should adopt the procedures that are suggested in this bill, the techniques in this bill, as a means of restoring and enhancing the status and position of ministerial assistants.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member resumes his seat I wonder if I could ask him a question. I thought his speech was excellent, if he is not too embarrassed at my saying so; I think he served a highly useful purpose in putting on the record a clear statement of the original purpose of the office. He made reference in the early part of his speech to the resolution on the order paper which provides simply for increasing the number of parliamentary secretaries or parliamentary assistants, as the case may be, beyond 16, the present limit.

Would he be agreeable to having his bill amended to provide for that increase? It would, of course, require that the house revert to public business for the purpose of adopting the resolution required, because of the added cost involved. Would he consider that proposal?

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I think the answer to that question can be very simply stated. My objective is to get this bill and these principles adopted. I believe that the changes which the government are proposing are equally proper. Whatever technique would achieve this end would meet with my approval. I can only say that I speak for myself alone.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I do not generally approve of the proposition that in private members hour ministers should speak, but there is a resolution on the other paper dealing with this particular subject. If hon. members will bear with me, I will try to be very brief in my remarks.

The resolution simply asks the house to permit an increase in the maximum number of parliamentary secretaries to one for each minister having a portfolio and two for the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson). The present maximum is 16. Nothing more is involved in the resolution.

As I indicated in my question earlier, I was quite taken, frankly, with the useful purpose served by the hon. member in restating the purpose and function of this office, whether it is called that of "parliamentary assistant" or "parliamentary secretary". I was glad because I am one of those who has had the honour, if you like, or responsibility or privilege, of serving in the two different capacities, that of parliamentary assistant for some years as well as that of minister. I believe that if this office is carefully handled by parliament it can be a great help to our parliamentary processes, both for the reasons offered by the hon. member, as well as for other reasons which I will not presume to take up the time of the house to give at the moment.

I view his bill as acceptable, subject to one problem that confronts me at the moment. We would like to amend the bill to put a ceiling on the number in accordance with our resolution. I am advised by the Law Clerk that this can be done by the house reverting to public business and adopting the resolution. Then when the resolution is adopted, according to the precedent that I have here, the resolution then adopted is referred to the committee of the whole house on the bill, its having been given second reading and referred to the committee of the whole house. Then, Mr. Speaker, when we reach the appropriate clause, an amendment will be moved changing the number, plus imposing the additional financial burden forecast by the resolution.

That is one procedure that can be used, Mr. Speaker. I have quite a lengthy manuscript here from the Law Clerk; and I believe that this is the correct procedure. I also have the precise precedent available. I am quite willing to do this if it meets with the wishes of hon. members. If not, I will not presume to take up more time in this private members hour.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, I just want to be clear about this. I do not want to defeat any of the thinking here, but the government's proposal on the order paper is in the form of a resolution which will be followed by a bill.

Mr. McIlraith: No.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): By amendment to my bill.

Mr. Lambert: The point is that the government's proposal is by way of resolution, which would have to be followed by a bill to amend the Parliamentary Secretaries Act. Because the payment of public funds is envisaged here we must proceed by way of resolution.

The difficulty I foresee in telescoping the two things is this. Although I may be wrong, my thinking about this is that this government resolution is tied to a particular bill. The provisions in the bill of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) could be brought in because it does not envisage the payment of funds. I doubt very much if we can telescope the two by moving from the government's resolution to my colleague's bill.

I would think we should proceed rather the other way, and I put this forward for consideration. To my mind a bill must follow the government's resolution. Even if the government's resolution were adopted, it could not be imported into my colleague's bill.

Mr. McIlraith: If I may deal with the point of order that has been raised, I had this matter turned up this morning and I got an opinion on how to proceed from the Law Clerk, as I have said. Undoubtedly, the method suggested by the hon. member could be followed. But the other method that could be used is to give the bill now before the house second reading and refer it to the committee of the whole house. At that stage—or at some earlier stage, but preferably at that stage—the government resolution, which can be dealt with by reverting to public business, would be adopted. Immediately on its adoption the resolution would be referred to the committee of the whole house on Bill No. C-46.

Then, Mr. Speaker, when we come to the relevant clause we then would have the authority, having met the requirements of the resolution stage, to amend the private member's bill on the private member's item of business by changing the number of parliamentary secretaries from 16 to the higher number proposed in the bill which would have been based on the resolution. We can proceed in that way and there is a precedent to substantiate it. That is an outline of the precise procedure.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask another question, Mr. Speaker. Supposing the private member's bill which is now before us is accepted by this house; would not the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McIlraith) then be able to carry on with his resolution at the appropriate time and in the normal way at some future date?

Mr. McIlraith: No. The difficulty that we then would run into is this. We would have decided in this session to fix the number at 16. Therefore we will get into the old question of the same question being dealt with twice in the same session, because a decision would have been taken on the point. This is the difficulty with that procedure. It could then be argued that the government's resolution could not be proceeded with this session. That is the nub of the difficulty.

[Mr. Lambert.]

• (5:30 p.m.)

Mr. Churchill: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we are fairly close to a new session. If the private member's bill is passed now, it might be only a few weeks before there is a new session, and the government could introduce the measure at that stage. There would be no prolonged delay.

If that is not acceptable I have to say this: I do not think the house should be asked to revert to government business at this stage and give up the private members' hour. There should be no attempt to carry on government business which has only been brought to the attention of the house during the last ten minutes. This is contrary to the practices of the house. We require notice as to when matters will come before us and we were not notified at any time of this.

I do not want to detract in any way from the work of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell). I listened with interest to his presentation and will read in *Hansard* the tables and comparative figures he gave. I hope that he will be given the full credit for the proposal he has brought forward. It appears to make good sense and would correct a situation which should be corrected. I do not think we should go beyond that and attempt to deal with government business enlarging the scope of the private member's bill materially, and bringing in a further matter of debate, the increase in the number of parliamentary secretaries, concerning which there might be considerable expression of opinion in the house when the time for that comes.

I regret that I cannot accept the idea of the Minister of Public Works that we proceed from this stage to government business. There must be some other way of getting around this difficulty.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the point made by the member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill), but I wonder if we do not in effect have an opportunity to see a private member's public bill get passed. This is something that happens in this House of Commons, but not very often. This is centennial year; let us do something different.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles: I think this proposition might be considered. If we were to revert to public business and take a great deal of time, then of course the arguments advanced by my hon. friend might carry some weight. But if we agree to accept the bill of the hon. member for Carleton and amend it, then it will take only two or three minutes to pass the other resolution. I would assume if we were to approve the procedure suggested by the Minister of Public Works and go into committee of the whole house on Bill C-246, that on arriving at the appropriate clause a minister of the crown would have to move the amendment. The result of the procedure proposed by the Minister of Public Works is that the bill before us would pass, with one amendment being made to it.

The bill itself would do two things. It would change the name from parliamentary secretary to parliamentary assistant and it would change the appointment from being an annual one to being one having "at pleasure" status. In addition to that, the governments' idea of increasing the number of assistants would be added, by an amendment to the bill proposed by the hon. member for Carleton. That would make sense. It would be interesting to see one of our private members public bills getting through. Let's do it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Is the house ready for the question?

Mr. Churchill: What is the question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): That the bill be read a second time. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): In view of the manner in which the house has dealt with the bill might I ask for unanimous consent that it now be referred to the committee of the whole house rather than to another committee?

Mr. Knowles: That is automatic.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): As I understand it, it has been suggested that the other resolution be brought forward at this time.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): My remarks refer only to this bill.

Mr. McIlraith: It was suggested that the bill be referred to the committee of the whole house. That we may be clear about the procedure, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the motion should be that this bill be referred to the committee of the whole house.

Mr. Lambert: With the greatest respect, this is a private member's public bill and the automatic referral is to the committee of the whole house.

Mr. McIlraith: I stand corrected.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): I stand corrected, also. I have been misled.

Mr. McIlraith: For the purposes of regularizing the procedure, this is the stage at which I would ask to revert to public business to move the resolution standing on the order paper dealing with this subject. If that is not agreeable to the house I would have no objection, because this is a somewhat unusual procedure. But this is the point at which it should be done. It requires unanimous consent.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Is it agreed that the house revert to public business?

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I raised my objection earlier and I do not want to be pressed on this. I am quite content to proceed with the bill presented by the hon. member for Carleton, but not beyond that.

Mr. McIlraith: In view of that I withdraw my request.

The house in committee, Mr. Richard in the chair.

Clause 1 agreed to.

On clause 2—*Short Title.*

Mr. Matheson: I wish to say a word on clause 2.

• (5:40 p.m.)

I should like to endorse from a personal point of view exactly what we heard from the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell). I think that we have heard today an extremely thoughtful speech. The fact that this bill was on the order paper impelled a number of members to carry out research to some extent into the office of parliamentary secretary, originally that of parliamentary assistant. What has been presented to the house is so factual and well documented that it almost

compels most of us now to remain in silence. This was a very scholarly address we heard, and a useful one from a comparative point of view.

My predecessor as parliamentary secretary, the hon. member for Coast-Capilano, (Mr. Davis) was able to carry out duties of a unique character, as I saw them, during the period at the beginning of the present administration while I was serving as chairman of the standing committee on external affairs. My predecessor as parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister, a man who holds five university degrees to the level of doctorate, high post-graduate degrees in different disciplines, was able to devote many thousands of hours of work for Canada at the time of the exhaustive study which was being conducted into the Columbia River treaty.

It was not easy for a new administration to step in and discuss adequately at the political level an arrangement which had been the subject of months of research by the previous administration.

Mr. Herridge: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. Matheson: I see that my dear friend from Kootenay West does not share that view. But I believe the country as a whole would agree that this great step forward was assisted substantially by the expertise of a parliamentary secretary who was both an electrical engineer and also, through his training at Oxford, a highly qualified economist.

During my period of service to the Prime Minister, since January 9, 1966, I have had until very recently the privilege and honour of sharing accommodation with the person who is now the Minister of Justice (Mr. Trudeau)—another ardent scholar, the product of Harvard University, the University of Paris and the London School of Economics. I know something of the work this parliamentary secretary did for Canada and if he had never assumed the high appointment he presently holds his contribution to Canada, as I see it, would already have been substantial.

Whatever may happen in the future to any parliamentary secretary, the experience of serving actively in one of the departments or in the department of the Prime Minister is no cause for bitterness—I think that is the expression in one of the quotations used by the hon. member for Carleton. On the contrary, it represents a great challenge and one which stretches most of us to the very limit of our abilities. I fully agree with the view expressed by the hon. member for Carleton in that the name has been an inconvenience. It is true that the word "secretary" has certain connotations in the United Kingdom which it has never enjoyed in Canada. Indeed, upon my appointment as parliamentary secretary I received a number of letters of congratulation upon my stepping out of politics into the civil service. Some people thought I would never have to go through the rigours of a political contest again. The name certainly has been a cause of confusion. Many people misunderstand what the office is. I feel this bill makes a useful contribution to parliament.

[Mr. Matheson.]

Mr. Faulkner: I would agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) that in the centennial year there are grounds for greater co-operation and that when the house is presented with an opportunity, as it was a moment ago, to do something constructive which is recognized on both sides as having merit, it is regrettable we do not seem to have the stuff necessary to do it. As a new member of parliament and, no doubt, an inexperienced one, I think this is regrettable.

The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) presented cogently and at times movingly a compelling argument for improving the status and the role of parliamentary secretaries. I cannot but concur in the argument he presented on behalf of this bill. The practice in Canada has been that parliamentary secretaries or assistants are not junior ministers as is the case in Britain. Their roles are determined largely by the ministers themselves and necessarily vary from one ministry to another. If I felt that a change of title would lead to an improvement in the status I would agree wholeheartedly with the hon. member for Carleton.

If the words which the hon. member quoted from our late distinguished prime minister, Mackenzie King, were put into practice by ministers there is no doubt that the role of parliamentary secretary could become a more useful and positive one both in government and in the House of Commons. We shall not bring this about simply by increasing the numbers of parliamentary secretaries. I object to the provision which speaks of 16 and envisages possible changes in the future.

This is a role which has to be examined. At present it is something of a no-man's-land. It is not clearly defined and, as I said earlier, it seems to vary from department to department depending on the particular portfolio to

which a parliamentary secretary is attached. My main point is that the role of parliamentary secretary or assistant has not been developed as fully as it should be. Every minister needs a parliamentary assistant and I cannot think of one good reason why any minister should refuse one. The responsibilities which ministers of the Crown presently bear must really be back-breaking and there are areas in which a parliamentary assistant could clearly be of help.

What are those areas? I was surprised to learn of some of them as put forward by Mr. Mackenzie King, in what I thought was a highly contemporary piece of thinking. Parliamentary assistants could do a lot more in the way of receiving briefs from interested parties and from pressure groups outside government circles. They could also do a great deal in the way of receiving individuals who always seem to want meetings with ministers. If their role were clearly laid down they could serve as effective liaison between members of parliament and their ministers.

• (5:50 p.m.)

It would be difficult for me to make suggestions about departmental responsibilities which they might assume. I am not familiar enough with what happens in this area to know, but I would think there would be areas where a parliamentary assistant could do some useful work within a department itself.

In respect to duties in the House of Commons it is perfectly clear that what we expect of our ministers today is more than we should reasonably expect in terms of attendance and responsibility. I would suggest it is unrealisitc and inefficient to expect ministers to attend here as well as to administer the large and complex government departments it is their lot to administer. Parliamentary assistants could serve an extremely useful purpose in relieving their ministers of some of the time those ministers are presently required to attend in the house.

In fact I would hope that parliamentary assistants could be charged with the responsibility of piloting through the House of Commons bills which are not of a particularly controversial or political nature. The hon. member for Carleton very rightly expressed the possibilities for apprenticeship that open up in this area. We are all too cognizant of how important that apprenticeship is in preparation for ministerial responsibilities, and particularly for duties within the House of Commons.

In recent years it has been our sorry lot to witness what can be the consequences to individuals who are over-worked or, in some cases, inexperienced when faced with the responsibilities and the challenges posed by becoming members of the front bench in the House of Commons. No one needs to elaborate on that point. No one needs to apportion blame. It is a fact of life of which all of us should be cognizant and about which we should be concerned. Therefore I would see considerable possibilities for parliamentary assistants in the role that I have just described, that of relieving ministers of some of their duties and responsibilities within the House of Commons.

Another area where a parliamentary assistant could do some very useful work, if given the opportunity, is in assuming some of the responsibilities we presently require of ministers outside the House of Commons and outside their departments. I am thinking of official openings, speaking engagements, and the like. These are very important functions which have to be performed. National organizations, and indeed constituency organizations very often like to have ministers present at their annual meetings to discuss departmental policies, and how they relate to those organizations. Parliamentary assistants could do useful work in this regard.

One final area in which they could do some useful work is in the area of long term policy planning within departments. It is not realistic to expect civil servants to be responsible for projecting in what direction a department is to move in the future, and what are the alternatives or options in policy matters. These are things which are a political task and a parliamentary assistant could do some useful work in this regard.

All I would like to say in closing is that I fully support the arguments presented by the hon. member for Carleton. However, I feel that if this bill passes, the authority vested in parliamentary assistants must be made much greater. Not only must a parliamentary assistant appear to have the confidence of his minister, but he must have that confidence. He must have access to confidential papers and to meetings which his minister has with departmental officials. In short, a parliamentary assistant must become the alter ego of his minister.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my support for the bill and to congratulate the hon. member for Carleton on his speech, but I do hope it will not take

another 100 years before we exhibit this centennial spirit, when private members bills are being considered in the house. I hope this will establish a precedent whereby bills will be dealt with on their merits, and I hope we continue the practice of referring them to committees more and more in the days ahead.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with other hon. members in congratulating the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) on this bill. Having had some experience in a minister's office I can assure the hon. member for Carleton of how important it is. As a result of this debate and of the negotiations that went on across the chamber it would seem to me hon. members are in favour of the objectives of the provisions in the hon. member's bill, and I would hope that when the government resolution, and the bill based on it, come up for discussion, the hon. member's bill could be introduced by way of amendment to the government bill.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the Canadian system has resulted in a somewhat too inflexible bureaucratic control over the government. In the United States when a new president and new administration take office, the senior officials are replaced by adherents to the party coming in, which provides them with a greater flexibility. We can attain a greater amount of flexibility by having parliamentary secretaries working deeply within their departments. As it is now, ministers tend to be overburdened by a combination of administrative and political duties, which does not allow them properly to fill all their functions.

Mr. Churchill: You have talked the bill out.

The Chairman: Order. It being six o'clock shall I rise, report progress, and request leave to sit again at the next sitting of the house?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: I am wondering about the business of the house. Do we take up this particular private members bill on Monday, or is there something else?

Mr. Pepin: The order on Monday will be the same as today.

Mr. Knowles: And next week will be the same as this week.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hour for the consideration of private members business has expired.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, April 10, 1967

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PERSONNEL OF FEED GRAIN BOARD AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry and Rural Development): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to the house appointments to the Canadian Livestock Feed Board and its advisory committee.

Mr. Roger Perreault, of Montreal, Que., will act as president of the board, whereas Mr. Charles W. Huffman, of Harrow, Ont., will be the vice president. The third member will be Mr. Willard D. Dernier, of Moncton, N.B.

The advisory committee will be made up of seven members including Mr. Lyall A. Currie, of Cloverdale, B.C., who will assume the duties of president; the other members will be Messrs. Delmer W. Bennett, Foresters Falls, Ont.; William G. Tilden, Harriston, Ont.; Albert Allain, Rochebaucourt, Que.; Lucien Bolduc, Compton, Que.; Arthur R. Hill, Onslow, N.S.; and Charles H. Yeo, St. Eleanors, P.E.I.

[*English*]

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

DEATH SENTENCES IN CANADA

Question No. 2,541—**Mr. Latulippe:**

From the date on which the House of Commons voted for the retention of capital punishment (a) how many persons were sentenced to death in Canada (b) how many were executed (c) how many sentences were stayed (d) how many sentences were commuted to life imprisonment (e) how many prisoners hanged themselves?

[*Translation*]

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): (a) 10; (b) 0; (c) 0; (d) 5; (e) 10.

Note: That of the 10 persons mentioned in (a) one was granted a new trial by the Court of Appeal and subsequently convicted of non-capital murder; another was granted a new trial by the Court of Appeal and has not yet been retried; and the other 8 cases are still before the Courts of Appeal. Thus the case referred to in (d) are not cases coming within (a). The cases referred to in (e) relate to the entire penitentiary population and one such person at the time of his suicide was being detained in a provincial institution.

[*English*]

SUPERANNUATION OF RURAL POSTMASTERS

Question No. 2,639—**Mr. Caouette:**

What is the age at which rural postmasters are eligible for superannuation?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Postmaster General): Rural Postmasters who contribute to the Superannuation fund are eligible for Superannuation: (a) because of ill health after five years of service. (b) with an actuarial allowance which would commence at age fifty after twenty years of service. (c) voluntarily at age sixty. (d) at age sixty-five, unless employment is extended. (e) compulsory at age seventy.

[*English*]

RENTAL OF SPACE IN JULIANA APARTMENTS, OTTAWA

Question No. 2,677—**Mr. Coates:**

Has the government rented space in the Juliana apartments, Bronson avenue, Ottawa, and, if so (a) for what department or agencies of the government (b) when did the government enter into a contract for the space in question, how much was obtained and what is the annual rental (c) who are the principal shareholders in the company who owns the Juliana apartment building?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Department of Trade and Commerce as follows: (a) Department of Trade and Commerce. (b) (i) One 1-bedroom and one bachelor apartment leased for a period of two years effective May 1, 1966. Total annual rent $7,800. (ii) Three bachelor apartments leased for a period of 1 year effective January 1, 1967. Total annual rent $12,960. (c) Not known.

VETERANS PENSIONS ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

Question No. 2,699—**Mr. Schreyer:**

1. What is the average length of service of all administrative level personnel serving on (a) the Canada pension commission and its divisions (b)

the veterans bureau (c) the veterans welfare services branch (d) the war veterans allowance board?

2. In each of the above cases, what is the maximum and the minimum length of service per division or branch?

3. How many medical doctors are employed on the various boards or divisions under the administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and how many branches or divisions of the department are involved?

4. When a veteran's pension is increased as a result of examination, to what maximum length of time is the increase made retroactive and if, as a result of appeal or re-examination, it is discovered that an error was made in determining the eligibility of an applicant for pension or for veterans allowance, what recourse does the applicant have as regards obtaining payment for that period of time which elapsed between original application and final acceptance or acknowledgement of eligibility?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): 1. (a) 11 years; (b) 10 years; (c) 17 years; (d) 19 years.

2. (a) minimum three months; maximum 34 years; (b) minimum two months; maximum 27 years; (c) minimum five months; maximum 28 years; (d) minimum one year; maximum 37 years.

3. Treatment services, 145 full time doctors; 774 part time doctors.

Canadian pension commission, 52 full time doctors.

4. When a veteran's disability pension is increased as a result of medical examination, such increase may be made retroactive to the date of complaint, or even earlier if supported by medical evidence. The recourse with regard to obtaining a retroactive payment of pension is through section 31 of the Pension Act which limits the dates from which disability pensions are payable.

Awards made pursuant to the War Veterans Allowance Act may be paid from the effective date of application, depending on the applicant's financial circumstances. Allowances may be awarded or increased retroactively to the effective date of an adverse decision when such a decision resulted from a mistake of fact or an error.

COMPARISONS BETWEEN ARMY AND AIR FORCE

Question No. 2,724—**Mr. Schreyer:**

1. What is the present ratio of total numbers of personnel in the Canadian army relative to that of the R.C.A.F.?

2. What was the total number of promotions in 1966 in (a) the army (b) the air force?

3. What was the total number of promotions to date in 1967, in (a) the army (b) the air force?

[Mr. Schreyer.]

4. With respect to parts 2 and 3 above, what was the ratio of promotions within the army to that within the air force?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Associate Minister of National Defence): 1. On 28 February, 1967 regular force strength was army 42,429; air force 44,307.

2. (a) 7,868; (b) 13,656.

These figures include 3,491 army and 10,095 R.C.A.F. promotions to corporal as a result of the 1 October, 1966 pay revision.

3. As of 14 March, 1967.

(a) 473; (b) 1,599.

These figures include 65 army and 169 R.C.A.F. promotions on an automatic basis from second lieutenant to lieutenant (or equivalent) from 1 October, 1966.

4. 1966, 1 to 1.7; 1967 to date, 1 to 3.

ASSETS TRANSFERRED TO TRANSAIR LTD.

Question No. 2,737—**Mr. Schreyer:**

1. What assets were transferred by either the government of Canada or Air Canada (Trans-Canada Air Lines) to TransAir Ltd. in any of the last six years?

2. For what price or consideration was this transfer made?

3. Have the services provided to date by TransAir Ltd. been in accordance with the agreement made at the time of transfer of these assets?

4. Has the government of Canada entered into any supplementary agreement with TransAir Ltd. relative to the above?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. In 1963 Air Canada transferred to TransAir one Viscount aircraft, one Rolls-Royce Dart engine, 12 first class seats, eight ground power units, four cargoveyers, two DC-3 aircraft, miscellaneous DC-3 components and spare parts, miscellaneous DC-3 ground support equipment, miscellaneous ground radio equipment and office equipment and furnishings located at Medicine Hat, Swift Current, Brandon, Yorkton and Prince Albert.

2. In consideration of agreement by TransAir to commence a class I scheduled commercial air service on the southern prairie and the Regina, Saskatoon and Prince Albert routes and to operate for a period of three years on such route pattern as may be approved from time to time by the air transport board.

3. Yes.

4. No.

*LINK BETWEEN CIGARETTE SMOKING AND LUNG CANCER

Question No. 2,754—**Mr. Mather:**

1. Is there statistical evidence linking cigarette smoking and lung cancer?

2. How many deaths from lung cancer occurred in Canada during 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965 and 1966?

3. Has a decision been arrived at regarding the advisability of regulating cigarette advertising in the interests of public health?

4. Is the matter under consideration?

Mrs. Margaret Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): The answer to the first part of this question, Mr. Speaker, is yes.

The answer to the second part is, lung cancer deaths in Canada were as follows: 1962, 3,034; 1963, 3,246; 1964, 3,387; 1965, 3,592; 1966, not available.

The answer to the third part is no, and the answer to the fourth part is yes.

OPENING OF PENAL INSTITUTION, SPRINGHILL, N.S.

Question No. 2,769—**Mr. Coates:**

On what date will the new young offender's penal institution at Springhill, Nova Scotia, be placed in operation from an institutional point of view?

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): The young offenders penal institution at Springhill, Nova Scotia is expected to be placed in operation during August 1967.

ARDA STUDY RESPECTING BLUEBERRY FREEZING PLANT

Question No. 2,776—**Mr. Laprise:**

What is the present situation as regards the ARDA technical and economic study No. 24017 on the possibility of establishing a blueberry freezing and storage plant in Lac St-Jean and Abitibi?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry and Rural Development): The study has been completed and received. The province of Quebec has built such a blueberry freezing and storage plant in St-Bruno, Lac St-Jean West. The total cost for the study was $19,500. The federal share amounts to 50 per cent, $9,750.

CONSTRUCTION OF FISHERIES RESEARCH LABORATORY, NFLD.

Question No. 2,794—**Mr. Tucker:**

Is it the intention of the government to build in Newfoundland-Labrador, a laboratory for the Fisheries Research Board of Canada and, if so (a) where will it be built (b) when will construction begin?

Hon. H.-J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Yes.

(a) Memorial University of Newfoundland campus, St. John's, Newfoundland, (b) 1968.

*DEFENCE ESTIMATES FOR UNIFORMS

Question No. 2,802—**Mr. McCleave:**

With regard to the estimates of the Department of National Defence for 1967-68, were the amounts based on a program incorporating unification and, if so, what would have been the amounts had unification not been so incorporated?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): The reply to the first part of the question, Mr. Speaker, is no. However, the development program includes provision for the procurement of 450 uniforms of new design for user trial purposes.

The reply to the second part of the question is "not applicable".

CHANNEL DREDGING, BAY ST. LAWRENCE, N.S.

Question No. 2,805—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

1. What are the plans of the department concerned for the redredging of the inner mooring and the entrance channel at Bay St. Lawrence, Victoria county, Nova Scotia?

2. What is the depth of water at low tide in the entrance channel at Bay St. Lawrence at the present time?

3. On what date is it intended to carry out dredging at this location?

4. Will this dredging be carried out by a departmental dredge or will tenders be called for this project?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): 1. The plans of the department are to redredge the entrance channel and mooring basin in 1967.

2. Due to continually changing conditions the depth of water in the entrance channel at the present time is unknown. A sounding survey carried out in June 1965 showed that the minimum depth at low tide was 2.8 feet.

3. It is expected that the dredging will commence before July 1, 1967 and will require eight weeks to complete.

4. This dredging will be carried out by a departmental dredge.

MEETINGS OF NATIONAL WELFARE COUNCIL

Question No. 2,810—**Mr. Enns:**

1. Since the appointment of members to the national welfare council on December 23, 1964, how many meetings has this council held and on what dates did the council convene?

Questions

2. Have such meetings been at the call of the minister or have members of the council initiated meetings?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. The National Council of Welfare, since its inception in 1965, has met on three occasions: (a) April 5 and 6, 1965; (b) October 18 and 19, 1965; (c) A meeting was proposed for November 24 and 25, 1966, or alternatively December 1 and 2, 1966. However, it was postponed because of the uncertainty of the transportation situation at the time and the inability of some members to attend on the dates proposed. This meeting was subsequently held on January 19 and 20, 1967, the earliest that a generally acceptable time could be agreed upon.

2. Meetings are convened at the call of the chairman, the deputy minister of national welfare. It is expected that the council will meet once or perhaps twice a year. Since it is a newly established advisory body, there has not been any lengthy experience with respect to the frequency of meetings. It is anticipated that these meetings will be convened at regular intervals and that the council itself will be able to determine how frequently it should meet. If any member or members of the council or if the minister want a meeting convened, it will be arranged as soon as a suitable time can be worked out with the members. At the last meeting of the council in January, there was a concensus that the council hold its next meeting in September.

HALIFAX CITADEL RESTORATION

Question No. 2,811—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Will there be a program of restoration work for the Halifax Citadel this year?

2. If so, of what will this program consist?

3. How many people will be employed?

4. How much money will be spent?

5. How many persons are presently employed on Halifax Citadel and other related Halifax county projects in other than administrative jobs?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Yes.

2. (a) Remove escarp revetment wall between postern No. 3 and No. 4 and also remove fill between revetment and courtyard wall. (b) Reconstruct verandah on Cavalier building. (c) Rebuild top of north reservoir and filter beds. (d) Construct storm sewer and moat drainage system to lower water table. (e) Regrade and seed moat area. (f) Apply seal coating to courtyard. (g) General landscaping.

[Mr. Enns.]

3. Between 25 and 35.

4. $159,300.

5. 32.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

CHECKING AND REFUNDS BRANCH, REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Question No. 2,717—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

1. What are the functions and duties of the checking and refunds branch of the Department of National Revenue?

2. How many persons are employed in the said branch?

3. Of the persons so employed, how many have had their positions converted to each of the new classifications, showing the number in each new classification?

4. How many employees were "redcircled" in the original classification review, showing the number converted to each new classification who were "redcircled"?

5. Have any of the persons so "redcircled" in the original classification review been removed from this status as a result of subsequent reviews or transfers and, if so, how many, in each new classification?

6. How many persons are still "redcircled", showing the number in each new classification?

7. With what other classifications or positions in the public service were the positions formerly known as principal customs excise checking clerk compared in order to determine their new classification?

8. What consideration has been given by the Department of National Revenue and/or the Public Service Commission to the problems arising from "redcircling" in this branch and particularly to the decline of morale resulting therefrom?

9. What further action is proposed by the Department of National Revenue and/or the Public Service Commission to meet the complaints of employees of the branch?

10. Has the government any plans for increased regionalization of the work of this branch?

11. If so (a) why have such plans been developed (b) what precisely is the nature of such plans (c) has the government satisfied itself that such plans will not lead to further decline in morale within the branch and to possible loss of efficiency?

Return tabled.

CONTRACT FOR STUDY OF SATELLITE COMMUNICATION

Question No. 2,757—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Has a contract been awarded by the Department of Transport to Northern Electric Company for the study of satellite communication?

2. If so (a) what is the date of the contract (b) what is the total amount of the contract and when are payments to be made thereunder (c) what are the purposes and objectives of the study and, in particular, what are the terms of reference set

forth in the contract (d) is the contractor required to make a report and submit recommendations and, if so, when are such report and recommendations due?

3. Is the contractor entitled to subcontract any part of his duties or obligations under the contract?

4. If so (a) has he done so (b) what part of the contract has been so subcontracted (c) to whom have subcontracts been let (d) what is the amount of each subcontract?

5. Has the prime contractor any previous experience in such studies or work as is required to be performed under the contract?

6. If so, for what person or persons did he carry on such previous studies or work?

7. Did the Department of Transport invite, solicit or entertain any proposal from (a) agencies or other departments of the government of Canada or (b) private Canadian firms or organizations, to undertake the study or work for which a contract was let to Northern Electric Company?

8. If so (a) what agencies, departments or firms (b) with what results?

9. Does the Bell Telephone Company of Canada have any commercial or other interest in the result or outcome of the studies and work to be performed under the contract?

10. If so (a) what is the nature of such interest (b) was this considered before the award of the contract to Northern Electric Company?

Return tabled.

EXPO '67

REPORTED THREATS TO DESTROY CUBAN PAVILION

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): In the absence of the Solicitor General possibly this question should be directed to the Prime Minister. It has to do with—

An hon. Member: He is here.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, Mr. Speaker, I did not notice the promotion. I see he is getting closer and closer to the Prime Minister's seat. Then I shall direct my question to the Solicitor General. It has to do with the threat that has been made regarding the Cuban pavilion at Expo. Has he a report to offer in this connection, and at the same time will he advise whether press statements are correct, namely that the Cubans who are now en route to Canada to look after their pavilion include 60 security personnel? Does the government not feel that the importation of their own police by countries who are going to be present at Expo is not in keeping with the security that we in Canada maintain, and that they ought to be told to leave their armies of security personnel at home?

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, as the newspaper report indicated there is very close liaison between members of the law enforcement agencies in Canada, both the R.C.M.P. and the agencies in the province of Quebec, and the F.B.I. and other law enforcement agencies in the United States. I believe the press report also stated that certain information had been forwarded to Canadian authorities regarding the visits of people from parts of the United States with interests adverse to Expo.

So far as the presence of security personnel in Canada is concerned, this matter is now being discussed with my colleague the Minister of External Affairs and I will take notice of that part of the question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is consideration being given by the government to telling these nations to keep their security forces at home when they visit Canada?

[*Later:*]

Mr. Nicholas Mandziuk (Marquette): I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. What terms of possession were given to nations which set up pavilions at Expo '67? Are the agreements on a rental basis?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am wondering whether the question is not much too general to be asked and answered at this time. Perhaps the hon. member wishes to rephrase the question.

Mr. Mandziuk: I do not know whether I can rephrase it satisfactorily, but I should like to know what consideration has been paid by each of the nations setting up pavilions. Was any consideration paid to us in return for setting up these pavilions at Expo '67?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): The Minister of Trade and Commerce is the minister who has jurisdiction over this matter, as far as any minister has, and I will be glad to discuss the matter with him.

Mr. Mandziuk: Would the Prime Minister also convey to the Minister of Trade and Commerce our anxiety to know what security guarantees were given by Canada or the province of Quebec to those who set up pavilions at Expo? Are they guaranteed absolute security or must they provide their own?

Inquiries of the Ministry

NATURAL GAS

ACTION OF U.S. COMMISSION RESPECTING PROPOSED PIPE LINE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In view of press reports that some $200 million worth of industrial construction will not be commenced unless there is assurance that facilities for gas transmission will be increased this year, can the minister give the house any information as to when we may expect a final decision from the federal power commission regarding the construction of the trans-Canada pipe line?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, there should be an oral argument before the federal power commission on April 21 between the interested parties. I do not know when the federal power commission will make a decision, but we hope it will be soon after that debate. If it should not be on time to use the 1967 construction period, there is no doubt that later this spring a decision will have to be taken with regard to an alternative project. Trans-Canada Pipe Line has been instructed to prepare that alternative project for introduction before the National Energy Board.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister whether he has set any deadline for the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Company to begin the twinning of the line along the northern Canada route in the event that there is no final decision by the F.P.C.?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that there is a deadline about the F.P.C. decision but I can say that there is a deadline for the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Company to introduce its application before the National Energy Board.

Mr. Douglas: Can the minister say what that deadline is?

Mr. Pepin: At the end of this month or early next month, I would think. There is no specific date because the National Energy Board makes the decision on the hearing of applications and of course other companies in Canada might want to intervene either in favour of or against Trans-Canada's alternative project.

[Mr. Mandziuk.]

FISHERIES

PARTICIPATION OF RUSSIA IN NORTH PACIFIC TREATY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to extend a welcome to the Minister of Fisheries on his return from his trip abroad. I should like to ask the minister whether the question of the participation of the Soviet union in the north Pacific fisheries treaty was discussed during the course of his recent talks with the minister of fisheries of that country.

Hon. H.-J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for his kind words of welcome. I can assure him that in the frank exchange of views I had with the minister of fisheries for the U.S.S.R., Mr. Ishkov, the question of Russian participation in the north Pacific treaty was discussed. However, the hon. member will understand that no decision could be arrived at because this is a matter which also concerns two other countries, Japan and the United States.

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON MEETING RESPECTING MARINE PLANT PROCESSING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should also like to express my pleasure at the safe return of the Minister of Fisheries after his 12 day visit to Russia. In this he was more fortunate than a former hon. member for Coast-Capilano who also visited that country while in the position of minister of fisheries.

While the minister was absent representatives of the federal government met at Halifax on April 5 with representatives of the five Atlantic coast provinces along with marine plant processors from Canada, the United States and Europe. Has the minister any report on the decisions made by government representatives and scientists to step up the development of the Canadian Atlantic marine plants industry, a matter which was discussed at that conference?

Hon. H.-J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that such a meeting took place on April 5. A report is being prepared, but as yet it has not reached me.

INQUIRY AS TO FRESH WATER FISH MARKETING BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric Stefanson (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I also have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. Have the minister and his officials now completed their study of the McIvor commission report of inquiry into fresh water fish marketing? If so, will legislation be introduced at this session to implement the recommendations of this report, namely that a fresh water fish marketing board be established under federal legislation?

Hon. H.-J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, in reply to similar questions addressed to me some time ago in this house I made it very clear that the implementation of the McIvor commission report came under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. An interdepartmental committee is studying this report. Meetings have been held with representatives of the provincial governments concerned and the industry, but no final decision has yet been reached on whether the recommendations made in the report should be implemented.

GRAIN

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, my question was intended for the Minister of Trade and Commerce but in his absence I wonder if I could direct it to the Prime Minister. Would the Prime Minister ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce to consider at the earliest possible moment—for example, tomorrow—making a full statement on motions concerning the negotiations carried on under the cereals committee of GATT on the price of wheat? I use as my reason the tremendously alarming headlines which have proliferated in the west during the last two or three days to the effect that the western farmers' wheat is going to be put on the open market.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce made a short statement on Thursday or Friday, I think, on this matter. I shall be glad to discuss with him the proposal made by my hon. friend, but I need not remind him that the discussions are still going on.

Mr. Hamilton: There is urgency here in that it was these questions and answers in the house that caused the panic in the west, and that is the reason for the question.

POWER

REQUEST FOR POLICY STATEMENT ON NATIONAL GRID

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I address my question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. I have not become quite adjusted to the greater distance existing between us now.

In view of the general support in Canada for the building of a trans-Canada electric power grid for the development of Canadian industry, and in view of the concern expressed in some quarters about proposals for the development of a continental power grid, would the minister make a statement at the first opportunity outlining government policy in this respect?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, it should be known that my recent physical move away from this end of the house is no indication of a lack of affection for the hon. gentleman who has just asked this question. On the subject he raises I simply wish to say that the policy of the federal government has been to encourage the development of a national power grid.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I understood the question was only whether the minister would make a statement. I suggest this is not the time to make it.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

PERSONNEL OF FEED GRAIN BOARD AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Forestry and Rural Development.

The minister was supposed to announce last week the names of the members of the Canadian Livestock Feed Board. Since he has failed to do so, does he think he will be in a position to make that announcement this week?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry and Rural Development): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot was late, because I made that announcement at the beginning of the sitting this afternoon.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, I simply wished to further emphasize that the minister had deferred that announcement for several weeks.

Mr. Speaker: In that case, the question is out of order.

[*English*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the right hon. Prime Minister. I know that he, in common with the right hon. Leader of the Opposition, wants to do everything possible to unite this country in centennial year. My question is about the anticipated visit of the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) to Quebec, to debate with the separatist member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire). I ask this question in a non-partisan way, to clear up the matter. Will the right hon. Prime Minister assure the house that the hon. member for York-Humber is not making the visit to Quebec with the approval of his party or of the government?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This question cannot be asked in this form of the right hon. Prime Minister.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

INQUIRY AS TO STAMP COMMEMORATING VISIT BY THE QUEEN

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to direct my question to the Postmaster General. I ask him whether, in view of the visit of the Queen of Canada to our country this summer, his department is considering issuing a stamp with the Queen's head thereon, surmounted by the crown? Has the minister no answer?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Postmaster General): I have already announced that in honour of the Queen's visit this summer a stamp will be issued.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Will the stamp have on it the Queen's head, with the crown on it?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

[Mr. Ricard.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is what I want to know.

M. Côté (Longueuil): As soon as I have a picture of the stamp I shall send a copy of it to the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I thought you were abolishing the Queen.

SHIPPING

INQUIRY AS TO STUDY OF PROPOSED MERCHANT MARINE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): My question is for the Minister of Transport. May I express the hope that because he has moved one seat farther from the Prime Minister that that is not to be taken as a demotion. I ask the minister about the status of the long awaited and long promised departmental study of a merchant marine for Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member and to the hon. minister that this question is much too general to be asked on orders of the day.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR DISCUSSION OF NEW DAIRY POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put my question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Following the meetings announced last week by the minister with several farmers' associations, is he in a position to tell us whether he is ready to reconsider the price of manufacturing milk, in order to guarantee the farmers $5 per hundredweight of manufacturing milk?

Mr. Speaker: Order. It seems to me that the question of the member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) is similar to those put on several occasions last week.

Mr. Caouette: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Last week I asked the minister if he planned to meet the farmers, and he answered me last Wednesday, that as a matter of fact, he was due to meet them on Thursday and Friday.

I should like to know whether anything developed from this meeting with the minister and if he is now considering the requests made by the farmers?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I met the farmers but I have nothing new to report to the house.

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

NATO—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON MEETING OF NUCLEAR PLANNING GROUP

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Will the hon. gentleman soon be in a position to make any announcement about the meetings of the nuclear planning group in Washington last week?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): I do not think there is much I can usefully add to the communiqué issued at the end of the meetings. It may be that at some subsequent time, after the possible success of the negotiations between the United States and the U.S.S.R. with respect to the future development of the anti ballistic missile system is more clear, there would be an opportunity for some debate on this question. In the meantime, I think there is not much I can usefully add to what is already public knowledge.

DIVORCE

REQUEST FOR IMMEDIATE RELIEF IN CASES OF PROLONGED DESERTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax): My question is addressed to the Minister of Justice; I would have sent him notice, but I had a little difficulty locating him after the game of musical chairs last week. Because full fledged divorce reform later this year will throw a heavy burden on the courts, would the minister ask his government to consider an interim measure now to give relief to the neediest class of cases, that is, husbands and wives who have been deserted for three years or more?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is now making a representation. It is not a question in a form that can be answered at this time.

Mr. McCleave: Then, Mr. Speaker, probably the simplest thing to do is to invite the minister to join me at ten o'clock, and I so do.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

CAMP HILL, N.S.—REPORTED LACK OF HOSPITAL ACCOMMODATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, again I direct a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. I refer to the question I posed to him on Monday, April 3, and which I reiterated for the acting minister on Thursday, April 6, with respect to the charges and accusations that bed space was not available for pensionable overseas veterans at Camp Hill hospital, Halifax, while at the same time beds were being occupied by merchant seamen from Canada and other countries. Is the minister now in a position to reply?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman supplied me with information on a specific case which I am now having investigated. As soon as the answer is at hand I will forward it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): As a supplementary question, is the minister aware that Dr. C. J. MacDonald, director of the hospital, has completely refuted any such criticism, and will the minister hurry up his investigation as much as possible?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is now making an argument.

[*Translation*]

WINTER WORKS

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PERIOD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Albert Béchard (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, but in his absence and in the absence of his parliamentary secretary I shall direct it to the acting minister or to the Prime Minister.

Because of the severity of the winter which the Gaspé peninsula just went through and which has greatly delayed the implementation of the winter works planned by the municipalities, would the government consider the possibility of extending this period to May 31?

[*English*]

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): On behalf of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, I will take this question as notice.

Inquiries of the Ministry

HOUSING

REQUEST FOR REDUCTION IN MORTGAGE INTEREST RATE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. R. Keays (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour who is responsible to parliament on housing matters. Because the interest rate on C.M.H.C. direct loans is based on the cost of short term treasury bills, namely 1¾ per cent higher than that cost, is the corporation giving consideration to lowering the interest rate below the present 7 per cent?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the policy in this respect was announced some months ago. There is no fixed rate. It is in line with the return, the long term yield on government bonds and, as previously forecast, it has already dropped to 7 per cent. It is the government's hope that there will be a further drop before long under the formula announced last December.

Mr. Keays: As a supplementary question, does the government intend to give consideration to changing its policy and not waiting the full three months as mentioned in its original policy statement?

Mr. Nicholson: That, Mr. Speaker, involves a question of government policy. It also involves legislation, and if any such change were decided upon it would be announced in the usual way.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

INQUIRY AS TO APPOINTMENT OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State. I would ask her whether the government has made any decision regarding the appointment of a president and vice president of the C.B.C.

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Well, no, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: That is a well thought out answer.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I compliment the minister on that answer. It is like saying yes and no in the same answer, and only a good lawyer could achieve that. Now I ask her whether it is a fact that Mr. Jules Leger has been appointed president and Mr. Chris Young of the Ottawa *Citizen* vice president?

Miss LaMarsh: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the right hon. Leader of the Opposition that the question as asked cannot be accepted.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why, Mr. Speaker, similar questions were asked of me when I was on the other side of the house—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —by these hon. gentlemen who now object. I can understand them objecting to the mention of Chris Young. The Prime Minister was the first to object.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I was not in the chair in those days.

[*Translation*]

BANKRUPTCY

INQUIRY AS TO GOVERNMENT ATTITUDE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Henri Latulippe (Compton-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. Could he inform the house of what his position will be on bankruptcies in Canada, particularly in the province of Quebec where they are increasing at an alarming rate?

Mr. Speaker: I think the question, in its present form, is too general, hence out of order.

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—PROPOSED PROTEST AGAINST USE OF FRAGMENTATION BOMB

On the orders of the day:

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the intense human suffering involved, will the government protest to the United States government against the use of the anti-personnel fragmentation bomb in Viet Nam?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have asked for a report on the exact situation. When that is received I will be in a position to reply.

Inquiries of the Ministry

TRANSPORT

SECOND FERRY BETWEEN NOVA SCOTIA AND NEW ENGLAND

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. O. Bower (Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Can he now give the people of the maritime provinces the assurance that a supplementary ferry will be put on the Yarmouth-Bar Harbor run this summer, in order that the tourist business and the fisheries exports of those provinces will not be restricted but will be permitted the development of their full growth potential?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member should limit his question to the first part of his speech. I suggest that the second part is not in order.

Mr. Bower: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, on February 24 I asked a question of the Minister of Transport on this matter of a needed supplementary ferry on the run I have mentioned. Your Honour said it was out of order and suggested that I take it up in the adjournment debate. This I did on February 27—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Bower: Now, with respect, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. In view of the facts to which the hon. member is just referring I hope he will notice I did not rule the question out of order, just the supplementary comments which I thought were superfluous. I recognize the validity of the question itself which was asked in the first part of the hon. member's comments.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I was quite prepared to answer the hon. gentleman's question, and still am. I regret he is not going to be any more pleased than I am with the answer, but I am sorry to say there is not a ship available to my knowledge and therefore I could not give that assurance. But if some suitable vessel should become available I would be very glad to consider the possibility of adding to the service for the summer months.

Mr. J. R. Keays (Gaspé): As a supplementary question, I wonder would the Minister of Transport give consideration to taking the *Grande Hermine* out of Expo and helping the people of the maritime provinces with it.

CRIMINAL CODE

POSSIBLE AMENDMENTS WITH RESPECT TO FAMILY PLANNING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. In reply to a question last week he said that legislation to amend the Criminal Code concerning birth control would not be introduced until the fall. In view of the announcement made on the week end by the Ontario provincial minister of health that that government is going to urge its county public health units to provide family planning advice, and will give the necessary money, can a simple amendment not be brought in earlier to bring the government of Ontario within the law?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to see amendments of this kind, which I have already spoken about in the house, introduced into the house as quickly as possible; but if this session goes on, for instance to the end of June, it might be difficult to start the new one before the fall.

[*Translation*]

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

DISCUSSIONS RESPECTING CHANGES IN FISCAL RELATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I should like to give to a minister embodying the brilliance and dynamism of youth, the opportunity to reply to his first question as a minister. So, I am putting this question to the Member of the Administration attached to the Department of Finance.

I should like to ask him whether following the talks held this morning, a redistribution of taxes is to be expected soon?

[*Later:*]

Mr. Speaker, I should like to rephrase the question I directed earlier to the hon. member for Saint-Maurice-Laflèche, Member of the Administration. I should like to ask him if he had discussions this morning in Ottawa with the Quebec finance minister, Mr. Dozois, what was the purpose of those discussions and if he can report on the conclusions which were reached?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member knows that he cannot direct a question to a minister unless the subject matter comes under his administrative jurisdiction. I do not

know whether the question is asked in that way, but since there is a doubt in my mind, I shall ask the hon. member to let his question stand for the time being.

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST THAT DAIRY PRODUCERS BENEFIT FROM PRICE INCREASES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent (Ont.)): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I am sure the minister will agree with me that because the Canadian Dairy Commission is a new agency there is some question in the dairy industry as to the responsibilities of this government agency. Because of a contemplated increase in the prices of dairy products to consumers may I ask the minister whether the Canadian Dairy Commission, the government and the stabilization board will be able to direct that the increase in prices, or any portion of it, will be passed on to the primary producers?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Dairy Commission announces the support levels of various products, and I believe an announcement in this regard will be made very shortly.

POTATOES—REQUEST FOR SUBSIDY TO MOVE SURPLUS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister, in view of the fact that the matter involves one or two departments of his government. In the light of the fact that the surplus of potatoes in the maritime provinces, particularly in Prince Edward Island, has depressed the price to the farmers, has the minister received any request for a subsidy either for a starching process or in respect of the export of these potatoes? I should like to know which departments of the government are engaged in seeking a solution, and how soon we may expect an announcement.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture and I have discussed this matter. The minister will be making a report very shortly, possibly this afternoon.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, a support program in this area in respect of starch plants was announced over a week ago.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, I am referring particularly to additional assistance which has been asked by the farmers of the maritimes and by the legislature of the province of Prince Edward Island to meet this particular surplus. They ask also for an export subsidy to enable them to drain these surplus potatoes off the market.

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, the question of exports was considered. I believe export sales in the past year were the largest in history, and it was not thought that an export subsidy would be helpful to the farmers. However, the support subsidy was announced and further considered after representations from the province. I believe the procedures we are working out will be more satisfactory than that of the original plan.

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture. Will he give further consideration to a more satisfactory diversion plan which will meet the needs of the growers in this regard, especially in the light of the fact that he has been so kindly reminded of the problem by the gift of a bag of potatoes from Prince Edward Island which I understand was shipped to him by centennial iceboat transportation.

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. gentleman that every consideration will be given to the problem of the potato farmers, irrespective of any bribery or corruption which may have been involved.

[*Translation*]

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

ACTION OF CABINET IN COMMUTING SENTENCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Henri Latulippe (Compton-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

Is it the hon. minister's intention to have the majority decision of the House of Commons enforced with regard to capital punishment?

[*Later:*]

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Quite often when I ask a question you do not even allow the minister time to answer. I put a question on capital punishment to the hon. Minister of Justice earlier, and you immediately changed the subject.

Now, I put a question concerning capital punishment on the order paper, question 2,541, on January 27, 1967, and I have not yet received an answer. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether justice can overrule the decisions of this house, the decisions of parliament?

The majority of hon. members have decided that capital punishment should be maintained, but justice has not been done in that direction since that time.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member will admit that his intervention is a suggestion or a representation rather than a question of privilege, and I must therefore rule that his original question of privilege is not in order.

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION

FARM LABOUR—REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF ADMISSION PERIOD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. E. Madill (Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour. I should like to ask the minister whether he would reconsider for 1967 the limitation on the use of Caribbean labour on Ontario farms, particularly in the market gardening areas, by extending the period from November 1 to December 1.

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice and discuss it with other ministers who are involved.

[*Translation*]

PRIVILEGE

MR. CAOUETTE—UNSATISFACTORY ANSWER TO QUESTION ON ORDER PAPER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a question of privilege because I believe it is the privilege of every member to obtain as accurate a reply as possible when information is sought from a department and the officials of such department are required to give a reply.

Question No. 2,721, which I put on the order paper some time ago about Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation followed a question asked a few weeks previously to find out who were the notaries writing the contracts for the purchase of houses in Lebel-sur-Quevillon in the riding of Chapleau. The answer at that time was that the services of notary Réal Caron of Senneterre and notary Joseph Morin of Val d'Or were being used. I was asking for additional information and I was refused for instance data on the amounts paid to each of these notaries while given to understand that both wrote notarized contracts.

To question No. 2,721, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Nicholson), replied that Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation had approved 335 loans for an amount of nearly $5.8 million in Lebel-sur-Quevillon for 378 units of housing. Of these, 92 loans have been cancelled, and 243 are active loans for 286 units.

To the direct question: How many of these loans required the services of Mr. Réal Caron of Senneterre, the officials of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation replied: none. Yet, two or three weeks previously, I was told that notary Caron of Senneterre had drawn up contracts for houses at Lebel-sur-Quevillon.

To the third part of the question:

How many of these loans have required the services of Mr. Joseph Morin?

The answer was 243; that is the total number of the loans.

Mr. Speaker, the reason is not given why the services of notary Caron were not used. I should like to observe here after securing the information, that notary Morin—and I do not want to play politics—was the Liberal candidate in my riding at the last election and these contracts bring him $250 each which amounts to $70,750.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe my question of privilege is quite in order and I should ask the minister responsible for Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation before the house to state clearly whether this corporation has been established for political patronage or to give justice to the citizens of Canada wherever they may be.

[*English*]

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt whether it would be in order to allow the minister to reply to the statement made by the hon. member for Villeneuve. I suggest to him that this really is not a question of privilege; it is perhaps more in the nature of a grievance than a question of privilege. I think if he will consult Beauchesne, citation 181 (3), he will ascertain that this type of objection, which as I have said is more of a grievance than a

question of privilege, can not be raised in this way.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Referring to the question raised by the hon. member for Villeneuve a moment ago, I would not want an erroneous impression to be left. I think Your Honour is quite right in your ruling—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is very difficult to let the minister make a statement when the Chair has ruled that there is no question of privilege. On the other hand, I understand the importance of allowing a minister to make a statement to correct what he considers to be an erroneous impression. But I doubt that this can be done at this time in the present circumstances in view of the ruling I have made that there is no question of privilege.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

MOVEMENT OF PERSONNEL FROM ST. HUBERT TO NORTH BAY AREA

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question of immediate importance to the Minister of National Defence. It has to do with the transfer of some 300 families from St. Hubert to the area surrounding North Bay in the township of Widdifield. This township has asked for assistance because of the added expenditures the municipality will have to make in order to meet this influx. Indeed, their tax rate has gone up by some 14 mills already as a consequence of this movement.

The municipality requests that this area be declared immediately to be a non self-contained unit which would enable the Department of National Defence to provide a grant under the Municipal Grants Act. I understand this matter has been looked into, and I should like to ask the minister whether he will once again give it consideration, because of the injustice that will be done as a result of this added taxation which has been brought about by these large numbers who have moved into the area.

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I thank the right hon. gentleman for his question. This morning the hon. member for Nipissing phoned me and came to see me in my office in respect of this matter. As a result of his representations I already have asked the departmental officials to examine the situation, with instructions to report back within 48 hours to see whether there is some way we can meet this problem.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is the minister aware of the fact that the officials were there on Thursday and Friday and indicated that it would be impossible to give any assistance unless an alteration was made in the description of the particular unit?

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, the matter is being inquired into by the officials of the several departments involved. I have asked my deputy minister to co-ordinate the investigation and make a report to me as soon as possible.

NATIONAL FILM BOARD

INQUIRY AS TO APPOINTMENT OF PERMANENT HEAD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State related to one asked earlier by the Leader of the Opposition. Will the government be in a position soon to name a permanent head of the National Film Board?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I expect so, Mr. Speaker.

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

AMALGAMATION OF NAVY, ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The house resumed, from Friday, April 7, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof—Mr. Hellyer—Mr. Batten in the chair.

The Chairman: Order. House again in committee of the whole to consider Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof. When the house rose on Friday evening clause 2 was under discussion.

On clause 2—*Canadian forces, Canadian armed forces.*

Mr. Chatterton: Mr. Chairman, we on this side advocated all along that the unification bill should have been sent to the defence committee before second reading or approval in principle. I wonder how many hon. members, particularly on the other side of the chamber, would have voted for second reading if they had heard the evidence given in

the defence committee. Speaking of the evidence given in the defence committee, I quote from a publication of the Tri-Service Identities Organization:

> It is noteworthy that not one recently retired senior officer no longer having any attachment to the department of defence has supported the program which will be carried forward if Bill C-243 is enacted and everyone of any stature outside the services or government whose military opinion would command respect who has testified before the defence committee has expressed criticism or reservation on the proposed reorganization of the defence establishment.

I wonder, particularly, how many hon. members opposite have carefully read the evidence given by Air Chief Marshal Miller. In referring to Air Chief Marshal Miller I quote from an editorial which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of March 22. The editorial is headed "An Unseemly Rush To What?" It reads as follows:

> When Air Chief Marshal Frank Miller retired last July, he did so quietly, without any comment about differences over unification then roiling the armed forces. Until that point, as the first chief of the integrated defence staff, he had been defence minister Paul Hellyer's right hand man—how significantly so is indicated by the fact that he had been persuaded to stay three years past the normal retirement age of 55.
>
> The testimony which Air Chief Marshal Miller gave to the Commons defence committee this week is, therefore, of peculiar importance, for it is the testimony of a man who had the regard of the minister, who personified integration, and who studiously observed the duty of an officer not to comment publicly on matters of public policy.

I will not quote at length from Air Chief Marshal Miller's testimony but merely give his reply to just one question. I quote from the *Gazette* of Saturday, April 8:

> Air Marshal, you have indicated in answer to Mr. Harkness that you saw no advantages to unification. Did I understand you correctly when you said you could list several disadvantages?

Here is the answer:

> I said I did not see any monetary return for unification, nor did I see any significant military effectiveness. I said I saw some unanswered questions associated with unification that perhaps should be spelled out before you could really get out and attempt to sell it to people—Gentlemen, could I say thank you for your courtesy and understanding.

And so on. Then Air Chief Marshal Miller said:

> I feel the next step that was forecast in the white paper, that of doing away with the services, will cause the loss, against this business we have been discussing recently, of a lot of people we cannot afford to lose and that we will not get very much of a benefit from this single service proposal.

I wonder how hon. members opposite would have voted in favour on second reading had they had that advice from Air Chief Marshal Miller. I wonder, for example, how the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) feels after having read the evidence of Air Chief Marshal Miller. I know that the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) was not there at that time—incidentally we are all very happy that he has been able to return to the chamber—but I am sure that he has since read the evidence of Air Chief Marshal Miller and I hope that he has not changed the position he took last October. I should like to quote the following from a letter he wrote dated October 20, 1966:

• (3:30 p.m.)

> On the subject of unification, I understand your views and my position at the moment is that I am awaiting the introduction of the government's legislation on unification. Complete unification is of course not practical, nor is it contemplated. The degree of unification the government proposes will very largely influence my own position.
>
> Yours sincerely,
>
> David W. Groos,
> M.P. for Victoria, B.C.

The hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) made a speech on unification in the house on January 31. However, all he said on the subject matter of the bill was the following, as found on page 12468 of *Hansard*:

> I have purposely refrained, Mr. Speaker, from entering into the subject of the debate because, as chairman of the defence committee, I feel it is my most important duty, if this bill ever does come before us, to help resolve the differences during the clause by clause study in committee.

The hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) is no longer chairman of the defence committee but it is my belief that, based on his distinguished record in the Royal Canadian Navy, he will be anxious to let his true thoughts on unification be known, and we look forward to his speech in the near future. I know that his constituents are anxiously waiting to hear from him. I myself was not able to become a member of the defence committee. I asked to be placed on the committee but that was not possible, and since I was a member of five other committees it was not possible for me to attend many of the meetings. However, I believe I read all the evidence given before the defence committee.

It is true that mostly as a result of the form of questioning of witnesses some of the evidence was conflicting. But that does not justify hon. members on the other side, who are no doubt making speeches for consumption in their home ridings, taking quotations completely out of context so that the people reading their speeches may be led to believe that a

certain person who gave evidence before the committee was in favour of unification even though that was not necessarily so. For example, I will quote part of the speech made by the hon. member for Hamilton West on April 5 as it appears at page 14577 of *Hansard*. The hon. member quotes General Foulkes as follows:

> The problem can only be solved by complete unification of the three services with one chief of staff, one chain of command, one ladder of promotion and one uniform.

This is the only part of General Foulkes' evidence which the hon. member quoted. The obvious intention is to lead readers of his speech to believe that General Foulkes is completely in favour of unification. That quotation was taken from an article written by General Foulkes in 1961. If the hon. member had wanted to be fair he might well have quoted from a subsequent article by General Foulkes which appeared in the Ottawa *Journal* of Thursday, October 13, 1966, in which he wrote the following:

> One of the aspects of integration, which is relatively unimportant but which is causing some resentment in the services, is the announced intention to force the servicemen into a neutral uniform by 1967. Perhaps this is to be part of the "centennial" celebrations to show that Canada still maintains what a pundit once referred to as "the best dressed, best fed, best paid, but poorest equipped force in the west."

Again I quote from this article by General Foulkes:

> Since any acceptable integration scheme calls for the continuation of regiments of soldiers, squadrons of aircraft and flotillas of ships, the servicemen in these combat formations must continue to wear the appropriate combat uniform.

Again I quote from the article:

> We should not be mesmerized by the idea that a common uniform will ensure a happy, contented and efficient integrated service.

I quote further from the article:

> The minister has not been forthright in informing the services and the public of the true and real extent of the integration plot.

Continuing on the same lines the hon. member for Hamilton West quoted General Moncel as saying the following:

> I was well aware of the fact that the white paper said that unification was the ultimate end. Well, that was fine. There was nothing wrong with it as a name.

If read out of context that quotation certainly gives the impression that General Moncel was in complete agreement with the minister's plans.

[Mr. Chatterton.]

I should like to quote briefly from the evidence given by Lieutenant General Moncel as found on page 13304 of the minutes of proceedings and evidence of the committee on national defence. The following exchange took place:

> Mr. McIntosh: Would you tell the committee, General, why then you made the decision to leave your position as vice chief?
>
> Mr. Moncel: The conditions which I specifically refer to are as follows. At this stage of the operation, the lines were pretty well drawn and it was abundantly clear to me that we were going to force ahead with this process of unification which, to me, appeared to be moving on an uncharted course at a very, very high speed toward a very, very dim destination, and I did not think that I could produce the staff work necessary at that speed to keep the thing on the rails.

There are many such instances of quotations being taken out of context by hon. members opposite to mislead the people who would normally read their speeches. An effort has been made by the minister, by some of his officials and by informed persons in his department who write the press releases to give the impression that this wonderful scheme of the unification of our armed forces is being studied carefully and might be followed by other countries. The senior officer in the navy told me that in March of 1964 the Minister of National Defence called together at the medical services theatre all the officers from headquarters and told them that Great Britain was very interested in the program and that Lord Mountbatten was in favour of it.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, I should like to rise on a question of privilege. I do not think I should let this statement go unchallenged. Since there is no verbatim record of that particular meeting I cannot recall in precise detail what I said at that time but I do know I have never said that Lord Mountbatten was in favour of all the things we are doing. I know he is not. I have discussed and corresponded with him over the months and I have talked to him several times. What he certainly said when he was here a year ago was valid, namely, that whereas previously they were ahead of us, now we are ahead of them and they will go further in our direction because it makes sense. I would not want my hon. friend to give the impression that I said something I did not say in respect of Admiral Mountbatten's point of view.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Mr. Chatterton: I happen to know the person who wrote this letter very well, and I can assure you there is no credibility gap there.

The letter from which I am quoting is dated March 14 and was written by Commodore Harold V. W. Groos, R.C.N., retired. It reads in part as follows:

Probably the last thing you would choose to become involved in is Canadian politics, yet you are now in them deeply.

Yesterday, Monday, 13th March, 1967, our last chief of the naval staff of Canada, Vice Admiral Herbert S. Rayner appeared before the Canadian House of Commons defence committee to advocate the continuance of a navy in a distinctive uniform and with a titular head to speak for it and to set standards of seagoing fighting efficiency. Under cross-examination by Liberal party politicos who are out to submerge (i.e. destroy) the Royal Canadian Navy as an indentifiable sea force, Admiral Rayner quoted you as being in favour of retaining navies with titular heads.

Last night the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's national news summary referred to Admiral Rayner's testimony and then there was a two or three minute presentation of an interview with you which had been held at government house, Ottawa, last autumn. In your interview you supported strongly both integration and the unification of our armed forces.

Undoubtedly the television camera interview with you had been held in reserve by the Liberal politicians to discredit Admiral Rayner and in this it has succeeded admirably.

I have before me the original of the letter sent by Mountbatten of Burma, dated March 28, 1967 and commencing, "My Dear Groos". I should like to quote one paragraph from the letter:

You are quite right in saying that the last thing I would choose to become involved in is Canadian politics and I am indeed sorry that use has been made of the views I expressed during two visits to Canada which appear to involve me.

Then Lord Mountbatten encloses a statement which explains his position and I quote from this statement, of which I have the original signed by Mountbatten of Burma:

I have been asked for an explanation of my views on the integration and unification of the British services as they are said to have been misunderstood in Canada.

Then I skip part of the statement and quote this pertinent passage:

In the British reorganization care has been taken to preserve esprit de corps and morale and those traditions which help to maintain this in the services and fighting units. It has been accepted that to achieve this the three services must retain their uniforms and ranks with an identifiable professional head of their service. The idea of a single uniform and rank structure was also rejected as undesirable and unnecessary.

There was some talk of taking the uniform and ranks of one service and imposing this on the others but the idea of a man in say army uniform with an army title arriving at a foreign port in command of a warship was generally felt to be so ludicrous that it was not pursued. The general cut and colour of naval uniforms are internationally so well known that a sailor from any one country can readily be recognized as a sailor in any other country. Sailors the world over take great pride in this and so in their own services do soldiers and airmen. No compensating advantage could be seen in attempting to impose so unpopular a change.

The last paragraph of Lord Mountbatten's statement, dated March 28, 1967, reads:

These were the views I expressed or intended to convey when I was asked to explain them to the Canadian press, radio and television. Nothing has happened to change these views.

Mr. Hellyer: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I wonder whether the hon. gentleman, having now referred to the letter and the accompanying memorandum, would agree to table the letter and memorandum so that hon. members will be able to peruse them?

Mr. Churchill: He is not under any obligation to do so.

The Chairman: Order. It will not be possible for the hon. member to table the documents in committee.

Mr. Chatterton: I am quite agreeable. I have no objection and I have the permission of Mr. Groos to use these letters.

The Minister of Transport made a rather interesting speech last Friday and at one point seemed to imply that we should now vote on this matter, that we should let it come to a decision. The fact is that this is the first chance I have had to speak since the bill was returned from the standing committee and I certainly insist on my right to express my views. The Minister of Transport also made an appeal to members to stay away from personalities. I wanted to ask him a question but his time had expired and I did not have an opportunity to do so. The question I was going to ask him was whether he thought a remark such as the one I am going to quote now represented dealing in personalities. I am going to quote from the *Globe and Mail* for Monday, April 3, which contains an article concerning an address the Minister of National Defence gave to a group of young Liberals in Toronto. The article reads in part as follows:

The questioning, by about 60 young Liberals, ended with:

"Mr. Hellyer, is there any truth in the rumour that William Landymore may be our next Governor General?"

Mr. Hellyer pondered the question a moment.

"When the admiral retired last year he said he was going back to the farm to pitch hay—but what he's been pitching isn't hay."

Perhaps the minister can deny that statement and I will give him an opportunity to do so.

Mr. Hellyer: No, that is exactly what I said, Mr. Chairman. Throughout this whole episode I have been trying to keep a sense of humour. I think it is necessary in public life and I recommend to my hon. friend that he do the same.

Mr. Chatterton: If that is a sense of humour, then in my opinion it is the grossest perversion of humour I have ever heard, particularly after the statement the minister made to the effect that Admiral Landymore had been disloyal. This is a man who has given eminent service to Canada. This prompts me to quote from an article which I did not intend to use. However, the minister's reply has convinced me I should use it. No, I do not think I will. I shall merely refer to a column in the Victoria *Colonist*, for March 1, 1967, which is called "Bill Thomas' Notebook". I am not going to sink to the minister's level by quoting from it but I suggest to the minister that he read it.

The article to which I have just referred appeared after the minister's statement that this man who had given loyal service to Canada had been disloyal. The point that was raised consistently by members on this side during the debate on second reading was that the minister had not fully explained to us what integration or unification means. The minister and his vast propaganda machine have consistently tried to confuse integration with unification. This process is still continuing. The minister cites ad nauseam all the economics and other wonderful things that have been effected through integration, all the time implying that the same results will be achieved by unification.

I should like to quote Air Chief Marshal Miller again as found in the *Gazette* for Saturday, April 8:

> I did not see any monetary return for unification, nor did I see any significant military effectiveness.

• (3:50 p.m.)

The minister made a speech last Monday, I believe, in which he gave what he considered to be the advantages, as he saw them, of unification. I do not want to go over the same ground because I think the hon. member for Calgary North did an excellent job in destroying the validity of every one of the points that the minister tried to make in his attempt to sell the advantages of unification.

During the debate on second reading we consistently asked that the minister give a clear and concise explanation of his plans for unification. Every one of the witnesses who appeared before the committee, that is, the witnesses I referred to in my opening statement from the Tri-Services Identities Organization, said that there was no plan. Air Chief Marshal Miller was asked, this question:

> Have you any knowledge as to any plan that was produced in regard to unification, say at the time the white paper was produced or shortly thereafter?

He replied as follows:

> No, there was no plan.

Then he was asked this question:

> Do you feel that the single force concept would adversely affect the over-all security of this country?

Air Chief Marshal Miller replied:

> I really do not know. I am unhappy about the implications of a single force because it has not been spelled out and I do not know what it is going—

There was some suggestion by hon. members opposite to the defence committee that perhaps the plan was prepared after Air Chief Marshal Miller has retired. I believe he retired about August, 1966. The unification bill was placed on the order paper on October 31 so if a plan had been prepared for unification surely it must have been prepared before the bill appeared on the order paper. The chief of the defence staff stated that in August that he did not know of any plan, and I suggest that between August and October the minister hurriedly had a plan for unification prepared. If the minister did have such a plan prepared he certainly has not disclosed it yet to any members of this house. None of the officials of his department has been able to produce a plan for unification. There I can only hope that sufficient members on the other side, at least those with special interests in defence perhaps because of their service in the armed forces, will urge the minister to listen to the advice which has been given, and, if he listens to no one else, that he listen to Air Chief Marshal Miller.

I should like to conclude with an editorial which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* for Wednesday, March 22 dealing with the subject of unification. It is headlined: "An Unseemly Rush To What?" The last paragraph reads as follows:

> It remains too big a pig-in-a-poke for any parliament to ask Canada to buy, and the Commons defence committee, for all its questioning, has not been able to trace out its shape. What is

needed is a complete re-examination of the whole defence apparatus, and of the job it is intended to do. What is not needed is a guns-blazing rush to get unification through the Commons to accommodate the government's desire to have done with the current parliamentary session.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman, before I turn to the subject of the bill I want to say a few things about the standing committee on national defence which I had the honour to chair through the latter half of its sittings. It was like being a spectator at that famous Arctic poker game that Robert W. Service told us about at which all the men around the table simultaneously drew their revolvers on each other. Unlike that story, however, the committee members did not stay in that pose until they all froze to death. They held a total of 55 meetings between February 7 and March 21. They examined 28 principal witnesses and published 2,000 pages of briefs and verbal evidence. They examined and passed the 65 clauses of the bill and its lengthy schedules. Moreover, they wound up their work in time for everyone in this chamber to go home for a well deserved Easter holiday. None of the members of the committee missed more than a meeting or two and I am sure only then because of real necessity. We always had a full quorum and we had no problems getting started although as chairman I frequently had problems in getting people stopped. What we proved by our actions in that committee was that you can unify anything.

I want to say a word about the services of the committee. We were never without the services of an interpreter throughout all our hearings. We had the unfailing services of Mr. Hugh Stewart, the clerk of the committee. Despite competition from several other hard working committees, the committee reporting branch produced 5,000 folios of evidence during the hearings. All of this evidence was edited by the committees branch and then sent to the printer. Then the printing staff worked overtime through Easter to see that we received it back in time for the commencement of the committee stage of the bill in the house. Moreover, all the evidence was translated into French and the whole thing printed in French and English in time for us to use it in the house after we returned from Easter holidays.

Finally, Dr. Ollivier and the Judge Advocate General's staff incorporated all the amendments into the bill, saw that the French and English matched and produced a newly printed version for the house in time for our use. We do not often say things about the servants of the house and how they serve us and I thought, Mr. Chairman, you would like to be made aware of these things at the outset of the few remarks I wish to make on the subject of the bill.

A few years ago Professor Northcote Parkinson became famous as the author of a satirical book called "Parkinson's Law". He observed that while the number of British warships had decreased by 67 per cent between 1914 and 1928, the number of admiralty officials had increased by 78 per cent. The officials, he said, would have multiplied at the same rate had there been no actual seamen at all. The fact is, he told his readers, that the number of the officials and the quantity of the work are not related to each other.

In case anyone felt that he had chosen an isolated incident on which to base his theory he noted that the colonial office, in the period of British colonial decline from 1935 to 1954, had increased its staff from 372 to 1,661.

Speaking at the University of Alberta in 1963 in the Henry Marshall Tory lecture series, Professor Parkinson threw in a couple of extra observations on his theory. He said that a correspondent had pointed out to him that an organization which has a headquarters staff of a thousand can be regarded as administratively self-sufficient. It can keep itself entirely busy on its own internal problems. Then he spoke of a certain German industrial group that apparently had a headquarters staff of 2,000 persons. All its factories were destroyed by enemy action during the war but the administrative staff went on working as hard as ever though there was nothing to administer. I mention this because Bill C-243 deals with reorganizing a big headquarters staff, big enough to be entirely self-sufficient according to Professor Parkinsons' terms.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Before we become too dazzled by military science, let me make a few observations in the Parkinsonian manner about some of the things witnesses brought up before the defence committee. In the past there have been numerous examples of integration, some workable and some not. Always these integrations took place in the field at the command level, never at headquarters. Not until the present minister came along had anybody attempted to integrate the headquarters.

If you turn to the evidence of General Foulkes you will find very interesting reminiscences of integration attempts stretching back to the time when Hon. Brooke Claxton

was minister of national defence. He brought together the three defence ministries of wartime days. He started the idea of unifying all three services but gave it up. He set up studies and committee work in connection with integration, studies which were later pursued and developed by some of the very men who appeared before the defence committee as competent officer witnesses. General Foulkes told us in an amusing way about efforts to unify the chaplain services. During the tenure of office of Mr. Pearkes as minister of national defence the matter had ended with the addition of a brigadier to the chaplain services but with no apparent amalgamation of services.

No one will say very much if the forces are integrated at that level. I am speaking of naval or air force units, for example. The local air force commander may not want to be put under the authority of the local naval commander but he will tolerate it and the system will work after a fashion because each commander believes that the arrangement is not permanent and that he will not have to put up with the other fellow forever. The air force commander may even take comfort in dreaming that he may one day be in charge of the integrated command. That is why the minister and other ministers have been able to get along with the business of reorganizing at the command level without causing significant political flurries.

When the minister integrated his headquarters a number of things began to happen that could not happen with integration at the command levels. First, the chiefs of the three services found themselves without jobs. They had gone from the organizational structure. At the same time the three services found themselves without chiefs above the level of the command structure. There was now a new chief who represented a consolidation of the three services. The new chief of staff now stood alone at the top of the structure and had to turn his back on the old three-service organization that he had known and grown up with. He had become the chief of the new integrated commands. All this happened when Bill C-90 was passed in July, 1964. This is what Bill C-90 did. All the important operative legislative and organizational steps which we have been discussing and which were necessary to create a unified force were taken when we passed Bill C-90 in July, 1964. Let me check this out with hon. members again.

[Mr. Deachman.]

First, the old chiefs of the three services were retired. Second, a single chief was established in their place. Third, the officers and men of the three old services were reorganized into new functional commands or components. As I say, this is what we did through Bill C-90. Only one thing of any real importance remained to be done and that was to give the new single force which we had created in 1964 a name. Bill C-243 asks us to do that. No clause in Bill C-243, other than clause 2 before the committee now, is of any real significance. I say that because clause 2 gives the force a new name.

The clause concerning the ranks of officers has been thoroughly amended. I invite hon. members of the committee to read clause 4 and note how it has been amended and what it means now. The power to regulate how officers shall be referred to has been withdrawn from the minister and placed in the hands of cabinet. It is only possible through an order in council now to change the designations of officers or the titles by which they shall be called. By no stretch of the imagination will the bill give landlubbers' titles to seagoing men. This was one of the major complaints made, and one of the complaints raised by my hon. friend from Esquimalt-Saanich a few moments ago. He has not studied the bill. He does not know what is in it. He has not read the testimony of General Allard. He has not looked at the evidence given again and again by the minister. Yet he stands up and says the same thing that has been said many times before though the committee diligently went about its business of attending to the very point complained about.

Mr. Nugent: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deachman: The words of the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich were completely irrelevant.

Mr. Nugent: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich is not in his seat now but I am sure he would object, as I now object. The hon. member now speaking has said that the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich did not read the evidence. I think the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich would take issue with that.

Mr. Deachman: It is very kind of the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona to intervene on behalf of the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich who is sitting behind the curtain, out of sight, listening carefully. The

hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona cannot see him.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deachman: I hope hon. members opposite will give him a round of applause, as have hon. members on this side.

Mr. Chatterton: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Am I to understand that the hon. member implies that I have not read the evidence given before the defence committee?

Mr. Churchill: That is what has been said.

Mr. Chatterton: I wish to state that to my knowledge, though I may have skipped a few pages, I have read from beginning to end all the minutes of proceedings and evidence which have come to my office. I have read every volume of the minutes of evidence of the defence committee.

Mr. Deachman: I will not dispute that, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member may have read the evidence but it is apparent that he did not understand it. I will not dispute that he did not read it.

Mr. Ricard: A smart-alecky remark.

Mr. Deachman: The rest of the bill consists entirely of consequential or editorial changes that had to be made to the National Defence Act and other acts affected by it. I repeat that this bill asks us to do only one thing of consequence. It asks us to give our forces a name: "The Canadian Armed Forces." It asks us to stop pretending, as the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich has been pretending this afternoon, that the men in the armed forces will experience some new, dramatic experience if this bill is passed by the house. It asks us to cease protesting that there is any real doubt about the effect of this bill. This bill is very simple indeed. It asks us only to give the force which was created by Bill C-90 a name. It asks us, in heaven's name, now that the baby is born, to cut its umbilical cord and let it live. I see the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich trembling on the edge of his seat so I will sit down.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Chatterton: If the only purpose of this bill is to do that, then why all the haste to force it through? Why not let it go? It is causing great dissension throughout the country so why not defer it as recommended by Air Chief Marshal Miller?

Mr. Deachman: Is the hon. member pleading with me not to give a name to the Canadian armed forces?

Mr. Chatterton: I am appealing for some common sense from the other side.

Mr. Ricard: Then address your question to someone else.

Mr. Deachman: Let me go over again with hon. members opposite the points which have been made clear so many times. The men will remain in their units. They will not be taken from their units and sent somewhere else as hon. members opposite have suggested time and time again. That is a sham and a shibboleth. The officers of the Royal 22nd will still march out of the Citadel with their men. The officers aboard H.M.C.S. *Fraser* will still be there to greet the sailors when they go aboard and they will still call the men by the same titles. This was guaranteed by the committee in its work, and the hon. member who is rising now was a member of that committee.

Mr. Nugent: Since the hon. member says that all this bill does is change the name of the force, I gather he disagrees with the Minister of National Defence who tells us the legislation is necessary in order to complete the process of integration.

Mr. Deachman: It is necessary that we finish the work of reorganization now, get off the back of the chief of staff and let him get on with his work. It is essential that these men should know what to call themselves if they are to have pride and a sense of esprit de corps as members of the new force. It is essential that this be done now and that we cut out this ridiculous debate.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McCleave: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Deachman: A great many questions are being asked; there seems to be a good deal of interest in my speech. Apparently points are being raised which so far have not come to the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite. But I will hear the question.

Mr. McCleave: Does the hon. member not feel concerned lest by some mistake the Minister of National Defence should throw out the baby and simply keep the umbilical cord?

Mr. Deachman: Well, the hon. member's remark will be recorded for posterity. Members of the armed forces may find themselves with greater scope as a result of unification because they will be able to move freely across the whole width of the force. Young officers of competence will find broader opportunities available to them. The names of the units, as I have said, will not be changed. The customs and traditions of the units will not change.

One of the hon. members opposite, the hon. member for Vegreville, went to considerable pains in the committee one day to examine General Allard on this point. He did an excellent job of drawing from the general recognition of the fact that the traditions and customs of the regiments would remain and that there was no danger that these things would be taken away. I am sure he was well satisfied with the situation. Indeed, I am sure the general satisfied everyone present. Yet we still find people saying that these regiments and their traditions will be destroyed. This is nonsense, and members opposite such as the hon. member for Vegreville who have taken the trouble to find out the facts know very well that this is the case. Nevertheless the opposition has perpetuated this sham, believing that somehow or other it will have its effect upon the Canadian people who will eventually accept it as the truth. I do not believe this will ever happen.

The most radical thing which will happen to the man in the Canadian armed forces after the passage of this bill is that in due course he will get a new suit. I want to remind hon. members who have spent a considerable amount of time discussing this point that it does not require Bill C-243 in order to make that possible. The bill before us does not effect the cost of operating the forces. This was taken care of by Bill C-90. The savings to be made will result from the changes in materiel command and training command as those changes evolve. All this was provided for in Bill C-90 which was passed back in July of 1964.

Hon. gentlemen opposite are asking that we pause, that we kick this issue around like Chicago's garbage until we lose it. We do not intend to do this. The bill before us does not affect the composition of the forces. The composition of the forces was affected by Bill C-90 and those changes have now been made.

An hon. Member: Tell the minister that.

[Mr. McCleave.]

Mr. Deachman: This bill has nothing to do with morale. The morale of some of those serving in the ranks reflected for a time the very low morale of their senior officers. Those were the men who got out because they did not believe that a minister should have the right to reorganize a headquarters. That is what this debate is about, basically. The Tories do not believe that a minister of the crown should have the right to reorganize a headquarters, only to tinker with the structure underneath. These are not the facts of political life. Great changes of this kind must be made at the political level. Hon. members opposite cannot evade this issue.

Finally, let me say a word to all those who say we should pause. It is necessary now to create an organization with a headquarters under a single chief responsible for functional commands working in the field. He is struggling to project a new spirit into this new organization, to teach the men new loyalities and a new esprit de corps. It is not an easy task and we do him no service by prolonging argument here for the retention of a military system which we voted out in this house when we passed Bill C-90 in July, 1964. We have said everything that can possibly be said about this matter ten times over, Mr. Chairman. It is time we stopped procrastinating. It is time to pass this bill and to give this force a new and honourable name and not leave it as a nameless child on the doorstep, something which hon. gentlemen opposite would like to do.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Churchill: May I ask the hon. member a question? He just said something about giving the force an honourable name. Is there something dishonourable about the name "Royal Canadian Navy"?

Mr. Deachman: No, sir, but I would make a suggestion to the hon. member. If he believes in unification like I do, let us put them all into the Royal Canadian Navy. This is one way to achieve unification. You could take army, navy and air force units and put them under one single name. The Royal Canadian Navy will do; the Canadian Army will do; the Royal Canadian Air Force will do. It just happens that the bill we have before us has suggested a first class name which does not give offence. Instead of all those others names it simply calls the service the Canadian Armed Forces. I think it is a good name. I think it will look marvelous on the shoulder flashes. I think the armed forces will be proud of it and I ask the

hon. member, a former distinguished and gallant officer, will he not assist these men by seeing that this new name is born?

Mr. Churchill: In answer to that question, I will do everything in my power to prevent the government from forcing this change on men who are now serving in three very honourable services, the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Chairman, during the past week we witnessed strange happenings on the other side of the chamber with Liberal members, one after the other, standing up and reading from prepared texts contrary to what the rules provide. I wonder whether they were reading for the very simple reason that they have joined the minister's propaganda team and are not allowed to express one thought of their own lest they might say something not in agreement with the minister's propaganda.

The other day the hon. member for Lambton West speaking or, I should say, reading his prepared text made reference to my attitude while serving on the defence committee and said that when the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona and myself joined the committee it became partisan and we began insulting serving officers. At that time I asked him how many serving officers appeared before the committee while I served on it and he said he did not know. I draw his attention, the attention of the minister and that of every Grit opposite to the fact that I was not on the defence committee for the complete examination of one serving officer. This, Mr. Chairman, will give you an idea of the approach of the Liberal party when we have one of its members standing up and accusing me of something which I could not possibly have done. Furthermore, the implication that the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona and I joined the committee at the same time is entirely wrong.

Despite what the Minister of National Defence may think I wish to tell him that he does not have the support for his unification bill within his own party that he would like to have. Some of its members have different opinions from his and that is why each and every Grit who stands up has had to read word for word from a prepared text, with one exception. The exception was the Minister of Transport who became exercised on Friday afternoon, jumped into the debate without the permission of the Minister of National Defence and, without notes, put his foot in it. I shall refer to what he said later, but he was the one exception and it was a mistake on their part to allow him to speak because he got excited.

Even the Secretary of State for External Affairs read word for word from a prepared text. Granted, he was dealing with foreign policy rather than with the unification bill. The minister is shaking his head. Before I am finished he will have a lot of shaking to do.

Since the hon. member for Lambton West saw fit to criticize me perhaps the best thing I could do would be to review the committee hearings to see what his attitude was. But I will have to forego that. He did not have an attitude in the defence committee so I cannot criticize something that was non-existent. The hon. member referred to the membership of the committee. How can the Liberal members who participated in the defence committee have followed what went on? Reference was made to the fact that I and other members in this party were involved in changes in the membership of the committee. For every Conservative change in membership on the defence committee there were at least six Liberal changes, a total of 41 changes on that side of the chamber. How could they have kept up with the evidence? They were shuffling in and out day after day. Not one of them liked to spend too much time on the committee.

We have just heard from the man who said he had the honour to lead the defence committee in the last half of its sessions. I repeat he said he had the honour to lead it. All I can say is that it is too bad he could not have turned that around and led the committee with honour. He did not lead with honour because on March 3 in this house, the first day he participated in the committee, he came into the house and made a report from the committee which was far removed from the truth, and the House of Commons spent the greatest part of the afternoon on a question of privilege in reference to his action as defence committee chairman.

I suggest to hon. members, and especially to the Minister of National Defence, that they look at page 13702 of *Hansard* for March 3 and read there what the defence committee chairman said. I would then call the minister's attention to the March 3 committee hearings, page 1960, where he will see for himself a complete denial of what was said by the chairman of the defence committee in the house. The chairman of the defence committee came into the House of Commons and reported something that had never happened. It is

recorded in *Hansard* and the denial is recorded in the evidence of the defence committee hearings.

Since I am talking about the defence committee hearings I would point out that there have been a few other changes. I would request now that the Minister of National Defence hold available for the committee of the whole house the tape recordings of the hearings in the defence committee so that the written record as we have it now can be checked against the voice record of what was actually said. I will use those tapes as against the prepared evidence provided to us to prove again that there has been some tampering done.

Some hon. Members: Prove it.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): The proof of it is in the minister's hands. Produce the tapes. We have the evidence of the committee. Produce those tapes. I have already proven, I think to Your Honour's satisfaction and to that of the minister, that the chairman of the defence committee came into the house on March 3 and reported incidents in the defence committee that never happened. Again I call attention to page 13702 of *Hansard* for March 3 and to page 1960 of the March 3 defence committee proceedings. The denials are recorded there for everybody to see.

What Liberal members have been trying to do in this committee and would like to do is to push something through the House of Commons, push something down the throats of the people of Canada, and especially push something down the throats of the serving personnel of this country. Why do hon. members day in and day out receive anonymous mail and newspaper clippings strongly denouncing unification? I believe many of these are coming from servicemen who, according to the rules, are not permitted to write to members of parliament objecting to this sort of thing. Again I repeat that the hon. member who said he had the honour to lead the committee did not lead it with honour. He has used the word "shame" and has said we should cut out this ridiculous debate.

This is another indication that hon. members on that side of the chamber are still trying to push something down our throats despite the fact—and I refer to what the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona brought out very clearly—that serving officers could only give evidence to the defence committee based on government policy and could not express an opinion outside that policy. The rule forbids them to go beyond that so they could express opinions only within that given policy. It is strange, however, that every serving officer who has recently retired and is now free to speak has expressed the opinion that he is against unification.

• (4:30 p.m.)

I should like to go back to the Minister of Transport. The Minister of National Defence will realize that the Minister of Transport jumped in because he was excited. He jumped in even though he did not have the benefit of the propaganda which has been available to the Minister of National Defence. He still made some strange statements. When I asked him whether he would permit a question, in his usual rude way he refused to give me that opportunity. Mr. Chairman, you and I know that over the years the matter of courtesy and rudeness between the Minister of Transport and I has been a debatable issue. So far rudeness and courtesy between the Minister of Transport and I are concerned, I believe we are almost even. He is away ahead on rudeness and I am ahead on courtesy.

I do not have the words of the Minister of Transport in front of me but at one point when he was trying to justify a unified force he said that there never has been a unified force. I do not know whether the minister realized it, but he was contradicting many members on the Liberal side of the house. Liberal members have held up the United States marines as an example of a unified force, which it is not, and in general have stated that it was the government's idea to pattern its force on the United States Marines. This statement has been made by members of the Liberal party and contradicts the statement made by the Minister of Transport.

Hon. members will remember also a rather strange statement made by the Minister of Transport not too long ago. He turned to the Prime Minister at a time when Conservative and other opposition members were accusing the government of backpeddling and retreating and said to his own Prime Minister that as usual he would have to backtrack. This was a very amazing statement. I did not think it could be improved upon until the minister spoke in the house on Friday. On Friday the minister made a statement which I think should be given some attention. As found on page 14668 of *Hansard*, the last paragraph, the minister is reported as having said:

> If the minister accepts the wrong advice and adopts the wrong course, of course he should be defeated.

I will be much more generous and say that if he should not be defeated he should at least resign his portfolio. The former minister of finance resigned his position because he had given the Prime Minister the wrong advice. According to the Minister of Transport, we should have the resignation of the Minister of National Defence.

I should like to turn now to the Secretary of State for External Affairs who in support of the Minister of National Defence last week made a few strange statements. He read his speech and spoke entirely on foreign affairs. In answer to a question concerning a statement made by General Allard and later published, the Minister of National Defence stood up in the house and said that he had confidence in General Allard and that General Allard did not have to clear his statements with him. Apparently the Minister of National Defence does not know the rules. Not only does the minister have to clear such speeches but he also has to give permission for them to be made.

This matter was brought up earlier by the hon. member for Kootenay West. At that time he asked a question in respect of a German who was to speak before a group in Winnipeg. The answer given by the Secretary of State for External Affairs was that he had no intention to interfere with freedom of speech. Last week the Minister of National Defence implied that General Allard can go wherever he wishes and say whatever he likes. The minister was entirely wrong and the Secretary of State for External Affairs was also wrong when he answered the hon. member for Kootenay West. The German in question was not allowed to speak in Winnipeg, or at least did not speak. The Minister of National Defence not only has erred but in addition he has received incorrect advice as is evident by the mistake made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

I should like to direct the attention of the Minister of National Defence to the Queen's Rules and Regulations. The latest edition available to me is one I obtained from the Parliamentary Library. I should like to refer this to the minister as recommended reading. He should know at least the basic rules which apply to serving personnel in this country. Paragraph 679 reads as follows:

> The publication or disclosure of any form of unpublished official documents, or of their contents, or of official information to unauthorized persons, or the use of such documents or information in personal controversy or for any private purpose, without due sanction from superior military authority, is forbidden.

The paragraph 680 (a) contains the following:

> An officer or soldier is forbidden to publish in any form whatever, or communicate, either directly or indirectly, to the press, any military information, or his views on any military subject, without War Office authority. He is further forbidden without first obtaining War Office permission, to deliver any lecture or discourse, or to answer questions, on any military subject, either publicly or by means of broadcasting or television, or to prepare a paper or write a script on any military subject for delivery or transmission to the public. He will not prejudge questions which are under the consideration of superior military authority by the publication, anonymously or otherwise, of his opinions, and he will not take part, in public, in a discussion relating to orders, regulations or instructions issued by his superiors.

There it is in black and white. The Minister of National Defence does not know the simple rules which apply to serving officers. This brings us back to the fact that the ultimate authority over the military in this country is a civilian one. It is about time the minister re-examined his position and looked carefully down the road he is leading the forces of this country. The evidence contradicts what has been said by the Minister of National Defence in the house and supports the statements made by other members of the government in respect of certain adverse remarks which have been made. As I have pointed out, the Secretary of State for External Affairs found himself out in left field in respect of questions pertaining to freedom of speech when military matters are involved.

• (4:40 p.m.)

The Minister of National Defence apparently thinks he has the support of his members and believes that unification is a good thing. I come back to what I have stated before in the house on the question of unification. Canada has always been proud of the fact that we have had volunteer forces. In the committee the Liberal members voted against the opportunity to re-attest being given to every serving man in our forces. In other words, as I said before, what they have been doing is voting for conscription. It is nothing more nor less than conscription because every man serving in the forces today will be serving under compulsion unless he is given the opportunity to re-attest. It will no longer be a volunteer force.

I suggest that the hon. member in the back row keep quiet for a little while because we will get around to him during this debate. I say to the minister that he is not in a position to stand up in this house and sanction the action of Liberal members in the house

and his staff. In fact, I defy the minister to stand up now and say that he supports the action of the members of his party in this house and his staff. Would the minister care to stand up and say that he supports their action?

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, perhaps while I am standing I could ask the hon. gentleman the source of the Queen's Regulations from which he was reading.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): If the minister reads my speech tomorrow he will find the source. If he wants the Queen's Regulations I suggest that he go to the library.

Mr. Hellyer: I wonder whether the hon. gentleman can tell us if they are the Queen's Regulations for this country?

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): The Queen's Regulations that are available—here again this involves another criticism of the minister—in the library are the British regulations on which the Canadian regulations are patterned. I ask the minister whether he would care to stand up and say that the regulation I have read from the British Queen's Regulations does not apply also to the Canadian forces. Does the minister know enough to say that what I have quoted this afternoon from the Queen's Regulations does not apply to the Canadian forces? Will the minister stand up now and say that he sanctions and supports the action of the Liberal members of this house and his staff? I put the direct question to the minister: Will you stand up in this house and say that you sanction and support the action of the members of your party in this house and your staff?

Mr. Foy: Regarding what?

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): The hon. member raises a question; he asks, regarding what? That carries the inference that there are certain things the minister does not support. I am surprised there is an admission by a Liberal that there is something going on that the minister does not support or that all those in his party do not support. I ask the minister wether he will stand up in this house—in fact I defy him to stand up in this house—and say that he gives complete support to the action of the Liberal members in the House of Commons and his staff with respect to the unification bill.

Mr. Hellyer: I do not want to interrupt your speech.

Mr. Danforth: I bet you don't.

[Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South).]

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I notice that the hon. member for Lambton West is back in the house. He did not stay around earlier so that I could point out to him the fallacy of his remarks last week. I would draw attention to the hon. member's actions in the committee. He has now come back into the house and is trying to make interjections. He should be ashamed of the fact that he stood up last week in the house and made the references he did regarding the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona and myself. They were far removed from the truth. I should think the hon. member for Lambton West would at least want to tell the truth in respect of the committee proceedings. When on March 3 the minister was given the opportunity to support the chairman of the defence committee he would not support him. The hon. member has said that he had the honour to lead the committee but I say he did not lead it with honour. He did not get the support of the Minister of National Defence on March 3. He reported to the house matters which he said took place in the committee but which in fact never did take place there.

The hon. member for Lambton West has not told the truth in respect of what happened in the committee. The hon. member who led the committee for the last few sessions came into the house and tried to impose upon us the will of the Liberal members in that committee, without backing up the statements he made with the truth about what actually happened. The hon. member has stood in the house and referred to this debate as a sham. It was a shameful thing that he did. He should not come into the house and refer to members on this side and say that what they are doing is a sham and that this is a ridiculous debate. Nobody has performed his duties more shamefully than the hon. member who represented the minister on that committee during the last half of its sessions. This is the hon. member who says this debate is a sham so far as we on this side of the house are concerned. He made a sham of the defence committee. If he wants to know what kind of a chairman he proved to be during the proceedings of the committee I will quote a couple of sentences from the committee record. I start on page 1960.

An hon. Member: I will send you over a couple.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): If the hon. member were to send something over to me I would have to have cross-references because I would not believe it when I received

it. Anything the hon. member puts in writing or says requires a lot of checking before we can finally get at the truth because the original will not have a speck of truth in it. Take note of the chairman's competence as demonstrated by this quotation from page 1960 of the committee proceedings for March 3, 1967:

The Chairman: I am always at the disposal of the committee and I will call for a vote on that from those who will meet here this afternoon.

Mr. Churchill: No, no, you cannot call for a vote, sir. You have to have a motion.

An hon. Member: I move that we adjourn until 2 p.m.

The Chairman: We have a motion. Now gentlemen, we have business to do.

This is all in one portion of the defence committee's proceedings. Having said that, in the very next sentence the chairman said:

I have no motion in front of me, gentlemen—

I would ask hon. members to look at page 1960 of the proceedings of the defence committee on March 3 where they will see for themselves the kind of leadership we had from the chairman of that committee. In the same breath he said:

We have a motion. Now gentlemen, we have business to do. I have no motion in front of me, gentlemen—

This will give hon. members an idea of the competence with which the committee was led. It will show them the lack of competence of the chairman who tried to lead the committee and who led it without honour.

I have indicated that Canada has always prided herself on the fact that we have a volunteer force. All that is required to continue in that way, rather than having the men in the services continue under compulsion until the time of their retirement, is to have them re-attested into the Canadian forces at the time the bill is proclaimed, if it ever is. I have on a number of occasions quoted from the official records to the effect that such attestation should take place. I have pointed this out to the minister and proved that during the war years, in time of national emergency, the Canadian government always thought enough of its servicemen to give them the opportunity to volunteer for service in whatever branch of the forces they wished to serve. But today we have the Minister of National Defence during peacetime refusing to give the servicemen of this country the same opportunity that was given to them during wartime by a former Liberal government. I have put this proof on record on a number of occasions, but for the benefit of the minister I will again draw attention to the Official History of the Canadian Army. On page 43 of that history it is stated:

"Government decided to place militia on active service in Canada (mobile force). Although all submissions to council were ready and all plans made, we were horrified to hear"—

• (4:50 p.m.)

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the babble on the other side of the house indicates that the Liberals are changing their minds.

—"the cabinet decided at the last minute to change the name of the mobile force from Canadian Field Force and Canadian Active Service Force. The result being many changes, torn up stencils, and $65,000 worth of mobilization forms almost useless. Very hectic day—but we managed to get the general order 135/1939 issued and in the mail to all districts."

General order No. 135 announced that the governor in council had "authorized the organization of a Canadian Active Service Force" and had "named as Corps of the Active Militia" and "placed on active service in Canada" certain specified units. The accompanying schedules listed nearly 300 individual units and formation headquarters, including the headquarters of "1st Corps C.A.S.F.", the whole of the 1st and 2nd Divisions, C.A.S.F., and quotas of corps, army and lines of communication troops. In addition, this order incorporated in the C.A.S.F., the units and details of the non-permanent active militia which had been called out under general order No. 124 to guard vulnerable points and man coast defences. Some additions were now made to the original list. The N.P.A.M. soldiers on duty were attested into the C.A.S.F., except for those not wishing to enlist, who were released in due course.

This is a clearcut precedent which shows that even during wartime the Liberal government gave to every serviceman in the country the opportunity to serve his country as a volunteer and not have to come under the compulsion which the minister is trying now to impose on the Canadian services.

There are many other precedents. I should like to quote from page 63 where the following description appears:

Very few men took advantage of the opportunity to leave the service which the new order afforded. The war diary of the Hastings and Prince Edward Regiment for 30 September describes the order's reception in that unit. It was probably typical of many:

"During the afternoon parade at Picton the terms of the 'Supplementary Declaration', form M.F.M. 2(x) were read and explained to Picton Coys., and they were told that they might have a short time in which to discuss these terms and deliberate over them. However one strong voice called out: I don't need any time on mine! Bring on the declaration! I'm all set to sign! This was the signal for quite an outburst of enthusiasm, and there was a period of shouting and cheering. The upshot was that when the Coys. were called upon to sign for overseas service "D" Coy. turned out to a man, but five members of "C" Coy. refused to sign and were heartily booed as a result."

In all, only five officers and 532 other ranks of the C.A.S.F. declined to re-attest and were struck off the strength, "services no longer required".

The minister and hon. members opposite would leave us with the impression that if one were to be re-attested into the Canadian armed forces, that is, the Canadian Army, the Royal Canadian Navy and the Royal Canadian Air Force, chaos would result. If it is the opinion of the Minister of National Defence that to re-attest the men would bring about chaos, then may I remind him that during the war only five officers and 532 men in other ranks refused to sign the re-attestation papers and were struck off strength. The minister tells us that he is confident unification is the proper thing—

The Chairman: Order. I must advise the hon. member that the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few brief remarks on this important bill but I must say at the outset that I am not an expert on military matters; in fact my military experience is very limited. I was a member of the Church Lads Brigade. I have been a boy scout and a scoutmaster. I have been a member of the Arrow Lakes Rifles affiliated with the Rocky Mountain Rangers, and I served with the 54th Kootenay Battalion in the first world war. Later I graduated from the School of Guards which was operated in France during the first world war by the Brigade of Guards. Therefore you see, Mr. Chairman, that I am not really knowledgeable enough with respect to military strategy and tactics even to write a book.

Mr. Churchill: Will the hon. member permit me a question? The hon. member is pretending he did not see active service overseas although I believe he did. Was the hon. member not wounded at the Somme? Was he not in the trenches serving with the other members of the Canadian forces at that time and was he not honourably discharged after having performed his duty to his country?

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, in reply I will give the same answer I gave to the old lady who visited me in hospital in London. I told her I was bitten by a German wasp on five occasions.

I said that I do not profess to have sufficient knowledge of military strategy and tactics even to write a book. All I have done in this respect was to write a script for the local dramatic society which dealt with the well-known Bairnsfather character, Old Bill, and Colonel Blimp. That was the only production in the literary sense with which I have had anything to do. So I trust all hon. members will realize that I am speaking as an amateur on this subject and from a somewhat different point of view to that of my hon. friends to my right.

However, I do want to say that I know people feel very deeply on this question. They have strong feelings on both sides of the question and they express themselves very vehemently on occasions. I must say I do not like personal remarks in a debate of this kind. I think we can take a dig or two and make certain cogent references now and again as long as we retain our sense of humour, but if we are to maintain a certain standard we must present our views, in regard to policy as if we were gentlemen. I remember that my mother always said a gentleman was a man who always acted properly and never did anything wrong in public. I wish that members of this house would take my mother's advice in that respect.

The attitude of the New Democratic Party to the unification of the armed forces is based on our policy with respect to foreign affairs, the United Nations, and our defence policy with respect to NATO, NORAD and nuclear weapons. So there will be no mistake with respect to our policy I wish to place on the record the resolution adopted by the New Democratic Party at one of its national conventions. I wish to refer to the program which was adopted at our convention of August, 1963 held in Regina. Of course this program has been carried forward to this date. I wish to emphasize the rather different approach we have to this problem from that of hon. members on my right. Let me say before I go any further that I do not think any of us has any objection to integration but there are different and varying reasons for opposing what is termed unification. I should like to quote the resolution which reads as follows:

• (5:00 p.m.)

NATO has played its part in the maintenance of west European security. However, it has concentrated on a military role and has failed to adapt its policies to the growing importance of the economic and social front in the present world struggle. The New Democratic Party believes that we should seek a reappraisal and change of NATO's policies and objectives.

The New Democratic Party believes that the extension of nuclear weapons to any further states and alliances threatens disaster to the world. It therefore opposes Canada's troops being supplied with such weapons at home or abroad.

At present, except for those nations which have independently developed atomic capacity, neither NATO itself nor its members individually possess or control nuclear warheads. Should they do so, Canada must make it clear that it cannot remain in the alliance. To relieve tensions, Canada should press for a demilitarized zone in central Europe and for the simultaneous disbandment of the Warsaw and NATO pacts.

I must remind the house that in reply to a question of mine addressed to the Minister of National Defence some time last year he said that NATO was a nuclear alliance. Therefore, according to our national convention resolution we propose that Canada should withdraw her forces from the alliance. This was the basis upon which this resolution was supported by our convention.

I go now to our attitude to NORAD. In this respect I wish to quote from page 51 of the New Democratic Party program. I want to be exact in this respect because possibly some members actually do not understand our resolutions.

It is questionable whether NORAD ever made any significant contribution to the defence of Canada, and in any case it has outlived its usefulness.

Furthermore, there is every danger that the Bomarcs will be equipped with nuclear warheads. The NORAD agreements should therefore be terminated.

That is the attitude of the New Democratic Party with respect to NORAD.

I might say I had a most interesting experience when I visited NORAD, and I think the minister got some of the backwash from it. We were there for three days and were lectured by the United States officers in charge of these installations. They treated us very well indeed. Just as we were leaving the gentleman in charge said to one of the members, what is your politics, sir? He said, I am a Liberal. The same question was asked of the next member and he said, I am a Conservative. The next member said he was a member of the Social Credit party, and when asked I said I was a revolutionary socialist. When we returned to Ottawa people had heard all about this and wanted to know what I had been up to. I had really made this comment in a sort of a humorous vein but it was taken seriously and resulted in an inquiry about me so far as security was concerned.

Mr. Foy: Was your own party upset when you said this?

Mr. Herridge: No, I would not do anything of that sort, you know. We stand united except when we are apart.

Our policy with respect to NATO and NORAD is supported by other groups in Canada, including the Voice of Women, and in that connection I wish to quote a statement issued by that organization:

Following the publication of the white paper on defence, Voice of Women notes that the government recognizes that Canada's defence policy cannot be dissociated from her foreign policy.

Voice of Women acknowledges the usefulness and efficiency of the integration of the armed forces but notes with concern contradictions and discrepancies between the declaration of Canada and her representatives at the United Nations and Geneva and the contents of the white paper.

I am going to give a few examples because I have a lot of correspondence with various ladies in the Voice of Women and all my life I have taken a great deal of pleasure in pleasing the ladies.

The question of nuclear weapons for the Canadian armed forces is subordinate to that of Canada's political possibility as a member of a nuclear armed alliance.

When Canada joined NATO in 1949 NATO was not a nuclear alliance. When NATO became a nuclear alliance in December, 1957, Canada could not withdraw in view of article 13 of the North Atlantic treaty which prevents withdrawal before 1969. On the other hand, it is a fact that some countries, members of NATO, have refused all nuclear weapons while remaining in the alliance.

According to the white paper, the first objective in time and in importance of Canadian defence policy is collective measures for maintenance of peace and security as embodied in the charter of the United Nations, including the search for balanced and controlled disarmament. I am very pleased to note the discussions that have been taking place in recent months at Geneva in this respect.

On January 5, 1964, the Prime Minister said that he believes Canada's future military role will require a diminution of nuclear arms and equipment. How, therefore, can the white paper recommend nuclear arms for a nuclear role for Canada's armed forces? This is a question asked by the ladies in the Voice of Women.

The white paper states that the alliance must continue to possess nuclear weapons in the absence of controlled disarmament. The greatest obstacle to controlled disarmament at the present time is precisely the possession by NATO of nuclear weapons in ever-increasing quantities.

Our position with respect to NATO is being supported by an increasing number of people with some knowledge of the circumstances. For instance, recently Hon. Howard Green,

former secretary of state for external affairs, was quoted in the Vancouver *Province* as saying that Canada should consider dropping out of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization when the present treaty expires in 1969. I might say that Mr. Green was in the same company as me for several years. I always had high regard for him. He is not a person to make a statement just to catch the press. He is a most serious-minded person and I knew him as such in civilian life, in the army and while he was secretary of state for external affairs.

The present Leader of the Opposition was quoted in an article in the Nelson *Daily News* of December 18, 1966, entitled "Diefenbaker Urges Cut In Canada's Force In Europe", as follows:

Opposition Leader Diefenbaker has added his voice to the growing chorus seeking a Canadian troop reduction in Europe.

I may that we in this party are very pleased indeed that the Leader of the Opposition is commencing to march in our direction. This is not the only case in which he has commenced to march in our direction. He has done so on several other occasions in recent months. Numerous editors across Canada are also beginning to realize that the defence policy of Canada must be altered to meet changing circumstances. It is for this reason the hon. member for Vancouver East said, when speaking in the house on January 30 last:

Canada should think not just of renegotiating its position in NATO but of getting out of NATO.

Later in the same speech he said:

No reasonable explanation can be given why, in regard to defence co-operation and our relations with the United States under NORAD, we should have nuclear weapons in the hands of Canadians and on Canadian soil.

Later he went on to say:

The policy of integration seems logical and reasonable to us, but the House of Commons should not be asked to endorse the principle of unification until the government has clearly outlined its attitude to existing military alliances and its reasons for the same, and the anticipated role for Canada's armed forces.

Later the same day the hon. member for Greenwood supported this point of view in similarly vigorous language. After this bill received second reading it was referred to the committee on national defence. A good many witnesses were heard both for and against the bill. I have not had the opportunity of reading all the evidence carefully, but I have picked out the evidence of those persons who received particular attention in the press or whose evidence was discussed by members in

[Mr. Herridge.]

conversation. I was particularly impressed by the evidence given by General Moncel and by Air Chief Marshal Miller, who was Canada's chief of defence staff until his early retirement last summer. I was particularly impressed with some of the questions put to him in the committee and I should like to quote one. This is a man of authority and knowledge, and he was asked this question:

• (5:10 p.m.)

Air Marshal, you have indicated in answer to Mr. Harkness that you saw no advantages to unification. Did I understand you correctly when you said you could list several disadvantages?

Air Chief Marshal Miller replied:

I said I did not see any monetary return for unification—

Which in effect means no savings.

—nor did I see any significant military effectiveness.

When dealing with this type of legislation I think we have to pay particular attention to the opinions of one who so recently was Canada's chief of defence staff.

Passing from the evidence brought before the committee, I was interested to note an editorial in the *Globe and Mail* of Saturday, March 25, entitled "Where Are We Going". The article commenced:

Two New Democratic members of parliament, Andrew Brewin and Harold Winch, have at last put the dispute over unification of the armed forces in its proper context. Unification makes sense, they pointed out in a statement after the defence committee reported the bill back to the Commons, only—

The word "only" is the key word, Mr. Chairman.

—if the government intends to make drastic alterations in its present NATO and NORAD commitments. They would not, they indicated, support final passage of the bill until the government agreed to these alterations.

That is pretty definite.

Had NATO developed into some form of economic community, as once foreseen by Louis St. Laurent and Lester Pearson, there might be reasons for maintaining our part in it. It did not. We should bring our forces home. We can fulfil any responsibility to our European allies through treaties that could, for example, commit forces to their assistance in time of need.

There is also another purpose served by our armed forces: the preservation of peace in Canada itself. However much as we resent the thought, it has been necessary at times for them to play that role, and could be again.

Beyond all of this, of course, is the peacekeeping role, at which Canadians have distinguished themselves and which is undoubtedly, so far as most Canadians are concerned, the role we would wish our armed forces to play.

The military correspondent of the *Globe and Mail* is writing, I think, with considerable balance and thought in using these arguments. The editorial continues:

> In fact, most Canadians are much more interested in preserving peace than preparing for war. Making larger forces available to police duties is one way of achieveing such an objective. Another is through ever-increasing amounts of foreign aid to underdeveloped nations. Abject poverty feeds international unrest. Could Canada shift its defence emphasis from the manifestations to the causes of unrest?

I thought that quotation from the editorial in the *Globe and Mail* was very interesting indeed.

During the present debate the hon. member for Greenwood placed some interesting information on the record with respect to the evidence given by General Moncel. Later the hon. member made these remarks, as reported at page 14447 of *Hansard* April 3:

> In my view, Mr. Chairman, this reveals the essence of the matter which is facing the house today. General Moncel put his finger on precisely the real issue. However much it may be obscured by the discussions of unification, the real issue is that unification makes sense if the concentration is to be on a single mobile force which will be available for peacekeeping and other activities, but if the present roles are to be continued then it does not make sense.

The members of our group agree wholeheartedly with this point of view.

On April 5 the hon. member for Vancouver East made a very interesting speech in which he clearly indicated that it was the responsibility of the government to inform the House of Commons of the role of the armed forces, and that this party would have to make its decision on this bill according to what we believe is best for the armed forces and for Canada. In concluding his remarks the hon. member said, as reported at page 14573 of *Hansard*:

> In the final analysis, we will search our consciences and vote in the way we think is right for the future of Canada.

According to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, to whose speech I listened carefully the other day, Canada has no intention of getting out of either NATO or NORAD. With respect to NATO he said that Canadian forces contributed to existing stability in Europe and that unilateral withdrawal of them could have significant political consequences. In effect, he said that the role of the Canadian armed forces was to continue as at present. In saying this he failed to meet the suggestion put forward by our party when this bill was first discussed before it went to the committee, as well as during the committee hearings and in the course of this debate, that the role of the armed forces should be to defend Canada and provide peace keeping forces for the United Nations when required.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, in another respect this debate has been somewhat disappointing in that it has not given the Canadian people any clear idea as to the cost of defence in the future, and I think they are entitled to know this. General Moncel, the former vice chief of the general staff, told the defence committee that Canada will require a budget of $2 billion to meet her commitments. I am informed that the associates of the minister have not confirmed or denied this statement.

Mr. Hellyer: They have denied it.

Mr. Herridge: I am glad to hear the minister say that.

Mr. Hellyer: If they have not, I do now.

Mr. Herridge: I am glad to hear the minister say that because I want to be as accurate as possible.

Mr. Hellyer: The evidence of Air Chief Marshal Miller on this point is more accurate, I think, than that given by General Moncel.

Mr. Herridge: I thank the minister for his explanation in that respect and I accept it.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say that the role of the armed forces as outlined by the Secretary of State for External Affairs is completely unsatisfactory from the point of view of the members of this party. We again affirm our belief that Canada should withdraw from NATO and NORAD, and we again express our opposition to nuclear weapons being placed in the hands of Canadian troops at home or abroad. Our view is that we should let Canada make a positive and constructive contribution to the development of peace in the world, first of all by the provision of peace keeping forces to the United Nations and, second, by the provision of funds, material and technological know-how and skills for underdeveloped nations.

That, Mr. Chairman, is our point of view, and we shall do all we can to support such efforts. I might say that I have heard people mention contributions of the order of 1 per cent, 2 per cent or 3 per cent of our gross national product. I believe we should all be men enough, and ladies enough, to support the taxation that is necessary to pay for this because no government can undertake any program of this sort at home or abroad unless it

takes some money away from somebody. Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that when it comes to voting on this bill this party will, as usual, exercise its conscience.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Before the hon. gentleman takes his seat would he permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. Herridge: Certainly.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I want to be perfectly clear about his standpoint with regard to his remarks on NORAD. Is he saying that it is his view, whether or not it is the view of his party, that Canada should not be party to any joint defence arrangement with the United States with respect to the defence of the North American continent?

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, what I put on the record was the view of our party as expressed at the national convention, clearly indicating that Canada should withdraw from NORAD, as I have said previously on the resolution stage. This is the view of this party, not the view of the hon. member for Kootenay West. I am always very careful on those points.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few comments on Bill C-243, commonly known as the armed forces unification bill. I have had the privilege of serving on the defence committee in the past but I did not serve on the committee when it considered this bill. Personally, I felt it was desirable to have personnel on the committee who have served in the armed forces of Canada, particularly as we are concerned about the defence of our country and the defence of freedom everywhere.

This parliament has many such distinguished members. On this side of the house in our party there are many such members who served with dedication and distinction during world war I and world war II. These men gained personal and practical knowledge of the structure of our armed forces, the structure of our defence philosophy and the structure of actual combat. Many of us do not have this experience. As one who did not serve in the armed forces of Canada I felt that a wise course for me to follow was to listen to the views of those with experience and practical knowledge. I also feel that a wise minister of national defence should follow a similar course.

I have followed the proceedings of the defence committee in the examination of the bill

now before us. It is disturbing to me, as I am sure it is disturbing to Canadians everywhere, to read the testimony of so many former senior officers who have come out squarely against the principle of the bill and who in fact maintain that the present bill, if passed, will destroy the effectiveness of the armed forces of Canada. These are men who have dedicated their whole lives to the service of their country in peacetime and in war. These men are not seeking glory or personal gain but are expressing their views based on many years of experience. There sole aim is that our country be provided with the best and most effective defence force possible. They have no ulterior motives nor axes to grind. They have the welfare of their country at heart. We as members of parliament also, I hope, place the welfare of our country first.

It is most disturbing to see the long list of senior officers who have taken early retirement or who have been fired for expressing views different from those of the minister or opposing the intent of the bill before us. The calibre of the men who have left the army, navy and air force is exceptionally high. With so much opposition to this bill and with so much doubt expressed about any beneficial effects from it, I would think that the minister would be wise to go slowly and to take a closer look at all aspects of defence. The testimony of men like Lieutenant General Moncel, Air Marshal Annis, Lieutenant General Fleury, Air Chief Marshal Miller and many others has left doubt in the minds of many about the value of the bill and about where we are heading.

There are those, including the hon. member for Trois-Rivières who spoke on Friday, who say that this debate has taken too long. They forget that parliament is a place for discussion. Hon. members on this side have been participating in discussion, in a debate. Hon. members have been expressing their doubts and have been giving their views about this matter.

Everyone has agreed that integration is a good thing and I congratulate the minister for bringing it in because I think it was a forward step. Integration, however, had been under study for many years. The department had considered it for a long time and had carried out, as I have said, extensive studies. The minister implemented those studies. He also explained that integration was experimental, that errors would be made and that we shall not have the full benefits for some time to come. In that context I would think it would be better to wait until we can see the full

effects of the integration program before proceeding farther. It was said when integration was introduced that there would be a saving of many millions of dollars. I do not doubt that some savings were effected but they were not as great as Canadians had been led to believe.

Coming from an area in which there are two defence establishments and living in a town in which there is an R.C.A.F. station, Gimli, now known as Canadian Forces Base, Gimli, I have been over the years and am still much interested in the defence of our country. I might say in passing that we have had exceptionally good commanding officers throughout the years. We have been very fortunate in the high quality of these men and we have always enjoyed excellent public relations in our district between servicemen and civilians.

People in the services have expressed many doubts about this bill. Some, in common with some hon. members here, are in favour of it; others, in common with other hon. members here, are opposed to it. We are reaching the point where many in the services are afraid of saying anything against the bill as too many have been fired for speaking against it. Surely both views ought to be heard particularly from the minister's department. Everyone ought to be allowed to speak freely.

I do not agree with senior officers making speeches and statements to the public, as reported in this morning's Montreal *Gazette*. The article is headed "Unification Defended". The text reads as follows:

> Vice-Admiral R. L. Hennessy Friday night delivered a spirited broadside at critics of armed forces unification in an address to the Navy League of Canada.
>
> "The myth that unification will destroy the navy isn't borne out by the facts," he said.
>
> "It verges on being insulting to the fine men of the navy."
>
> Those who say navy morale is low are either "ill-informed or misinformed."

The evidence before the committee showed that morale in the navy is at an all-time low; yet here is a senior officer saying that is not so. One of the reasons for hurrying this bill through is that if it is not passed morale in the armed forces will sink. As this officer says morale is high, there is no need to rush the bill.

While referring to freedom of speech I wish to read from an article in the Winnipeg *Free Press* of Thursday, April 6, 1967. The column is headed "Who Can Speak?". It says:

> Defence Minister Paul Hellyer's staff play under some peculiar ground rules when it comes to speaking out in public.
>
> In Parliament on Monday, when opposition members questioned some statements that General Jean Allard, the chief of staff, was alleged to have made in a speech in Montreal, Mr. Hellyer sprang quickly to his defence. (The fact that General Allard was misquoted has no bearing on this particular point, as Mr. Hellyer admitted he did not know what the general had said.) What Mr. Hellyer said in the House was, "Mr. Speaker, I did not know of the speech, but I have complete confidence in the chief of the defence staff and he is at complete liberty to express himself publicly as he sees fit."
>
> Does General Allard have this privilege because he is the chief of staff? Or does he have it because his views on unification coincide with Mr. Hellyer's? If it is proper for the general to express himself publicly as he sees fit, surely this should be extended to other senior military officers. But what happened to Lieutenant General Moncel, Rear Admiral Landymore, Lieutenant General Frank Fleury, Vice Admiral Kenneth Dyer and other senior officers when they questioned Mr. Hellyer's policies? They were fired out of hand.

Mr. Hellyer: Nonsense.

Mr. Stefanson: Nonsense, says the minister? I hope that those senior officers enjoy that freedom in speaking that we enjoy in parliament.

• (5:30 p.m.)

The Minister of Transport told us the other day that it was important to hear both sides of the question. I hope, therefore, that this freedom exists and that the promotion of men who expressed their views will not be prevented. If this has taken place it is certainly cause for a great deal of alarm.

Canada is a member of NORAD and NATO and it is important that her military role should be integrated with defence and foreign policies. In addition, I certainly think that Canada's military organization should be able to fit in with the military arrangements of allies such as the United States and Britain. Last fall I had the opportunity to visit defence establishments in the United States on a NATO trip. Most of the information we received was classified and I will certainly not refer to it here. I will merely say that at all the bases we visited, whether navy, air force or marine corps, the commanding officer was always a four-star general and in every case, I would say, he was roughly 50 years of age. The minister said we should not be listening to senior officers such as these but that we should be paying attention to the younger men. Nevertheless these are the people upon whom Mr. McNamara relies for his ad-

vice—the senior officers at these bases and at the Pentagon. I think it is indispensable that any minister should have the benefit of advice from people who have made the defence of their country a lifetime job.

I have put forward the view that our forces should be similar in structure to those of the United States and Britain. I found no indication that the United States was contemplating any change in the present constitution of its services, that is, an army, a navy and an air force. I should like to quote part of an editorial which appeared in the Winnipeg *Free Press*, a paper which is a strong supporter of the Liberal party though it has often come out with editorials directed against the present government. This editorial says:

As members of parliament cast their votes in support or rejection of Mr. Hellyer's bill, they must surely recognize the grave responsibility they bear individually. It is a question that far transcends both politicking and party. Canadians will not lightly forgive or forget if our defence structure is thoughtlessly dismembered. This ill-advised step could, by a single act of parliament, sponsored by an inexperienced minister, tear down and destroy proven services which have been built with the sacrifice and efforts of Canadians in the past hundred years and more.

The reputation, character, efficiency and traditions of Canada's regular and militia units have been won and tested in action in battlefields in Europe, Asia and Africa, in the sea lanes of the North Atlantic and in the bombing and fighter missions in the air. They have been carefully designed and organized to work in the closest possible harmony with our two major allies, Great Britain and the United States.

It is beyond comprehension that Mr. Hellyer, by insisting on total unification, should ask parliament now to endorse a completely new defence structure, entirely foreign to both British and U.S. defence organizations. Unification, and elimination of service identities, despite Mr. Hellyer's statements to the contrary, have been openly rejected by Britain after much study—as declared in the white paper of 1963. A check with Washington would also reveal that the U.S. has no intention of unifying its combat units. To the contrary, the present purpose is to build up the proud reputations and esprit de corps of individual fighting units, whether it be the "Green Berets", the Marines or the first Cavalry Regiment. For Canada to launch into a radical experiment which will make our defence organization incompatible with U.S. and British organization constitutes the most drastic step ever taken with the defences of this country. It could, in large measure, destroy our existing defence structure.

Bearing this in mind, I say that the minister should be extremely careful, when contemplating changes in the defence structure of Canada, to see that our forces fit into the defence structures of the United States and Great Britain.

[Mr. Stefanson.]

Furthermore, the NATO agreement is to be reviewed in 1968 to arrive at a basis for the coming ten years and the indications are that great changes will be brought about. At this point I should like to read from another article which appeared in the Winnipeg *Free Press* on April 4:

In the course of the next year, Canada will be reviewing and renegotiating her military commitments under NATO. Common sense, at least, should dictate delaying any major revision of our defence forces until these revised undertakings become known.

Regiments, air squadrons and ships' companies are not simply constructed by bookkeeping statistics, mechanical devices, theories on paper, or by inexperienced guesswork. Canada has much practical experience to draw on. It should not be ignored. A far more cautious and realistic approach should be adopted before risking the destruction of such matters as confidence, harmony, pride of service, esprit de corps and proud tradition which every great commander in history has recognized as the vital qualities in any fighting service. Such things, when destroyed, cannot easily or quickly be restored.

In considering this bill in parliament, members should demand some explanation of the effect of Mr. Hellyer's program on Canada's important commitments under NATO and NORAD. These continuing responsibilities should not be ducked or diverted to buy support for Mr. Hellyer's unification program.

As has been pointed out, if Canada's role is to be merely one of peacekeeping, unification could perhaps be justified. But if we are to have a force of the kind which has existed in the past there can certainly be no justification for such a drastic step. I notice that even though integration was begun some two years ago the estimates for 1967-68 are roughly $115 million higher than the defence estimates for 1966-67. The total estimates of the department for the present year amount roughly to $1,600 million. This is an enormous amount of money. Members of this committee are entitled to know, as are the people of Canada, exactly what the defence forces of this country consist of. Most of the editorials which have appeared in the press are strongly opposed to the bill we are now discussing. Last night I listened to a television program in the course of which Charles Lynch said he felt the debate in this house was justified because in his opinion this was a dangerous bill and one which should be opposed. I am sure the minister has read editorials in papers right across Canada, every one of them condemning the bill before us and suggesting it would be most unwise to move hastily at this time.

• (5:40 p.m.)

In conclusion I wish to propose some questions to the minister. Will the passing of this

bill save the people of Canada money, or has the minister some doubts about this? Will the passing of this bill assure Canada of an effective defence force, or has the minister some doubts about this? Is insistence on a single uniform not likely to have an effect on the morale of the forces? If it does affect morale would it not be better to allow the three services to retain their identities by retaining their respective uniforms? Has the testimony given by many qualified personnel as to their doubts about the bill not been a shock to the minister and left some doubts in his mind?

I find myself having serious doubts about these points, and if the minister has any doubts I hope he will proceed with caution and take another look at what this bill may achieve. He has indicated that it will take many years to implement the provisions of the bill. Therefore there does not seem to be any need for rush. Why not wait until the full effects of integration are felt and then perhaps the minister and all concerned will be in a position to assess the merits for or against unification? I therefore trust that if the minister has any doubts about the value of the bill he will request that it be stood so that consideration can be given either to scrapping it entirely or amending it.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman, I rise to take part in this debate as another member who was not a member of the defence committee. Having served on a number of standing and special committees of the house I realize that the members of the defence committee have acquired specific and better knowledge of the question we are debating than those of us who were privileged only to sit in on committee hearings and to read the evidence as it was published. However, the purpose of a committee is to report to the house assembled in committee of the whole so that all hon. members can consider the evidence and the report and look at them in perhaps a more broadly based fashion than a committee itself is capable of doing. Therefore I have no apology to make for rising at this time to make some general remarks on the whole question of unification.

There has been a considerable amount of comment about whether or not this or that member served in the armed forces, for how long, and in what service. I do not feel that this is essential to an ability to debate the subject. However, I feel no modesty about standing here because I did serve as an infantry commander for some time in the front lines on European battlefields. I do not feel that gave me any special knowledge about the larger organizational problems but I do think it gave me some knowledge on the question of the identity of individual fighting units and the importance that these units bear to the whole force.

We have used the words, esprit de corps and morale. These qualities are very essential. I shall deal with them a little more deeply in a few minutes but, regardless of all the other matters that have been discussed, fundamentally the question is, are we going to have an effective force for the defence of Canada's shores? That is the question we have to face. I feel that the answer is in the negative and that by unification we will not assist the morale of our fighting forces nor improve the over-all-picture.

There are a lot of questions that have not yet been answered. The whole weakness of the minister's position arises from the assumption that there is something difficult about the matter of unification which only the experts can understand. The understanding which the public has got is probably more important than anything else, because we cannot run that far ahead of public opinion and get away with it. I believe at this particular moment we are running ahead of public opinion, and running so far ahead of it in this effort at unification that the public will neither understand nor support unification.

Public reaction, both from those who had a smattering of military knowledge and from those who wanted to save money, was favourable to integration. People agreed in general with the fact that we could integrate support, supply and command services and thereby produce a more effective national fighting force at more modest cost. This was the first thing which the public approved, but I am going to submit that the public's view has changed and that the minister cannot ignore this change or, if he does, it will be at his peril.

The second thing the public felt was that unification, the second step of integration as they saw it, was not really understood by any civilian. However, they felt the minister had assurances from his experts that everyone in the services knew what was involved and everyone in the services approved. On this basis the public went along with the question of unification believing that though they could not understand it everybody else did. There was no effective vocal opposition across the country. But that public reaction has changed.

I find that people who talk to me as a private member of the house are now a little bit confused because they have learned that the experts did not know exactly what was involved and in large measure did not approve what was taking place. This has made a considerable difference in the minds of the public. They are now asking if the experts did not know, if the heads of the services did not know what unification meant, if Air Chief Marshal Miller did not know, then who does?

Until quite recently people thought the Prime Minister probably knew but then he said, "My, I am really surprised at what Air Chief Marshal Miller said. I will have to look into this again." All this is quite surprising to the public. They figured that at least the Prime Minister knew what unification was and what was involved. Now the public are beginning to wonder. So am I, and so are a lot of people who admitted they did not know what was involved but thought everyone else did.

As I read the committee proceedings I found that time and again expert military witnesses stated they could not define the meaning of unification. Some even said they could not understand the difference between integration and unification. Time and again witnesses stated that unification would not provide an increase in the efficiency of the services.

• (5:50 p.m.)

They stated that it is not clearly understood even by the members of the services and, finally, that unification would not improve morale and esprit de corps in the services.

I believe the government of the day is prone to ignore the individual. Everyone is treated in the way a mass of people would be treated. This is my criticism of much of their legislation. In respect of unification they are now going beyond that; they intend to abandon battalions and units which have been historic for centuries. They intend to abandon corps and even services—the navy, the air force and the army. Individual units are now to be abandoned and absorbed into an anonymous group where the personnel have no interest whatsoever in the others who are serving in the same service.

There is to be a green uniform. I think a grey uniform would be more suitable. In this way we would have a grey mass of indistinguishable persons, units and services.

Mr. Winkler: With black armbands.

[Mr. Aiken.]

Mr. Aiken: I should like to say, from my own very limited experience, that morale and esprit de corps are very intangible things. They cannot be photographed like a uniform; they cannot be counted like individual members of the service; they cannot be valued like equipment. They are, however, eminently more important than any of these things. The absence of a willingness to work together with another group, the absence of a pride in one's own unit, and the absence of pride in one's own service, take away all the desire of a fighting man to do a little better. All the great stories of military adventures have arisen because some member of a unit has done something which has brought that unit to the attention of others and has given it a special importance. The unit perhaps has led an attack or held the line and many of the personnel in that unit receive medals. These are the important things which are involved in morale.

Medical men tell us that shock often is the cause of death of persons who are involved in an accident. It is difficult either to define or distinguish shock. It can be caused by loss of blood or by injury. Sometimes it is caused by a combination of several things. The result of shock, however, can be death just as definitely as decapitation. In many cases the real cause of death never can be defined. I am attempting to establish that shock easily could cause the death of the Canadian armed forces if the fighting men should lose their morale and esprit de corps.

There seems to be a feeling that unification is based on some changed concept in respect of the defence of Canada or in respect of the methods of waging war. This new concept has not been defined by the minister and therefore we are left guessing as to what is behind the need for unification of the forces. Some people believe that the advent of a most horrible means of mass destruction will eliminate the likelihood of a conventional war or conventional battles. Of course, all the evidence is to the contrary. The battles which are going on at the present time are in the conventional war field.

I can remember that in the 1930's, prior to the second world war, we were told that if there should be another world war it might be the end of mankind. People gave as an example all the various types of gases which were available in great quantities. They told us about the germs which were being incubated in thousands of places. It was said that if war broke out these germs would be released and everybody would be wiped out. This did not

happen. When members of the armed forces went into battle in the second world war, for months they carried respirators or gas masks and then later these were abandoned. In fact, even in his death throes and his final instability Hitler did not authorize the use of mass destruction.

I do not believe we should assume that there would be no conventional attack on this country, that there would be no conventional war, or that we would have nothing to meet of a conventional standard. I believe this is what we are doing and that we are laying a false basis, but I am not sure in what direction the minister is moving because this has never been explained. We really cannot tell in what direction the government is moving.

I should like to conclude my remarks with a word of advice to the minister. He may not wish to take it but I think he should. I know he has received much advice in the past few months but he has not received any from me previously.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): He has taken none of the advice.

Mr. Aiken: It is rumoured, Mr. Chairman, that the minister is attempting to push this project through because he has his eye on the leadership of the Liberal party.

Mr. Hellyer: You must be kidding.

Mr. Aiken: He wishes to show himself as a forceful minister. Be that as it may, whether he has his eye on the leadership or just wishes to be a forceful and effective minister is not of the slightest importance to me. I suggest he might show himself to be diplomatic. He could do this by backing off a little in the face of the recent and effective opposition to the program of unification which he has outlined.

In respect of greater men in the past it has been shown that intransigence has been the downfall of many politicians. The salvation of many others has been their ability to recognize criticism when it is well established and has a proper basis. In this instance I believe the minister would be well advised to reconsider his position, look at the opposition which has been raised, look at what the public has been saying in respect of his judgment, and then act like a statesman.

• (6:00 p.m.)

The Deputy Chairman: It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the committee that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: The hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge), Canadian Centennial—Castlegar, B.C.—request for presentation of air force performance; the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain), Canadian Pacific Railway—night train between Montreal and Quebec city; the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. McCleave), Justice—interim divorce measure.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, I am not seeking to re-enter this debate because I am anxious to prolong it. If it is any satisfaction I can assure the minister that when we reach the individual clauses we in this party will not be intervening very often or at great length because the clauses have all been gone over in committee and most of them are merely consequential upon the main principle.

I am entering the debate again because the Secretary of State for External Affairs took part in the debate on Wednesday last and said some things that I think go to the root of the matter of unification and deserve very careful examination. He reiterated the government's contention that unification would not affect the carrying out of our present commitments. He also said that the government proposed to maintain our present commitments, particularly to NATO. It appears to me that on the surface we have here an absolute contradiction.

It seems to me to be as clear as a pikestaff that unification makes sense if some of our present commitments are to be abandoned but that we cannot maintain all our present commitments and concentrate on the mobile role. No one in this debate has attempted to contradict General Moncel's evidence; indeed, his evidence was plain common sense. He said that unification would be inappropriate if our present NATO roles are maintained. He said that the brigade group and the air division are not susceptible to unification and would not be affected by it. He said that unification would be meaningless as far as they are concerned. That is the view stated by General Moncel.

On the other side of the picture, Air Vice Marshal Sharp, vice chief of the general staff, says that there is to be a new emphasis on a mobile role. Mr. John Gellner, a writer, in an article which received the imprimatur of General Allard, chief of the general staff, said that a new mobile, intervention force of 15,000 is to be created, or if not created at least re-equipped and made effectively mobile within three years. I say it is as sure as day

follows night that this involves a very considerable added expenditure and it will blow the ceiling right off our present defence budget, now fixed at roughly $1.6 billion a year, if at the same time as we re-equip this mobile force we continue our present NATO roles. No one has answered General Moncel's estimate that the creation and fitting out of this mobile force, together with the maintenance of our present roles, would cost at least $2 billion.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, I think my hon. friend recalls that Air Chief Marshal Miller did deal with this point later and said that in his opinion those estimates were not valid.

Mr. Churchill: He did not say they were not valid.

Mr. Brewin: The Minister of National Defence is correct, but he did not himself give any details. I would point out that the minister himself was questioned in the defence committee on this matter. What he had to say appears at pages 1592 and following of the committee proceedings. When the minister was questioned about what General Moncel had said in this regard he said that in fact no estimate had been made of what it would cost to produce the mobile intervention force. His statement was that perhaps we would need so many helicopters and until it had been decided that we needed so many the cost could not be estimated. He also said it would depend upon the timing, that is, at what rate we were creating the force and how quickly we did it. But he did not deny—and how could he deny—that if it were to be done in any reasonable time span at all it would mean substantial additional expense.

I do not think the minister is to be taken seriously when he suggests that no estimates have been made of the cost of this new policy upon which, I remind the committee and the minister, Air Vice Marshal Sharp said the major emphasis was to be placed. He said that the whole business of unification was centred around a new emphasis to be put upon the mobile force. I think it is quite incredible that no estimates were made. Admittedly, estimates may involve a series of variations, namely, whether you do it in so many years, whether you have 50 helicopters, 500, or whatever may be required, but to assert that the cost has not been taken into account, which is what the minister said, seems to me to make no sense at all. I think it would be more reasonable to assume that the government was not grossly negligent in this respect and has made some sort of estimate of the cost. If it has made such an estimate, I suggest such an estimate would make it perfectly obvious that we cannot create a mobile intervention force and maintain our existing roles, within the budget ceiling that we now have.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that if we cling to the existing roles in NATO, unification makes no sense. There is an inevitable conclusion to be drawn from this, and in this respect I agree with the official opposition although not with their ultimate conclusion. The inevitable conclusion to be drawn is that the government does not mean what it says when it asserts, on the one hand, that it is going to proceed with unification with all speed and, on the other, that it is going to maintain its present roles.

It is my view that the explanation of this matter is to be found in a careful examination of the speech last Wednesday, of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. The Secretary of State for External Affairs is a disciple, and a very apt one, of his former leader, the late Mr. Mackenzie King. Mr. Mackenzie King, when he spoke on external affairs—some of us are old enough to remember his speeches and to have looked at them carefully—was able to keep everyone happy. This was done by studied obscurity, by never saying clearly what course of action or what school of thought the government favoured. Included in his speeches in the house was one section which seemed to favour Canadian isolation from European wars, another support for the commonwealth, and another devotion to the ideals of collective security exemplified by the League of Nations. No doubt if there were any other significant elements of opinion they would be found duly recorded, rather vaguely and hazily perhaps, in the speeches made by the then prime minister. Every significant trend of Canadian public opinion would find its views somewhere contained in the announcement of Canadian policy. Then the experts used to get to work and analyse the different, inconsistent streams of thought that appeared in Mr. King's utterances, try to determine which predominated and guess Canadian policy therefrom.

• (6:10 p.m.)

I think that the ghost of Mr. King still rules the government which has adopted his style. Therefore I do not find it so surprising that the intentions of the government with regard to its future relations with NATO are wrapped in obscurity. It is quite prepared to adopt a

sweeping organizational change in the Canadian armed services, which would only make sense if we were to change our roles in the future, and at the same time to assert stoutly its devotion to the maintenance of its present roles in NATO which do not at all fit into the new organizational structure.

However, in this light I studied the words of the Secretary of State for External Affairs very carefully and I may claim by now, having been in the house five years and having followed the words of the minister very carefully, to be an expert Martinologist, if I may coin a word. As a result of my studies I think I have resolved the mystery. It is perfectly true that the Secretary of State for External Affairs in one part of his speech does indeed appear to assert firmly the intention of maintaining unchanged Canada's present role in NATO. But then I find at the top of page 14565 of *Hansard* the following statement:

> I do not exclude the possibility that in the future it may become feasible, and indeed I hope it will, to withdraw our forces from Europe and to make our entire contribution from bases in Canada. But such a course of action is neither feasible nor desirable at this moment, and certainly not by unilateral decision.

It is my suggestion that the key words in this utterance are "at this moment". The organizational structure of our armed forces must not be considered in the light of what is current at the moment but in the light of the future, and in the light of the future can there be any doubt at all that the government intends to change its role in NATO? I suggest that is the key to this seeming conundrum of a government which proposes a sweeping change in organization and at the same time refuses to announce policies which would make sense of this sweeping change. I think it is quite right for the government to consider the future. What I think is wrong is to conceal from the people of Canada its true intent. No responsible government can propose the continuance of roles which are no longer militarily useful, necessary or sensible.

Once again I call to the attention of the committee the statement made by General Allard in his evidence. After all, he is chief of the general staff and the main military adviser of the government. The Secretary of State for External Affairs referred us to an article written by Mr. Gellner in which the latter described our roles in NATO as clearly lacking validity. He said that nobody in NATO believed in them. However, the Secretary of State for External Affairs did not refer in his speech to what the chief of the general staff said but simply referred to what Mr. Gellner said. Mr. Gellner is a commentator and writer. We are not obliged to accept his advice or views. He may quite easily be wrong. However, the point is that General Allard said perfectly clearly, in answer to a question from the hon. member for Simcoe North: "I do not disagree with this article". The meaning of this to anybody who wants to consider the matter carefully is perfectly clear, namely, that the chief of the general staff is saying that these roles make no sense militarily. If one reads his evidence carefully, the only justification for these roles is political.

Neither the Secretary of State for External Affairs nor the Minister of National Defence nor any other member on the government side has attempted to answer the challenge which I offered in the debate more than a week ago to discuss whether these roles had any military value at the present time. They simply keep saying: We must not change them at the moment; we must not rock the boat.

In excusing the government's silence on this matter the Secretary of State for External Affairs puts up a straw man and knocks him down. In his speech on this issue he said repeatedly that we must not proceed unilaterally to reduce our military contributions to NATO. So far as I know no one is advocating that we do so unilaterally. As long as were are part of an alliance it is our responsibility not to make any changes without consultation with, and notification to, our allies, but it is part of the practice of the alliance for each country to assume the role most appropriate to it. This was made clear by the Prime Minister himself when he spoke in 1962 before the election and when he spoke again in 1963 after the election and announced it to be the policy of this government and of his party to negotiate for a new role in NATO. This issue is coming to a decisive and conclusive point in the very near future.

During the course of his evidence before the defence committee the Minister of National Defence was questioned about the extent and the duration of our commitments to NATO. He explained that they were based upon an annual reconsideration but that now it was proposed to decide the basic roles to be undertaken for five year periods.

At page 1593 of the committee's proceedings the following exchange took place. The Minister of National Defence said:

> In so far as the future is concerned, we will have to indicate this to NATO, if my memory serves me correctly, in December of this year, assuming that all of the other nations agree to this procedure.

Mr. Brewin: But you have not as yet taken any steps to alter these commitments?

Mr. Hellyer: We are not required to reveal our intentions or to discuss our future plans and commitments except at that time.

Mr. Brewin: Is the government giving consideration to this question, or is it a closed question?

Mr. Hellyer: I think that during the course of the year, Mr. Brewin, we will have to decide what we plan to do for the following five-year period and indicate to our NATO partners what they can count on.

I would point out to the committee, and it is crucial that the house should be aware of this fact, that some time before December of this year the government—and I hope it will consult the house about this—will have to make up its mind on what it is going to do about these various commitments to NATO for the five year period in the future. I say to the government that if it proposes to make a change, and I think it should do so, then it is its duty to consult this house and to inform its allies in advance of the contractual date in December that it proposes to change Canada's roles.

As I have said, we have the assertion from the chief of the general staff that militarily speaking these roles are no longer valid. Of course we have this assertion by indirection because he was agreeing to a statement made by someone else. I suggest to the Minister of National Defence, the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the government as a whole that they should come out into the open and say whether in December they are going to commit us for another period of five years to the continuation of roles which their own chief of the general staff has said, indirectly it is true, no longer have validity and which indeed, on a careful examination of the facts, are militarily indefensible at the present time.

It seems to me it has become part of the natural style of this government to avoid facing these hard choices and to refuse to announce necessary changes when it decides on them. We in this party particularly view this tendency in connection with the whole issue of unification with very grave regret because in our view the whole process of unification would be easier and would be more acceptable to the services and to the Canadian people if it were made very clear not what the government thinks at the moment, which is what the Secretary of State for External Affairs has told us, but what it plans for the future. If the government does intend, not in the immediate but in the foreseeable future, to propose a complete change in the nature of Canada's military contribution to the security of the world, it should say so.

• (6:20 p.m.)

Much has been said in this debate about morale. I believe that if there is one thing that undermines morale more than anything else it is uncertainty as to the future, uncertainty as to the purposes which are being carried out. Every man if he is to do his best, not only in the armed forces but everywhere else, must believe that what he is doing is useful and necessary. The evidence of many of the witnesses pointed in that direction. In fact, Air Vice Marshal Sharp, if I have his title correctly, made this clear to us. One of his main arguments in favour of unification was an argument based upon morale. When it came down to asking what he meant by that, it was clear that he meant the dedication of the Canadian armed services to roles which were meaningful. In his opinion, this was the reason unification would lead to better morale.

I want to quote one other witness before the defence committee, Lieutenant General Simonds, former chief of staff and a very distinguished soldier. I asked him if he agreed with previous testimony that one of the reasons he put emphasis on peacekeeping as being an important role—certainly not the only one —was that it gave to those concerned a morale that was built on thinking they were doing something vitally important. To this General Simonds replied:

Yes, I agree with that. There is nothing in that to contradict the statement I just made.

I do not believe there was. So, Mr. Chairman, it is quite certain in our view that Canada is going to concentrate in the future on a military contribution which will be a complete change from its present contribution. It is bound to get out of obsolete and inappropriate roles. The failure to state that Canada is going to concentrate on a unified force which can make a vital contribution to world security undermines the very basis of the argument for unification. We believe that unification is a necessary and proper development but a development that is based upon a recasting of Canada's military role. It is necessary to get up and say so, to indicate that the far reaching changes in organization we in this house are being asked to approve are part of an imaginative proposal to recreate a new and more significant role for Canada's armed forces.

The Prime Minister himself indicated that his government is proposing such a reconsideration, a new approach. I hope before this

debate is over the Prime Minister, who has a vital reponsibility on security matters, will put this matter in perspective by telling the house that, whatever may be the momentary intention with regard to the maintenance of roles in Europe, the government contemplates as the most effective future role for Canada participation in a mobile intervention force and that unification is necessary to this and such a declaration is necessary to the building of morale and support for unification not only amongst the armed services but for the people of Canada generally.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Chairman, few debates ever held in this chamber have had more critical significance for Canada's future than that in which we are engaged. Yet at this stage it is not easy to present any novel or original arguments. For myself, I have never professed that knowledge of defence or matters military which would qualify me to speak with confident authority. On the other hand, sir, that very lack of expertise may have enabled me to approach the issue of unification of our armed forces with a completely objective view. I have been able to examine the evidence given in the standing committee without preconceived bias, and I have certainly done so without political partisanship.

To the study of that evidence I have given agonizing care. This detailed study of the evidence before the standing committee on defence has convinced me that this bill ought not to be enacted and has convinced me that if it is enacted it will irreparably damage the national interest. Indeed, sir, I fail to see how any objective person reading the evidence could come to any other conclusion. While I have spent many hours analysing and annotating the evidence before the committee, I see no particular point in spreading it further on the record. I will abbreviate my speech at least in that respect.

Nor do I think it is necessary or desirable to attack the integrity or bona fides of any witness. Most of the evidence presented to the committee was opinion evidence, and any experienced barrister knows how widely such evidence may differ even when tendered by equally sincere witnesses. But, sir, overwhelmingly the weight of evidence tendered by those who were free to speak without any inhibition was in opposition to this bill. I say to you, sir, that for parliament to act in the face of the opinions which were expressed by Air Chief Marshal Miller, General Guy Simonds and General Robert Moncel would be irresponsible and foolhardy in the extreme. It is all very well to say that there are other opinions of a contrary nature and to assert that the government and parliament have a responsibility to act.

My submission, which I want to make tonight directly to the Prime Minister, is simply—I make it to the Prime Minister because in my view he is the only man who can save Canada's present armed forces from annihilation—that administration and no parliament can properly disregard such expert opinion as that of Miller, Simonds, Moncel, Curtis and many others. No administration and no parliament should jeopardize the safety and security of a nation in the face of the opinions of such men.

I say to the Prime Minister that the task of statescraft is to achieve a national consensus, and where there is not a reasonable national consensus upon a fundamental issue affecting the very life of the nation then no action or at least delayed action is to be preferred to hasty and indigestible action. That is the very essence of statescraft. I assert to the Prime Minister that in my view this nation is not ready for unification and he should draw back before irreparable damage is done. This is not a matter merely of someone winning an argument. This is not just a case of the majority in parliament having its way. This bill is a blow at the very heart of our future as a nation. As Prime Minister the right hon. gentleman from Algoma East has a positive and unequivocal duty to all Canada to reconsider this hasty and ill-conceived measure. He was not sworn in as Her Majesty's first minister in order to preside over the liquidation of Canada's armed forces.

• (6:30 p.m.)

Sir, no one here doubts the desirability of what has come to be described as integration—integration of support services and a measure of consolidation of command. However, the destruction of service traditions, the dynamiting of all unit loyalties in order to create a single force, is another matter. In my view it ought not to be done. It certainly ought not to be done without the clear, unequivocal mandate of the Canadian people. I assert that only the Canadian people have the right to take the chances with the survival of the nation which are implicit in this bill. The Minister of National Defence claims to be leading the world on the road to unification. Personally, I would feel a great deal happier if other nations showed any disposition to follow; I detect none. In fact, the minister is leading a one-man parade. His attempts to

gain the support of Admiral Mountbatten backfired over last week end and the explanations made by the minister this afternoon were totally unrealistic. Informed opinion in Britain, the United States and throughout the world indicates, I think, total disenchantment with the proposals that are implicit in this bill.

On Thursday last, Mr. Chairman, as reported at page 14592 of *Hansard*, the Associate Minister of National Defence professed to speak for all servicemen. He went on to say that he believed the forces are convinced that the goal of unification is correct. I believe that few statements ever made in this house have infuriated more people. Since that statement was made, Mr. Chairman, I have literally been besieged by messages, both identified and anonymous, from servicemen in my riding protesting against the arrogance of the associate minister in professing to speak for all servicemen, and asserting with what I believe is constitutional propriety that only the member that they elect can profess to speak in parliament for any citizen, civilian or serviceman.

The associate minister may profess to speak for the servicemen in the constituency of Terrebonne, but he has no mandate to speak for the servicemen in the constituency of Carleton. I would remind the committee that only the members for Halifax and the hon. member for Russell have as many service electors as I have in Carleton. From the representations made to me, I am convinced that the overwhelming number of my service constituents and their dependants share the views that I am expressing tonight.

However, sir, I do not believe that it is a matter of counting service heads. It is a matter of judgment. My judgment and my submission is that the Prime Minister should intervene now to withdraw this bill, and I plead with him to do so. My observations, both of my service constituents and otherwise, are that the operational efficiency of our armed forces has been brought to its lowest point. Destruction of service loyalties and abandonment of historic units cannot help but lower morale, and that is precisely what has happened. The situation today is that our armed forces are being used as a pawn in the struggle for the Liberal leadership, and the Prime Minister should put an end to it at once.

In my view, Mr. Chairman, the provisions of this bill constitute a direct breach of faith with all serving officers and men. They enlisted upon one basis; this bill shifts the ground rules completely without any right of election to the servicemen. Legally of course this can be done. Morally it is indefensible. When we come to the particular clause in the bill I shall have more to say on the subject.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I venture to direct my words immediately to the attention of the Prime Minister. Into his hands, the fourteenth man so privileged in 100 years of confederation, has come the chief responsibility for the safety and integrity of the nation. I submit to him that the issue before this parliament is too basic, too essential, to the national future to be determined over the protests of the outstanding Canadians who have given their lives to service in the armed forces. In fact, this bill has reached its present stage only by the purge of almost all senior military advisers to the nation, a purge more ruthless than anything ever attempted by anyone anywhere since Stalin's purge of the red army.

I repeat with all the emphasis at my command that the essence of statescraft is to give leadership in the achievement of a reasonable national consensus. This the bill cannot do. Normally the task of parliament is to exercise judgment and to make decisions. This bill transcends that and ought not to be implemented, in my view, without the direct mandate of the people.

If the Prime Minister persists in enacting this bill, then let at least clause 65 be amended to provide that the bill shall come into force only 90 days or 120 days after the next election. In saying that, Mr. Chairman, I am not advocating an early election. Indeed I believe that a bitterly fought election on the eve of our centennial celebrations would be undesirable. But no harm would come about if this bill is postponed a year or two or more. Indeed, I am convinced that much good would result from delay.

The Prime Minister was prepared, Mr. Chairman, to delay medicare, even at the expense of losing the Minister of National Health and Welfare from the cabinet. Despite the risk of his losing the Minister of National Defence from the cabinet—and may I confess to believing that the loss would be a heavensent blessing—let the Prime Minister agree to delay this bill. Then whenever the next election comes—be it one year or two years away, or whenever it may be—the people will have the opportunity to pass upon a proposal which in its present form, in my view, now endangers the very life of our nation. The people of Canada can take the risk of endangering the survival of the nation: My submission is that this parliament cannot.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Chairman, my first words in opening the second part of a speech that I began a week ago are helpful to the morale of the minister. I want to assure him right off the bat that in any conflict between statements made by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra and the Minister of National Defence I would go along with the Minister of National Defence.

The second compliment I should like to pay him is to thank him for the continuation of the hydrofoil program. I think the announcement that he made in answer to a question I raised a week ago has done a considerable amount to help the morale of the armed forces in the constituency of Halifax. It does show there is some hope that the minister, no matter what his shortcomings—and heaven only knows they have been combed over from right to left and from north to south in recent days in this chamber—means to keep the Royal Canadian Navy in business.

• (6:40 p.m.)

I referred to the statements made earlier today by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra because he would have us believe that anything going on here is but a simple exercise in name changing, that we were really spending an extraordinary amount of time bringing about this change in name. The hon. member also had unkind words to say about certain hon. members on this side, suggesting they had not really read the minutes of the defence committee he headed. Having heard his speech I suggest that he neither heard nor understood what was said in that committee. I refer to the remarks of the Minister of National Defence, in which he deals with what he considers an imperative need to get along with this bill. On the second column of page 14438 of *Hansard* the minister said this:

> The passage of this bill does not mean instant unification. The passage of this bill is a statement of the intention that the ultimate goal is a single service and all the men and women in the forces will be managed in a single personnel stream. This must be known in order that the kind of detailed staff planning required can proceed on an orderly basis.

Comparing that statement with the utterances of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra one would think that there was more to this bill than a mere change of name. Indeed, should the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra look at the bill—and I invite him to do so—he will find that in clause 2 a change is to be made to section 15 of the National Defence Act, setting up one service to be known as the Canadian Armed Forces. That of course is a change of name, but it involves the process of unification. In clause 4 there is something dealing with the naming of ranks, and in clause 6 the members of the armed forces will become members of the Canadian Armed Forces. Here again there is more than just a change of name.

Clause 7 softens part of clause 6, removing the possibility that a person who has entered service in the army, navy or air force will be conscripted to duties which were alien to him in a single service. Having said these things, I think we can safely dispose of the argument of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra that all we are dealing with here is a change in name.

I also wish to be kind to the minister, though briefly. I shall not change my nature entirely. A very good suggestion, appearing at first blush to support the minister, comes from Major General F. F. "Fighting Frank" Worthington, who said this:

> As one of Canada's oldest generals it is my opinion that at the end of any large war the existing generals should be thanked, decorated and pensioned off.
>
> Put up statues if you like, but don't let them meddle with the future organization of the services. Hand that responsibility over to the young, fighting colonels who had to fight the war with the existing weapons.

It seems to me, as one reads between the lines, that the Minister of National Defence ought to pay attention to the views of the fighting colonels, the hon. members for Calgary North and Winnipeg South Centre, two excellent and knowledgeable persons to whom I hope the minister pays attention.

The strongest indictment of the minister's proposal is that it asks us to do something, and we do not really know what it is. We suspect the minister does not know either. Nevertheless he is asking for parliament to give him carte blanche to bring about some new process involving the national defence of the country.

Earlier in the debate I quoted extensively from the evidence of Air Chief Marshal Miller. Passing over some significant portions dealing with my point, I turn to page 2300 of the committee minutes, where the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona is asking this of the air chief marshal:

> If I have your testimony correct, unification had been talked about but you had never seen or heard the implications of it spelled out. Is that accurate?
>
> Air Chief Marshal Miller: We never had tentative unification plans submitted and agreed to.

The air chief marshal was chief of the defence staff, a position he held for two years covering a large part of the present minister's ministry. The air chief marshal perforce, one would think, would be the minister's closest adviser, and privy to his thoughts. He would be in the position of an adviser to the minister. The air chief marshal vacated that post in July or August of last summer.

On November 4 the Bill C-243 is presented to us in its present form. That bill has not just one page, as one would expect if it dealt only with a change of name, but has 48 pages in all, including the various schedules. It was not prepared overnight; as a lawyer I know that it would take weeks or months of preparation. The inference I am trying to draw—and I do not think one can be drawn to the contrary—is that the unification bill was prepared in the Department of National Defence without the leading officer of the department, the chief of the defence staff, having had an opportunity to know what it would deal with. If he had any inkling, there was no exchange of opinions between himself and the minister about the different parts of the unification concept. I find this almost unbelievable.

Any other minister bringing in something as radically new as this bill would have had an exchange of views with his deputy minister and leading officials of the department. Papers would have been prepared; the subject would have been discussed around the water coolers in various government departments. Why did this not happen here? I will repeat that part of the testimony where at page 2300, the air chief marshal says:

> We never had tentative unification plans submitted and agreed to.

I think those words were amplified in other parts of his testimony.

• (6:50 p.m.)

Here we have a massive 48-page bill dealing with unification, produced a few months after Air Chief Marshal Miller had left that office. It defies all common sense and all logic that any minister of the crown should proceed in such a fashion. Even trying to give the minister the benefit of any possible doubt, I find it impossible to believe that there could have been any thinking going into the unification concept which lies behind this measure. It could not have grown up overnight in the month or two before Bill C-243 was drafted. I hope I live long enough for somebody to write a book and explain just how this miracle could be possible. I hope it will not be the

gospel according to St. Paul but that some independent observer will explain this miracle to my satisfaction.

There are one or two points which puzzle me in connection with the specific details of unification. One of them is the failure to spell out in simple form, or even in complicated form, the ordinary day to day life of a serviceman so that it would be understandable to those who are trying to grapple with this concept.

For example, nothing has been said about the type of uniform he will wear, the type of living quarters he will occupy, the possibility of his being taken from one kind of duty, in a tank, for instance, and put on another kind of duty, perhaps supporting those who are operating in an air environment. Boiling it down in my own mind, take the case of a young fellow who wants to be a cook in the services. He goes to an integrated recruiting station, which of course exists at the present time, and may be cajoled into going to sea to cook, when all his instincts are against this; he would much prefer to cook at a stationary base, or even for a field unit serving in a ground environment—and I apologize for using some of the older terms. But who on earth would want to be served food at sea by a seasick cook?

There are other examples. I am advised that in the Royal Canadian Navy they do not want men much over the age of 40 to embark on vessels, life at sea being what it is. They feel that only the rare person over 40 who has good physical stamina should be allowed to continue a career which would keep him in a sea environment. Again—and I am relying on advice given to me by professionals—this is not the case with those serving in the air force or the army. They may not want senior officers or older men to handle planes, but I understand that the age requirement is not so restrictive. On this point I should like the minister to tell us just how unification would take into account the different approaches which the services use toward their personnel.

Last week I mentioned the case in Halifax of a person who under the present integration process could not find out who his immediate superior was. Other cases have come to my attention in the Halifax area. The transportation services of the three armed forces have been integrated, and this seems to have quadrupled the number of people engaged in transportation, most of them occupied in writing memoranda to each other without any

increase in the number of motor vehicles being driven about. I suppose this is inevitable; it is bound to happen when you take a large department and attempt to reorganize it. I do not minimize the problem the minister faces on this regard, because he has a $1.5 billion operation to look after, and it is difficult to make changes in it. But seeing the Parkinsonian laws in operation following the integration of transportation facilities for the armed forces in the Halifax area, one wonders how effective these plans are and how quickly any bugs can be ironed out.

Finally, I should like to make four points concerning the course which I respectfully suggest the minister should follow. I see it is almost seven o'clock, so perhaps I could wind up my speech at 8 p.m. and make them then—it will take about five minutes.

The Chairman: Is it the pleasure of the house that pursuant to an order of the house made last Thursday, April 6th, this sitting be suspended until eight o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

SITTING SUSPENDED

SITTING RESUMED

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Chairman, in my remarks before the dinner hour I had indicated that the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, chairman of the defence committee during its final sessions, appeared to have been there in body and not in mind, and was unaware of the implications of Bill C-243 which we are now considering. I suggested to the Minister of National Defence that at some time an attempt be made to spell out as simply as possible, so that even he could understand, just what was meant by his concept of unification, and what it would mean in the practical day to day living of members of the Canadian Armed Forces.

Also before the dinner hour we heard an outstanding speech and plea by the hon. member for Carleton, mainly directed to the Prime Minister who has the paramount interest and authority with regard to this matter. I could only very humbly second the very forceful, eloquent and wise words of the hon. member for Carleton. I hope that the Prime Minister, who seemed to grasp the nettle a few weeks ago by expressing surprise and interest at the remarks of Air Chief Marshal Miller, will again come to grips with the subject and exercise the responsibility that is his.

Finally, sir, I would like at this time to make four suggestions to the Minister of National Defence as to the course he could follow. The first is that I think it is necessary that integration be made to work. Integration is the expressed will of the parliament of Canada. There has been considerable evidence given before the defence committee about the snafus, the bugs, the serious problems that have cropped up in the Department of National Defence, and I understand most of these relate to the process of integration.

If the first step, integration, is not a completely successful one, why on earth should we in this committee expect that the further step of unification should be a successful one? The Minister of National Defence makes the point that it is necessary to have something on the statute books so that integration can be carried a step further into the area of unification. If this be so, and I take the word of the minister that it is so, then I suggest this step as a corollary to point No. 1, namely an amendment to section 18 of the present National Defence Act which would permit units of one service to join other services. I think in this way experimentation of a useful nature could be carried out, and the minister could iron out the bugs and develop his concept with a small unification scheme, rather than starting in with over-all unification.

I have made my second point in a previous contribution to this debate so I will not dwell on it at any length, but I wish to say I was very much impressed to see the service battalion in operation at Camp Gagetown a number of years ago. I think the minister and the officials of his department would be taking the right course were they to continue to fit the non-combatant units and non-combatant services together in support of the three services. My third point, dealing with unification, has to do with my first point concerning making integration work and attempting unification on a more humble scale. I think we should have some proof, and probably evidence given before an all-party committee on national defence, before the full plunge into unification is made.

• (8:10 p.m.)

My fourth and final point is in the area of high speculation and opinion. However, in this debate everyone has entered into this field. As other hon. members have so well pointed out, we are largely in the field of opinion when we deal with this matter.

It seems to me that if the minister's philosophy is correct and if all the developments in national defence here and in other countries are to be assessed correctly, we have had a significant move in this century, probably as a result of the nuclear age. It may be that the days of large-scale citizen armies are over. We have gone through a period of approximately 200 years when countries as a whole have been at war; and now, because of the nuclear age, we are coming into a period when small, professional and highly mobile services are necessary. Perhaps this is illustrated by the fact that the minister has closed down a number of the militia units which had been in existence in Canada for a long time.

I suggest to the minister, that, keeping in mind the holocaust a nuclear war would bring, the logical extension of what he has been doing would be to take even further steps in developing a closer bond between the services and those who are not in the services. I believe the thinking today would suggest that the civilian population could become more involved in emergency matters than in military matters; that is, we would still rely on the small professional force, but the citizens who are not members of the services would have to carry out the measures which are necessary for the survival of the population.

This type of development, horrendous though it might appear, is consistent with the realities of the nuclear age. I do not believe we should continue to think in terms of the 1914-1918 and the 1939-1949 era. The Emergency Measures Organization should be further developed in order that it will be in readiness to step in instantly, in a time of emergency, so that the people can be mobilized—not in the military sense—in an effort to survive.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I should like to make an appeal to the minister to pay some heed to the advice which has been offered and the questions which have been asked from this side of the chamber. National defence really is too important a matter to be either a partisan issue or one which develops as a result of one person's style of thinking. As other hon. members have pointed out, heretofore unification itself had never come before the retired chief of the defence staff in a tangible form and in a form which would have entitled us to raise questions concerning exactly what the minister had in mind. Until we have knowledge of what he has in mind we are entitled to ask questions on behalf of all the people of Canada.

[Mr. McCleave.]

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, I was happy to hear the hon. member for Halifax wind up with a reminder of the importance of this debate. I thought the hon. member for Carleton brought that very forcibly to the fore. It seems necessary to comment on some of the incredible speeches made in this house by hon. members across the way. I found the remarks made by the Minister of Transport on Friday remarkable in more ways than one, and I intend to get around to them later. Also the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra made an incredible speech this afternoon, for one who was chairman of the committee. During the committee hearings I did not think he had any realization of what was going on, but I did not expect such a frank exposé of the depth of the ignorance he had concerning what was involved as he exhibited this afternoon. I will also comment on that.

One suggestion which was made this afternoon by the hon. member for Greenwood I think should be developed by what is possibly a logical extension of his reasoning. I found myself quite unable to disagree with the arguments he put forward when he mentioned what the government is trying to do, so to speak, through the back door. He pointed out that the only way in which anyone could find a logical pattern in what the government is doing is to suggest that secretly they seem to have made up their minds that Canada must change its role in defence and world affairs. If I judge his remarks correctly, he has found this to be in the peace keeping role; that is, that the remarks of the Secretary of State for External Affairs can be interpreted to mean only that Canada's commitments will be changed later this year, and that the present unification bill, the shape of the forces and the speeches made by the Minister of National Defence all form a pattern which indicates that Canada intends to drop or drastically change some of its commitments in respect of NATO and so on. It would seem that we are intending to put more emphasis on peacekeeping and that our foreign affairs policy in the near future will follow this pattern.

The hon. member for Greenwood deprecated the fact that the government was not being more frank with the members of the house and the people of Canada in revealing its intention. The only thing about which I quarrel with the hon. member is that I believe he may be counting too much on this government following a plan because certainly from what the Minister of National Defence has been doing it is obvious that the lack of a plan has

been the most disturbing thing to the members of the armed forces and to the nation in the last couple of years. Therefore perhaps the first mistake we make is in expecting to find some logical plan which the government is following.

It may be that the action they are taking makes so little sense that they are just as misguided and undirected as they appear to be. Certainly the hon. member for Greenwood is the only one who has attempted to search out what the government may be doing. I should like to point out that if he is right, then it occurs to us that our policy in respect of foreign affairs is being decided now by a change in our armed forces.

• (8:20 p.m.)

I am one of those who have always felt that the armed forces of Canada should be able to respond to the support of the policy of the government on external affairs as that policy may exist or be formed from time to time, that the only policy that makes sense is to keep our armed forces in such shape that they do not interfere with the ability of the country to be able to formulate or change its foreign policy, and that the armed forces should be able to give as much weight and credence as possible to the external affairs posture that we adopt. Therefore I am most disturbed at the thought that the hon. member for Greenwood may be right, and certainly the evidence indicates that he is, that what is happening today under this minister is that our armed forces are being tailored so that we can have only one possible sort of external affairs policy.

Up to this time I am sure that most people in the country have been perturbed at the thought that the minister is selling the country a bill of goods when he says that he has been giving us more defence for less money, and we have found the evidence to be that we are getting less and less defence for more money. Next we are disturbed at the thought of what he is doing to our armed forces, the amount of destruction and harm he is doing to them, senselessly, since there is no rhyme nor reason why he should be proceeding with unification, and certainly less reason why he should be proceeding with this program with such haste. This situation becomes even worse when we consider that the result is not just less defence for more money but we are going to lose our ability to manoeuvre in the field of external affairs. I am against external affairs being decided on the basis of defence policy, especially when it is sold under such false pretences as the minister is using in attempting to sell it. I am even more against it if we are to be put in a strait-jacket that will determine our external affairs policy for years to come.

I think this is a fundamental point that the house should not overlook. At least with the old structure of the defence forces as we know them, we had freedom to move about in our defence policy as we wished. Many witnesses who appeared before the defence committee pointed out that it was perfectly possible and logical, and this had always been the case, for the government to decide external affairs policy and then, by selecting certain parts of our traditional armed forces, to make up any special units required to undertake any special tasks to which our external affairs policy committed us.

What is happening now is that we are going to make up a special type of force that will perhaps be most beneficial to one type of defence policy. What is more, we are destroying our traditional concept of the forces. We are destroying our three forces and substituting therefor a new and untried concept of one armed force, which it is hoped will be most useful in a new role in external affairs. The reversal of this process will be very, very difficult. We are not embarking on something that can be treated lightly. It is not an experiment, as are some of the experiments in integration, that can be reversed overnight if we find it is not working. If we allow this bill to pass and the government then proceeds to change its external affairs policy so that their new concept of an armed force makes sense, and we are to try that foreign affairs policy for two or three years and then change our minds and decide that we should find some other role or roles more in keeping with our status as a nation, more in keeping with our size or the feeling of the nation as to what we should be doing in world affairs, we will find ourselves in a strait-jacket. You cannot turn around and create a navy overnight, after it has disappeared for two or three years. You will not be able to create an air force as fast as you can destroy it.

The idea of having just one force because of the whim of this minister, in view of the way this concept has been presented in the house and the political attitude taken by government supporters, which will leave us in a strait-jacket for many years to come when it comes to external affairs policy, is something that just makes me sweat. I think the reminder of the hon member for Carleton was most

timely in his appeal to the Prime Minister. Every hon. member of the house should be reminded of this. It makes me very much afraid of what is happening in this house when I hear hon. members opposite say, "Let us get on with the job," and when I hear them approach this very serious problem of unification and its long-term effects on this country with the political arguments that they have used.

The Minister of National Defence has been telling us that integration-unification are one package, despite the overwhelming evidence that this is directly contrary to the truth. Hon. members on the other side of the house have used such political red herrings as to suggest that those who are against unification are against integration, are against modernization of our forces and are against progress.

Mr. Hellyer: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nugent: How any member of parliament who takes his duties seriously and acts, as I believe a member should in this house, with some sort of honesty in regard to his duties, can state as his view such trash, in what should be a responsible speech, is quite beyond me. The hon. member for Leeds and one or two others on that side of the chamber followed exactly that policy, despite the wealth of the evidence to the contrary given by almost every witness who appeared before the defence committee that integration and unification are not one, that in fact integration is not one complete step at all, that each integration experiment is separate unto itself. I do not know how they can take this position, even with the assurance of General Allard, the chief of staff, who is for unification. The assurance of General Allard to the committee was that any step or any experiment in unification that does not work can be reversed. After that kind of clear evidence of how distinct and separate is each one of these experiments in integration, we still get this kind of nonsense from the minister and his blind followers on the other side of the house, namely that it is the integration-unification package that we are talking about today, and don't criticize unification or you are against progress.

If the mentality of hon. members opposite is of that standard, and if that is all they have learned after all the evidence that so many very able men gave to the defence committee, they should not be in this House of Commons, because either their intelligence is so weak or their integrity is so lacking that they are very badly misplaced here.

I hope I have time to deal with the speech of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, because it was a dandy. I did want to comment on the speech made by the Minister of Transport, since he is a very old and experienced member of this house—perhaps I should have said, since he is a very experienced elder member of this house—and one would normally expect to take what he says rather seriously. This, in essence, is what I gathered from his remarks: First, that we did not have to follow the advice of the experts on military affairs; that since we are breaking new ground and it is a new experiment, anybody's opinion is as good as anyone else's. That sounds to me an incredible approach to take, one that I did not think would be taken by anyone old enough to have graduated from school, and certainly not one in keeping with a man who holds a responsible portfolio in government, as does the Minister of Transport.

But the Minister of Transport pressed on with that theme. To give hon. members an illustration of how peculiar the thinking can get when one starts by saying we must defend the program, rather than logically arguing its faults or merits I would quote the following exchange as recorded on page 14670 of *Hansard* for April 7:

• (8:30 p.m.)

Mr. Pickersgill: I am not questioning the system. All I am saying is, if you have a lot of evidence on one side and no evidence on the other that proves nothing. That is all I am saying. I am not saying whether this is a suitable or good rule.

I would say that any member who stands up in this house and says that, since all the evidence is on one side and none on the other this proves nothing, is bringing forward a most remarkable theory. I can understand why the minister was thwarted in his attempts to become a lawyer. Obviously no one whose logic is so lopsided as that would ever be admitted to the bar of any province in this country. I thought the entire purpose of the evidence was to prove a point. However, the Minister of Transport continues to say the following, and perhaps more light will be shed on his argument as he progresses:

Mr. Harkness: Is the minister maintaining that the evidence does not prove anything?

Mr. Pickersgill: I am maintaining that if the witnesses on the one side of the case are allowed to speak and the witnesses on the other side are inhibited by the rule from speaking all the evidence will be on one side. That is all I am saying.

Then I asked the minister a question, and the gist of his reply was that since no evidence was given on the order side we should discount the evidence given by the independent witnesses, such as Lieutenant Generals Fleury and Moncel, who were free to speak.

I want to review for a minute the situation in that committee. We asked for all the evidence from all the witnesses, all the senior officers who were now free to speak and who had been in the armed forces since the inception of the integration program. We wanted to hear them all, so that we could get a consensus of what went on. We were balked at every turn by members on the Liberal side. We asked for many more witnesses than we were able to get. To get any of them was like pulling teeth.

If there had been any officers who had reached the normal retirement age or who had retired early who were in favour of unification, I am sure there would have been no objection to hearing their evidence from anyone on the Conservative side of the house. We wanted to get all the evidence from all of those who were in a position to give us their expert advice, who had knowledge of the situation and knowledge of the facts, and who were now free to speak. What the Minister of Transport said is that since the only ones who were free to speak were against unification we must ignore their evidence because, according to his reasoning their evidence does not mean anything. I suppose he accepted my argument that those who are still in the forces must simply follow the government's policy, and we are unable to get their private and personal opinion. He sums it up by saying that only those in the department who are inhibited from speaking freely are in favour of unification, that the only ones who spoke against it are from outside the department, and that therefore we have called only witnesses on one side of the argument.

As I attempted to suggest to him in my question, surely if there are people who are free to speak and who believe in unification they would have come. Would the Liberals not have called them before the committee if there were any such people? Surely they must have had some officers in the positions of Lieutenant Generals Fleury and Moncel and Air Marshal Annis who would have come forward and backed up the minister in his ridiculous stand on this question. Is it wrong for this house to conclude that because the only witnesses who were free to speak all spoke against unification there is nobody free to speak who is in favour of unification? This is the logical deduction which I would make from the failure of the proponents of unification to produce one free agent to speak on their behalf. When I say "one free agent" I must qualify it by saying that a couple of witnesses who appeared before the committee were in favour of unification, but most of them were out of touch with the services. General Foulkes spoke on both sides; and there was another independent witness, long removed from the services. But I think I am accurate in saying there was unanimous evidence before the committee given by those who were in the most responsible positions when the integration program was started, who were most intimately connected with what was going on in the forces and who were free to speak, that unification is wrong.

If some of them did not go quite so far as to say it was wrong, they certainly said it was wrong to proceed with it at this time. The most support the minister received was when some of them said that when the experiments with integration are completed, the results tried and tested, it might be found that unification would be a good thing and we might then introduce it. However, those are the kindest remark that the minister got from people who are in a position to know. Bearing that in mind, how can the assertion be made by so many hon. members on the other side that we should get on with the job, since integration and unification are one package? What nonsense.

The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, who was chairman of that committee, amazed me with his speech today. He said that all this bill does is to change the name of the forces. He certainly made a monkey out of those on the other side of the house who say it is necessary to pass the unification bill so that we can carry on the great work of integration, complete the modernization of our forces, streamline them and finish up the job started. As a matter of fact I thought this was the minister's theme song, this was his argument. The minister has been saying that it is all one package and that unification is necessary to complete the whole process. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra understands as well as I do that the minister's remark is a lot of hot air, because it is not all one process.

The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra told us that the bill on unification is not necessary. It is apparent that he has listened carefully to the evidence of the witnesses before the committee. I am afraid his financial arguments are a little confused because every

witness who came before the committee said that any saving which can result either from integration or unification will be the result of the integration process alone. They have all told us that unification will not save us money. Perhaps that is what the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra meant when he said that this bill is not necessary. He went on to say there would be no savings as a result of this bill. Certainly he demonstrated a degree of honesty which we wish the minister showed. It hurts me very much to hear the only member on the Liberal side being so honest about the financial aspect and so confused about the other aspects of unification, which makes his evidence on our behalf not very helpful.

This may be a little embarrassing to the minister, but that is the way that the chairman of that committee sees it after all those sittings. He said first that the bill is not necessary, second that unification will not save us money, and third that this bill does not affect the composition of the forces. This is a most remarkable statement; in fact I find it incredible. Here we have a bill, the sole purpose of which is to destroy the identity of the three separate forces as they now exist and substitute therefore the minister's brainchild of one force. In fact the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra is making light of this great achievement of the minister. He says that the bill does not affect the composition of the forces, and yet the Minister of National Defence says that this is a brilliant new concept, that Canada is now the leader of the world in this field and that other nations are just too slow and cowardly, but that soon they will follow us when we have this new force.

• (8:40 p.m.)

In spite of all this the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra says the bill has nothing to do with the composition of the forces. I am sure he must have taken a very active, personal dislike to General Allard, the chief of staff, because the only reason that has been put forward by the minister or anyone on his behalf was a remark made by General Allard. He said that he was sure once this bill had been passed and there was no more uncertainty, the forces would settle down and morale would have a chance to improve. This, Mr. Chairman, is the only reason for speed, the only justification given by General Allard, the minister or anyone else as to why this bill should be pressed with what we have always considered to be such unseemly haste. This was the reason we could not call more witnesses. The Liberals may have missed their chance. They may have been able to find an ex-service officer with knowledge and freedom to speak who may have upheld the minister's idea.

The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra says that this bill has nothing to do with morale. Then he says the real effect of it is to give the forces a new and honourable name. Surely, Mr. Chairman, this is highly insulting to those forces that have built up Canada's reputation abroad. This is highly insulting to those serving officers and men who, through two world wars, made it possible for any serviceman wearing a Canadian uniform to walk with pride, no matter in what company he may be. The Royal Canadian Army, the Royal Canadian Navy and the Royal Canadian Air Force have always had a tremendous reputation. However, the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra is going to give them a new and honourable name. I wonder, is there any limit to how much abuse the soldiers, sailors and airmen have to take from these members who will go to any lengths in their assertion that, because what they are doing is new, then obviously it must be right. Anyone who gets in the way is an old fuddy-duddy who has done nothing to deserve any consideration, and who is trying to block progress.

I think perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I have dealt sufficiently with the background and the manner in which some of this evidence has been handled by people who should know better. I do not care what party a member represented on that committee or what party he represents in the house, his duty is to weigh carefully the evidence in as objective a manner as possible. His mind should be made up only after a careful and fair consideration of the evidence. The evidence of no witness should be rejected out of hand because it happens to conflict with a preconceived opinion. Due weight and consideration should be given to the person giving evidence, his experience, the position he occupies, his access to information and his ability and willingness to speak freely and frankly to the committee. I reject any suggestion that any of the witnesses who came before our committee were not trying to give us the truth in so far as they were able.

I have pointed out, and I believe the Minister of Transport has indicated he agrees with me, that serving officers are inhibited in giving their evidence, that they can only give evidence that is in line with the policy they

are bound to carry out. This evidence, therefore, cannot be given the same weight as the evidence of independent officers. However, this is not a reflection on their honesty. I believe it is a reflection, perhaps, on this house, as I pointed out some time ago. Certainly, if we are going to call witnesses before a committee, they should be able to give free and honest opinions. I disagreed with the minister when he said that he had the right to indicate what he wanted them to say. Certainly I believe this is a matter which should be looked into by the house.

Be that as it may, the evidence before the committee has been overwhelming, from those who were free to speak, to the effect that unification should not come now. Another group of witnesses said they would not go so far as to say unification would never work, but it certainly would not work now. It certainly needs more study. I hope, Mr. Chairman, to have other opportunities to speak because I firmly believe that many of these officers, after long years of service to the country and with the technical competence they have, should have their opinions put on the record of this house. The next time I speak I hope to be able to quote from their evidence and give a few good examples of their excellent opinions.

Mr. Clancy: I should like to ask my colleague about the other ranks, since he referred to officers who were inhibited from speaking.

Mr. Nugent: The only people who were called before the committee to give evidence on behalf of the department were officers. I was talking about the evidence before the committee rather than opinions in the country generally because we know the people in the service are inhibited from speaking, whether they are officers or other ranks.

• (8:50 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, a week ago I opened for the opposition, the discussion on Bill No. C-243 and, since that time, we have heard many members from all sides of the house. In fact, looking over the list of speakers, I see that 16 government members, about 20 members of the official opposition, five of the New Democratic Party and three independent members have participated in the discussion and their speeches were fairly extensive; following this, the Social Credit party and the Ralliement Créditiste both participated.

In view of the fact that we have also had interventions on a completely separate subject related to defence, the external affairs of the country, it seems to me that we are considering not only the technical aspect of the amendment to the National Defence Act but also the entire program of external affairs of the country.

That is why I found rather strange the words of my hon. friend the member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) when he closed his remarks Friday afternoon by saying:

> Therefore, we say, now that everything has been said, let us act, let us vote and the electorate will judge whether this government is right or wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I find this an over-simplification of the problem. True, a blind or a deaf man may, if you will, be forced to vote, and if the electorate has to decide whether the government is right or wrong. I believe that by that time it is a little too late. If we destroy our armed forces by this reorganization, it will then be too late to say: The government has done that.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that ten to 15 years will be required to correct—

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Lambert: Surely.

Mr. Mongrain: Has the hon. member the impression that his flow of words and speeches will change the opinion of any member? Has he not rather the impression that all have made their decision and that we are continuing to speak without settling anything?

Mr. Lambert: It may be that, in this context, I was ahead of the views of the hon. member for, in my first contribution to the debate a week ago, I said that the government had asked or demanded that the house state its views on second reading, and the yea or nay of an hon. member, whether on the government side or in opposition, would not have changed his opinion, as a result of all the testimony we have heard in committee; therefore, the government has proceeded under a false principle, and so there is nothing new there.

But what I would like to say to the hon. member for instance, is that here the evidence given before the committee can be reviewed, so that the public in general will understand the principles involved. Public opinion has changed to a great extent in the last week and even in the last few days.

In fact, what we have heard in our ridings is enough to make us realize that people understand the difference between integration and unification. I do not know if the hon. member has underlined that difference, because he left room for doubt in his speech Friday afternoon.

What does the word integration mean? And the word unification? For the information of the hon. member, I feel that the debate—in which the government members took part as much as the opposition members—showed the people what was what. There was a certain amount of reporting, but it is also true that some reporters or newspapermen have become fed up; they cannot make up new headlines, so they get fed up, because they want news, something new. We might organize a dance to create a diversion or change somewhat the present atmosphere.

But, on the other hand, are we not trying to decide a matter of major importance, a fundamental matter, something which we will be unable to get rid of tomorrow? That is tragic for those of us who oppose not only the principle of unification but unification now or later, or unification itself.

I do not accept the principle of unification and I am as sincere in this view as any of those who accept it. The hon. member for Trois-Rivières emphasized many times everybody's good faith and, therefore, blameworthy motives should not be imputed to anybody. On the other hand, I will say this, to him and to all hon. members: the truth always persists and a repetition of good arguments does not weaken them. In certain circumstances, arguments must be repeated, sometimes in one way, sometimes in another way. Therefore, I say that we have not lost our time.

We have heard almost all members of the defence committee. Certainly, a few others will take part in this debate; at least I hope so. I am sure we will hear in a few moments the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Groos), who was chairman of the committee for several weeks. As a former career officer, he should have some observations to make.

Now, I should like to go back to another matter raised by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire). I deeply regret that he is not in his seat tonight. He took issue with my colleagues from Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) and Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill), as well as myself, charging that we were racists because we objected to certain statements made by General Allard.

Well, I can say he is the one who introduced racialism, as some journalists did, too, who claimed that we were criticizing General Allard because he was a French Canadian, because he spoke French. But why General Allard and not General Moncel, or General Fleury? They too are French Canadians. And also, some criticism has been overlooked—

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. I do not want to be unkind to the hon. member, on the contrary; but I should like to ask him to state very clearly that he is not putting the member for Trois-Rivières in the same bag with the member for Lapointe. I do not want to be associated with his remarks, especially with regard to racialism.

Mr. Lambert: No, I thought I had indicated clearly that I was through referring to the remarks the hon. member for Trois-Rivières made last week about General Allard.

As for me, whether the chief of the armed forces is named Smith, Boychuk or Allard, I could not care less. But I maintain that he had no right to speak as he did. After all, our argument was based on a reliable report published in the newspaper *La Presse* in which he was reported as having condemned the motives of certain members opposed to Bill No. C-243. I shall not repeat his remarks, but I do not think the chief of the armed forces was justified in imputing motives to members of the house. I shall not add anything more, but he had no right to say that.

On a technical matter, it is only natural to disagree, because after all, it is impossible to always reach unanimous agreement.

I feel that even though he disagrees with his former colleagues on that point, they can also be believed. As for him, I am not imputing any motive but, on the other hand, he should not impute any to us either.

[*English*]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I found the intervention by the Minister of Transport the other evening to be rather strange, and this point has been referred to by my colleague from Edmonton-Strathcona and others. It is not so much that he wanted to discuss whether unification was good or bad; he was directing his remarks to something that I think is quite fundamental to a discussion of this bill, and the procedures of this house in arriving at his conclusions on this bill. He was raising a doubt as to whether retired

officers should come before a committee to testify on military matters.

The minister said that these officers did not put any evidence before us but that what they said was only a matter of opinion. Gracious me, Mr. Chairman, even before the committee on transport and communications the greater part of the evidence given on the bill that the minister had before the committee was a matter of opinion. If I may say so, there is a great deal of difference between the type of witnesses one would call to speak on a bill such as Bill No. C-243, which deals with military matters, and witnesses who would give evidence on a bill dealing with transport. After all, Mr. Chairman, military men are not out on civvy street; they are specialists and are found only in the armed services. That is where they get their knowledge.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Admittedly some civilians, if one distinguishes them from military persons, are also experts on military theory. I would have hoped that some civilians might have come forward to testify for or against this measure, to give the committee the benefit of their opinions.

It has been suggested that the former officers brought forward to testify were sympathetic to the opposition. I know I put forward the names of several officers on behalf of the official opposition, at the suggestion of my colleagues, but I do not think anyone knew what at least 90 per cent of their testimony would be.

Mr. Hellyer: The hon. member is not being serious?

Mr. Lambert: That is a fact.

Mr. Hellyer: The hon. member ought to talk to some of his colleagues. I have had conversations in private with some of them.

Mr. Lambert: I will not mention names. We did not know what 90 per cent of the testimony was to be. I can say this to the minister, that it was not known what the testimony of the former chief of the defence staff would be. The majority of men who have testified have kept their silence and their counsel. I could have dredged up men by the legion who would damn the minister in no uncertain terms. He should have listened to some telephone calls I received in Edmonton during Easter week from service and ex-service personnel. They spoke about unification. I will not repeat what they said about the minister, but they were not complimentary about the legislation he proposes.

Be that as it may, the members of the defence committee needed expert advice about the workings of integration and unification. One cannot say that in the main the retired officers who came before the committee had been retired for many years, or that the minister had discussed or failed to discuss this measure with them. Most of these men had had recent experience, and their testimony must be weighed carefully and must be given grave consideration by all hon. members of the house and by the public.

I know some feel that when a man reaches the rank of major general, rear admiral or air vice marshal that he starts wearing too much gold braid, which gives off some sort of radiation affecting his brain, and that he begins suffering from senility. This is a grave misconception. I suppose, similarly, that editorial writers think this way about publishers. They imagine that "the old man has gone soft in the top story". When it comes to running a newspaper I think that editorial writers, news reporters or cartoonists will agree that the publisher very likely is some streets ahead of the men who criticize him. Of course there are exceptions.

I say to this house that it will be a poor day when we cannot get men to come before a committee to express their views. I will agree that senior serving officials in the department should confine their testimony to facts. As will be seen from the testimony of a number of witnesses, when they were asked questions about confidential matters, about confidential advice they had given to the minister or others, they quite properly claimed privilege. No one insisted that they breach it. It will be to the advantage of the house to adhere to this facet of procedure. Before the Indian affairs and northern development committee the former commissioner of the Northwest Territories had some blunt things to say. When a man of mature judgment and experience who has had a great deal to do with implementing a policy comes forward should we not, as laymen, listen to him? How is one to determine policy? Is one to take only the minister's advice? This is the last thing we ought to do; otherwise we all become rubberstamps for ministerial suggestions.

It will be a happier day when legislative proposals are turned over to committees before second reading, to be accepted or rejected in principle at that stage. The present

measure is a classic example of why our system is not working. The Minister of Finance has said that legislation emanating from the Carter report on taxation will be placed before a committee, as a proposal, before acceptance on second reading. That I think is a step in the right direction. That procedure was followed with the transportation legislation last year, also in the Northwest Territories bill. These are halting steps in the evolution of parliament.

An hon. Member: By way of policy?

Mr. Lambert: I say this is part of the evolutionary process. What I have suggested ought to be done is in fact done in many legislatures of western Europe. As I say, I think this bill shows, in a classic way, where our procedure has been wrong. This afternoon, the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra made a ploy, if one may term it that, saying that we should get on with this bill: "It is so easy, let us get on with it." What is the hurry? I am reminded of a cartoon drawn by Chambers where, standing against the wall, with their hands tied behind their backs, and facing the execution squad are a soldier, a sailor and an airman. In charge of the execution squad are caricatures of the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence. To them is attributed the caption, "We have decided to go on with the execution, but we will postpone the funeral." This is precisely what the government intends to do with the bill. They say, "Pass this bill and we shall defer its implementation.

• (9:10 p.m.)

Vice Admiral Hennessy has said that morale in the navy is high. General Allard in his evidence before the committee said morale would get worse if this bill were not passed. Would morale indeed get worse if this bill is not passed? Remember there is not one member on this side of the house who talks about fighting morale when he talks about morale. As Admiral Landymore said in his testimony in June of last years: Ask me about the morale of men in maritime command; there are two kinds; if you talk about fighting morale there is not one who is not prepared to do his duty and even beyond it; but when it comes to a different kind of morale, job future, certainty, living conditions and all those things, morale is backward. It is in this second sense that we have discussed morale. Never once has there been a question as to the fighting qualities of our forces. Fighting capacity, yes, but that is something which is related to numbers and training, or the excessive bleed-out of men getting out ahead of time, and a weakness in recruiting brought on by the uncertainty of some of the steps taken toward integration, the "golden bowler" program, for instance, and some of the other things which weakened the direction of the forces.

Now we are faced with this other business of unification. Some may ask: Why repeat these things? As I said to the hon. member for Trois Rivières, a good argument never loses force by repetition.

Mr. Hellyer: Does the hon. member say the same of a bad argument?

Mr. Lambert: A poor argument never had any substance to start with.

Mr. Hellyer: Well—

Mr. Lambert: The minister is a great one for generalizations. This whole question of integration and unification could have been put forward in a better way. There would have been less uncertainty in the forces; there would have been a greater understanding by the public and by this house if the minister had given us much more information, if he had been fair with hon. members instead of treating us as ignoramuses, as we were treated on a number of occasions. We are not ignoramuses. I do not know what the minister used to think when he was in opposition. Was he then an expert?

The dilemma in which this house finds itself is still unresolved. It is one which has been adverted to by my hon. friend from Edmonton-Strathcona, by the hon. member for Greenwood, by the hon. member for Vancouver East and others. It was introduced by the Secretary of State for External Affairs when he intervened in the debate. It is something to which I myself have adverted during earlier debates with regard to Bill C-243, namely that the objectives of our defence policy have been modified or are to be modified, because the way in which reorganization of our forces is now taking place would make those forces incompatible with the full discharge of the present commitments and objectives of our defence policy.

Defence policy cannot be determined by the nature of our armed forces. That is putting the cart before the horse. Yet, as was pointed out by a number of the witnesses before the committee, we are committing ourselves in this bill to organize our forces in such a way

as to lose our ability to fulfil our obligations as we have undertaken them.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs told us clearly the other afternoon that no change in policy had taken place and that none was contemplated for the time being, though perhaps in the future the situation could alter. If that is the case, a much larger question mark has been placed over this bill. This bill is not necessary in order that integration of command may be brought about. There is a great deal of work still to be done. The whole of materiel command has to be organized and brought into operation. The machinery has to go on stream, and it is a long way from that at present. The same applies to training command. There are a number of ancillary and related problems which so far have not even been discovered.

The minister strikes me as an architect, or an engineer who hires a contractor to put up a building of revolutionary design. He puts in the foundations, builds the walls and the roof, closes in the windows, and then says: We had better test the foundations. This is where he has gone wrong.

This bill is completely and utterly unnecessary. In fact, the bringing forward of this idea at the minister's insistence has meant the loss of his most senior advisers and many more whose services we can ill afford to lose. Why? They are all out of step and he is the only one who is in step. As a result of this unresolved question between foreign policy and defence policy I wish to reiterate an argument which has been made earlier today—that the Prime Minister himself must now come into the picture. It is his responsibility as the senior minister to enter this debate and lay out clearly the relationship between the foreign policy of this government and its defence policy in the light of what it proposes to do. Until this is done the basic question behind this proposal will be left unresolved.

Mr. Fulton: I think it is not without significance that the discussion on this important and far reaching measure is taking place at a time which coincides with the 50th anniversary of the battle of Vimy Ridge, an anniversary which we have officially marked in Canada by sending a contingent of veterans overseas to take part in ceremonies on the site of that battle.

• (9:20 p.m.)

I am ill-equipped to pay adequate tribute to the heroism of those who fought in that battle or in the other battles of that war, or of the second world war, the Korean war, or any of the battles in which Canadian forces have taken part. Suffice it to say, however, that this is an area, the area of military accomplishment and of honour on the field of battle, in which Canada has established no mean tradition. Canadians have a very fine tradition of accomplishment militarily on land, on the sea and in the air and I would suggest therefore to the minister, and to hon. members opposite, especially to the Minister of Transport in the light of the speech he made on Friday last, that it would behoove them to take a second look at any measure which, as this measure does, strikes so directly at the heart and the content and the feeling of Canadians with respect to their military traditions, their service traditions, and the traditions of the splendid units which have served Canada so well in the past.

I am not one of those, and I think there are few of them in this chamber, who are opposed to change where change is demonstrated to be beneficial and where it is clearly proven that the change will produce a better result than the situation which now prevails. But I am indeed opposed to change for the sake of change especially where, as on the evidence we have before us so far, we have the opinions, not of reactionaries but of military moderates, of the people who have had training, who have brought their minds and their thoughts, and their desire to serve the best interests of Canada, to bear upon this problem. They have declared themselves overwhelmingly against the proposition that this bill will do any good, and overwhelmingly in favour of the proposition that the bill, on the contrary, will do great damage to the military effectiveness of Canada's Armed Forces.

What have we in effect by way of background for the consideration we are giving this measure tonight? We have here one minister, the Minister of National Defence, against over 30 senior advisers who, because of their disagreement with the policy, have either been compulsorily retired or have taken early retirement. These are not brass hats in the old and opprobrious sense of the word. They are not Colonel Blimps. They are men in whom Canada has a substantial investment in training and in experience, men from whom Canada should be getting the maximum return now in terms of advice and service and in the shaping of the armed forces in line with the accepted policy, and that is the policy of integration and not the policy of unification.

Well, where are they now? Gone, all gone; and the minister remains in the face of the

weight of evidence, adamant, stubborn, determined like a Hitler to give no extra ground in spite of the advice of his senior advisers—nor an inch. It does not matter if it means sacrificing the best interests of the armed forces of this country—not an inch will he give, because he personally is committed; and his personal position to him means more than what any council of moderation would advise, such as some gesture, some adjustment in view of the overwhelming evidence that has been given before the standing committee on national defence.

The minister now blames the press. "Oh," he says, "the effects of this bill have been misrepresented. The controversy has been misreported and distorted in the press." It is not just the senior military advisers; it is the press of the country, never the minister, never his stubbornness, but always somebody else who is wrong. "Yes," he says, "they distorted the meaning of the statements." But then in his discussion in Toronto recently before a group of young Liberals, having attacked the press he went on to attack Admiral Landymore. Having attacked the press because it reported the facts, then he attacked Admiral Landymore; and after that he said, "I hope the press won't report what I have just said." What a childish attitude. And, Mr. Chairman, he was on television. The minister, with all his avowed modernity, forgets there is a modern means of communication which, unfortunately from his point of view, brings home to the public the absurdity of his position.

That is the background against which we are discussing this measure. But while I think it is important to bear these facts in mind and to assess the importance or the significance of the minister's stubborn position, these are not the most important arguments or reasons that we should bring to bear in forming our judgment of the measure. No, the arguments in principle, the laws of principle remain, and they of course outweigh even the considerations of the evidence to which I have been referring.

I repeat, sir, that on the basis of the evidence, on the basis of the facts, there has been no sufficient justification made out to support the far-reaching and the dangerous proposals that are embodied in this bill. There has been no sufficient justification for the headlong plunge into unification, with all the turmoil, and all the upset, and all the loss of efficiency, and all the loss to the services of the senior advisers that it has involved and will involve in the future.

[Mr. Fulton.]

Search as you will, I defy hon. members opposite, or the minister, to show us where is the justification for this measure. Does it lie in the realm of economy? Are we going to save money by this proposed measure? Certainly not. According to the evidence of the distinguished officer who for seven years was chief military adviser of past governments and of this government, there is to be no economy.

If one looked for an illustration of the absurdity of the argument in favour of economy the demonstration of it is complete and total. One could find it in the recent words of the minister himself. He said there was going to be economies but when taxed with the question of what it meant to have one common uniform, did he say it would result in savings? No, he said that when servicemen were doing their ordinary daily work they will retain their working uniforms, and when attending any traditional ceremonies, in messes or elsewhere, they will retain their traditional uniforms. He said that only when walking out will they have a common uniform. What kind of absurdity is that?

So a common uniform means one extra uniform, and what pride can any one man, or any one unit have in the fact that when he or they walk out, instead of wearing a traditional uniform they have to wear a common uniform? What kind of saving is that? What improvement will it bring to their morale; or is it just extra expenditure on an extra uniform which will add nothing in terms of economy or efficiency?

What about efficiency itself? Is the single rank structure going to add to the efficiency of the fighting prowess of the men in the units and of the service themselves? Can it be denied that if we are to have effective defence forces for an effective defence of Canada—and in spite of the minister's intransigency that is still the primary responsibility of any government, to ensure the national security of the country—we have to have forces capable of military effort against attack, capable of striking a blow on the sea against any seaborne invasion or follow-up, capable of military effort on land to contain, and to repel, and to defeat any land forces that may attack us?

I see that the minister has just received another message from on high. I mention this in passing, Mr. Chairman.

To continue, we have to have forces capable of effort in the air, capable of beating down an airborne assault on Canada and of attacking troops on land. We have to have forces

capable of military effort in the three spheres. If it is necessary to have forces capable of a military effort in three spheres, what possible increase in effectiveness would there be in having them in one uniform instead of three, or in having a single rank structure instead of three. This has not been demonstrated and of course cannot be. What about the national interest; what about Canada's responsibility for maintaining and protecting the integrity of Canada. I suggest the evidence clearly establishes that if this course of unification is proceeded with it will mean that now, and in the foreseeable and definite future, when it comes to the matter of the defence of Canada, once again we will be dependent upon the United States and will not be able to play even our proportionate part in the defence of the North American continent.

• (9:30 p.m.)

While no one for a moment would suggest that Canada, by itself, can defend its part of the North American continent, nevertheless it is our responsibility to play our full part in the alliances and defence arrangements. This certainly means we must be prepared to integrate closely our forces in these alliances with the forces of those with whom we are allied in respect of the defence of the North American continent. This means the close co-operation of our forces with those of the United States, and we are fortunate that that country is there. How on earth does the minister suggest that this unified force of which he is speaking will be capable of bringing about a more effective Canadian effort, in respect of the type of Canadian responsibilities we have in this sense, than would three integrated forces each capable of its own distinct but co-ordinated effort in the three areas in which the defence forces must function, namely on the sea, on land, and in the air?

What about the more effective discharge of our defence commitments? Is it here that the bill can be justified? As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Edmonton West and other hon. members, we do not even know what our commitments are. The NORAD arrangement is under review at the present time. Is the minister in a position to tell us what will be the result of that review?

If the minister knows, will he tell us what factors govern the decision we are being asked to make here concerning the kind of forces we should have. The NATO commitment is under review at the present time, but we have had no statement either from the Minister of National Defence or from the Secretary of State for External Affairs concerning the direction these negotiations are taking. We have had no statement concerning an alteration in any of our commitments, any new commitments, or the affirmation of an old commitment which might come out of these reviews.

As a result of this bill, if it passes, we will be giving our forces a narrow capability. They will be capable of only one exercise, the exercise which the minister appears to hold in priority to all others.

Mr. Hellyer: Where did you get that false impression?

Mr. Fulton: From the minister's own words. From the only things the minister has said it is evident that he places at the top of the priority a peace keeping force.

Mr. Hellyer: You have not read my speech.

Mr. Fulton: The minister's speech is capable of a number of interpretations; but the minister's whole attitude is capable of one interpretation and that is that in his view Canada's prime contribution in the defence field is that of an integrated force capable of being transported anywhere in the world for a brushfire operation. Therefore in that sense our commitments and our capabilities must be tailored to the kind of forces we have. Yet, when we have the situation where our commitments are in fact being reviewed, when NORAD and NATO are under review, what should happen is that we should keep our plans flexible so that our forces are tailored to our commitments, instead of our commitments having to be tailored to the kind of defence force this bill inevitably will force upon us.

There is another and I think more important objection than those to which I have referred. Not only do we fail to find any justification for the measure on the grounds I have mentioned, such as economy, efficiency, national interest, and the discharge of our defence commitments, but the primary objection to the whole headlong precipitous course which the minister asks us to follow is jeopardizing the one sound, sensible policy, and that is the policy of integration.

I cannot understand why the minister, who professes to be a progressive and far-sighted man, would run the risk of jeopardizing the policy of integration. This is more than any of us, military advisors or anyone else who has given much thought to this matter based on

experience, can possibly understand. In support of my contention that the bill jeopardizes the policy of integration, I should like to refer to the evidence of Air Marshal Miller as given in the committee on national defence. Air Marshal Miller emphasized that he and all the senior military advisors were committed to and were working hard to implement the policy of integration. He also emphasized that the policy was far from complete, and that the program was far from being implemented. He said there were many unresolved problems of a type which required solution in order to lay a sound basis for the development of integrated forces and an integrated and effective effort. He said that this was being, and would be, jeopardized by rushing into unification.

I should like to refer members of the committee to a portion of the air marshal's evidence in this connection as reported in the *Gazette* of Saturday, April 8. In discussing the theory of integration he said:

> There have been various approaches to working and developing an organization that will control the three services. We have had examples of it in the two world wars, and we have examples of it in many of today's activities. So that, I think, anybody who has been in the military, thinks, and has studied the problem of what we have come to call here in the Canadian scene, in the context here, integration. By that I mean the operating of the three services under a single—what I would call—management. A single defence staff, a single planning organization, and a single budgeting arrangement.

This, of course, is the outline of an effective and co-ordinated defence effort. In the course of his evidence, Air Chief Marshal Miller was asked this question:

• (9:40 p.m.)

> But was there consultation between the military and civilians, or were you under instructions as chief of staff to bring up plans for unification?

To that question he replied:

> To the best of my knowledge and recollection, I have never had any instruction to bring up a unified plan.

I pause there to point out that Air Chief Marshal Miller was chief of defence staff until as recently as July of last year, and he says he had never had any instructions to bring up a unified plan. He had received no instruction to bring up a plan for unification up to July of last year. This bill was introduced last fall, and we are told now, to paraphrase the minister's words and his stand, that the whole welfare and efficiency of the defence effort of the country depends on getting this bill through. It has been too long delayed, we are told. Yet no instructions were given for the preparation of the first plan for a so-called program of unification as late as July of last year when Air Chief Marshal Miller resigned.

Air Chief Marshal Miller gave another answer that I think is of special significance. He was asked whether he would comment on the bill and its dedication to the principle of unification, and said:

> Specifically on the bill, I am not familiar with it because I have not had an opportunity to really look at it.

He went on:

> On the principle of integration, my own feelings about it are that it might very well be the end result. I do not think it is timely now.

I do not want to substitute my opinion for that of Air Chief Marshal Miller but I think that passage should read, "On the principle of unification, my own feelings about it are that it might very well be the end result." Then he said:

> I do not think it is timely now. I have felt that the problem of integration and getting the organization, if you like, was the area where the biggest return in manpower savings and in effective control of military lay, and it was important to get that right before we had ventured into the area of unification.

In those passages and others from the evidence of Air Chief Marshal Miller it becomes quite evident that what concerned the chief military advisers of the government was that they were all committed to the program of integration but felt that that program, and indeed the welfare and effectiveness of Canada's defence forces were jeopardized by the rush into unification. What they were saying was, "Let us get on with and complete the program of integration." Incidentally, that policy and program started long before the present minister was even in the house. It was started shortly after the end of world war II. It was started by the very men whom the minister has been attempting to brand as brass hats and reactionaries. It was started by the military moderates who thought and planned and succeeded in bringing forward plans, modifications and reforms that were in the interests of the country, and it was furthered by a number of ministers before this minister ever came into the house.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the hon. member, where in the evidence it was suggested that they had brought forward the integration plan?

Mr. Fulton: That who had brought forward the integration plan?

Mr. Hellyer: Whomever you are talking about.

Mr. Fulton: Does the minister say that this is one of his brainchildren? Is the minister now trying to claim parentage for the plan of integration? Does he say that his predecessors Brooke Claxton, George Pearkes and my seatmate in the house had no ideas of integration? Does the minister pretend that he brought in the concept of a chief of combined staffs and a chief of staffs committee, which were innovations of this concept and the first step in the policy of integration, with a definite idea of integration? These things were done long before this minister became minister of national defence. Those were the steps taken and the plan of these military moderates, over 30 of them, who have resigned or been forced to take retirement because of their disagreement with unification. These were the things to which they were dedicated. They resigned because they felt these plans were being jeopardized by the minister's unthinking, unjustified, unsubstantiated and headlong rush into unification.

This is exactly what Air Chief Marshal Miller said. These were not men who resigned in a blaze of publicity, although one or two of them did because they were forced into public controversy with the minister. Does the minister suggest that Vice Admiral Dyer is not a thoughtful and progressive military moderate? Does the minister suggest that General Fleury is not a thoughtful and progressive military moderate? Does the minister suggest that General Moncel is not a thoughtful, intelligent, brilliant military thinker and planner, and a moderate? All these people, and others, resigned because they felt the sensible, intelligent, progressive, sound plans to which they were dedicated were being jeopardized by the brainchild of the minister and one or two of his inexpert advisers. That is the fact.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Would the minister put his nod on the record?

Mr. Fulton: I suggest that it is incumbent upon this committee, having assessed the situation, having heard the weight of the evidence, bearing in mind the advice that has been received by the government, and now by the house and the country, from these experts in the field, not to jeopardize the sensible reform of Canada's armed forces and Canada's defence effort. This is a reform which would have the result of a co-ordinated staff, co-ordinated planning, integrated supply services and integrated efforts on the part of three fighting services of top efficiency. Those integrated plans should not be jeopardized. Rather, we should say it is not necessary to proceed with this measure now. This is the overwhelming advice we have received. We should say: Let us complete and consolidate the measure of integration. Let us build the integrated forces. Let us build in Canada the most skilful and effective integrated defence forces in the history of any country. But let us not jeopardize all this by succumbing to the dictates of one minister, which have already resulted in the largest purge in the peacetime history of any western country of skilled, seasoned, thoughtful and intelligent military advisers.

Let us get on with the job of building the integrated forces. Let us get on with the job of building the kind of forces which, when it is necessary—and let us pray God it never will be—to call upon them, will repeat, with the same morale, the same splendid tradition, feats such as those to which we have just paid tribute, the feats of Vimy Ridge. Let us get on with the job of building these integrated forces. If we do that with half the skill with which we built the separate forces, and if we can build the kind of Canadian defence forces which will attract Canadians into service and in which they will serve with the same zeal as did the veterans at Vimy, Ortona and at Korea, preserving the traditions and morale of the fighting services, giving them the best backing in integrated command, planning and supply of the best weapons, we can be proud of the job we are doing.

Parliament will have performed a really tremendous service to the country by insisting that this bill be brought to a halt and demanding that the minister and his staff get on with the job of integration, in order that Canada's role in the field of defence may remain sufficiently flexible, so that when our commitments are determined we will have forces of the kind that can be designed to discharge those commitments with the same splendid tradition of heroism, valour and effectiveness as has always characterized Canada's armed forces in her past glorious history.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. Thomas (Middlesex West): Mr. Chairman, there are a few comments which I should like to add to this debate. First, there is an evident desire to proceed to a clause by

clause study of the bill, and some demonstrations of impatience that the opposition is taking time to explain its position and bring out the points which it feels should be made for the benefit of Canadians generally, to help them to reach an understanding of what is involved in this so-called unification program. The opposition has a job to do, and its job is to make the objections to this proposed legislation perfectly clear to the Canadian public. Because this is a matter of great importance, the clarification to the public of the matters involved is so important that the necessary time should be taken, and I hope that the impatience of which we saw signs will be less evident in the future than it has in the past.

The rules of parliament are made so that the opposition can bring forward objection to any legislation which is offered by the government, and the time is provided under the rules for this to be done. If the government is not satisfied with the way this has been done, it has a remedy which it can apply.

One reporter wrote that this debate has gone on for 119 days, since the introduction of the white paper in 1964. I am not prepared to vouch for the correctness of that statement, but we do know that the debate has gone on for a long time, and rightly so. Surely the length of the debate and the efforts of the opposition to make good its points against this legislation should be a warning to the government to listen to the opposition and to modify its legislation. What the opposition is asking for, and all it is asking for, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Kamloops, is that this rush to do away with the three branches of our armed forces, the army, the navy and the air force, and to unite them into one single force should be stopped at this stage, until the integration which has been taking place up to date can be thoroughly tried out, and improved upon where necessary. Following this, if it becomes evident that unification, or the abolition of our army, navy and air force and their union into one organization with a single command, a common uniform and a common rank structure, should be carried out, this should not be done until the present state of integration has been thoroughly proven.

The people of Canada have been very uncertain as to what is involved. In listening to the debate over the years the government itself seems to have been very uncertain as to what is involved. It was not until quite recently that the ultimate objective of doing away with the army, the navy and the air force and uniting them into one body was made clear and that the objections to the whole program became very pronounced. I suggest that the management of this legislation has been mishandled. Uncertainty has been allowed to persist and the government has failed to make its position clear.

[Mr. Thomas (Middlesex West).]

I should like to refer the committee to an editorial which appeared in *The Legionary*, the official organ of the Royal Canadian Legion, for the month of November, 1966. The Legion, through its president, wrote a letter to the Prime Minister. I believe that part of it should be put on the record at this time. It reads as follows:

> We have been deeply concerned at some of the public statements which have been made lately, both by those opposing and those proposing complete unification of the Canadian forces. In spite of our best efforts to understand the situation we are compelled to say that, because of the lack of authoritative, clear-cut information and explanation we find ourselves unable at this moment to form a sound judgment on the whole question.
>
> The Royal Canadian Legion is not interested in the partisan politics which appear to be developing in connection with this question. We are, however, deeply concerned about the question of the state and condition of our defence forces at any given time. It appears to us that sufficient thought and planning have not been given to the important questions of tradition, morale and esprit de corps or, if so, the members of Canada's forces and the public have certainly been kept in ignorance.

The point I am trying to make here is that there has been continuous uncertainty, even on the part of the best informed people in this country, concerning the question of the unification of our armed forces. For that reason the government should listen to the opposition and should be prepared to stop the integration process in its present state and to give it a thorough try before proceeding further. That is all that the opposition is asking.

Mr. Chairman, may I call it ten o'clock?

The Chairman: It being ten o'clock shall I rise, report progress and request leave to sit again at the next sitting of the house?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will carry on with this fascinating debate. Should it conclude during the course of the day, we will take the business that I announced the other night.

• (10:00 p.m.)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

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

CANADIAN CENTENNIAL—CASTLEGAR, B.C.—REQUEST FOR PRESENTATION OF AIR FORCE PERFORMANCE

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, it will not take me very long to lay my complaint before the minister. The riding which I represent has always been very interested in navy, army and air cadets. The young people of the district in the various schools throughout the years have taken a great interest in the cadet corps. I am pleased to say, and the minister may not know this, that the Castlegar air cadets won the prize this year for the whole of Canada. I certainly congratulate the commanding officer, the parents and the children. The navy cadets of Kootenay West won first prize for the cadets in British Columbia. I hope the minister is taking in all of this.

There has always been a great interest in flying in our district. We have an unusually large number of men and women who have their private licence to fly planes. Even the little village some miles from where I live, with a total population of only 1,000, has a small airfield. I believe there are about ten young people in that district who have their private licence for flying planes. There has been a great deal of interest in the district in recent years in respect of the R.C.A.F. Golden Centennials. The people have discussed this group and are anxious to see a full show at Castlegar. I have had letters from practically every municipality in the riding of Kootenay West urging that the Department of National Defence, if it is possible, provide a full air show at Castlegar when this squadron is visiting the interior of British Columbia.

It is for that reason I asked the following question as reported on page 14422 of *Hansard* for April 3:

> I dislike very much intruding twice during one question period—

This is quite correct, Mr. Speaker.

> —but this is a matter of urgency.

It is from the point of view of the people I have the honour to represent.

> In view of the request by the municipalities in Kootenay West, representing the wishes of the people, that the R.C.A.F. Golden Centennials put on a full show while in Castlegar on July 14, and in view of the fact that the Castlegar squadron of the Royal Canadian Air Cadets, Kootenay West, has been chosen as the top squadron in Canada, will favourable consideration be given to the request of the municipalities and the 25,000 spectators expected to attend—

I should like the minister to let me know what can be done about this so that I can reply to the municipalities as soon as possible. I apologize for keeping him late this evening after a very tiring day.

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows, I think, from correspondence that I did offer to look at this question. Regrettably, the itinerary of the Golden Centenaires has been made up and is already so full that the crews are being worked to the maximum of their endurance. It has been suggested by the staff that any additional performances would be more than could rightfully be expected from them and might produce fatigue which would jeopardize the safety of the unit. It has, therefore, been recommended to me, and I have had to concur with the judgment of the staff, that additional performances should not be authorized.

The unit will be flying through Castlegar en route on two occasions, I believe, and there will be opportunity while there to talk to the crews. The air cadets can see what the airplanes look like and have discussions with the crews of the acrobatic team. I am sorry I cannot give my hon. friend a more positive reply, or that in this case we cannot oblige him and authorize the extra performances that have been requested. I really feel, under the circumstances, it would be doing an injustice to the very fine crews who form the Golden Centenaire team. I really do not think I would be justified in this case in overruling the judgment of the staff.

Mr. Herridge: Could I ask a question. Would the minister let us know the dates that these men will be there?

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—REQUEST FOR NIGHT TRAIN BETWEEN MONTREAL AND QUEBEC

Mr. J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières): Mr. Speaker, for the fourth or fifth time I beg the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) to give us his assistance so that a night train may run between Montreal and Quebec city, at least for the duration of Expo.

I want to explain right away that I do not blame the minister who until now has been extremely kind in offering his help, but to try

to get as much assistance as possible to urge the Canadian Pacific authorities to run such a night train. Until now, the only answer we got was in the negative.

Mr. Speaker, here is the whole matter in a nutshell.

Between Montreal and Quebec city, and especially in my immediate area, there are 350,000 people who are poorly served by the Canadian Pacific and who, at Expo time namely, will not be able to leave for Montreal in the morning and come back at night, which means that they will have just a few hours in the afternoon to enjoy Expo.

That night train was requested by the government of my province, through a unanimous motion. It has been requested by about 40 municipalities, by a great number of federal members, of my colleagues here; the project has also been supported by Expo's commissioner general and several special interest groups which have sent resolutions in due form.

In spite of all that, not only does the Canadian Pacific refuse to run the train in question but they even refuse to grant us an interview so that we may state our case.

Mr. Speaker, I charge the Canadian Pacific with gross negligence in its duty towards the people. I should like to remind the management of the Canadian Pacific that they became wealthy through the gifts and grants of the Canadian people, and that they have a moral obligation to the Canadian people to supply them with services that I call essential services. They have no right to treat such important and unanimous requests as this one with the haughtiness they have shown.

I charge the Canadian Pacific with refusing Expo assistance which would be of infinitely greater value than the building they put up, that of guaranteeing reasonable services for all those who wish to visit Expo.

Mr. Speaker, it is not only the people in my area who need this night train; there are thousands of passengers who will not be able to stay in Montreal during Expo and who will have to spend the night in municipalities 50 or 80 miles away from Montreal, when they would like to visit other municipalities after spending the day at Expo.

There are also people in my area who will not be able to reach Montreal by car because of inadequate roads and parking facilities.

[Mr. Mongrain.]

I charge the Canadian Pacific with having amassed wealth off public moneys and refusing today to recognize its obligations totoward the commonweal.

I charge the Canadian Pacific and, in particular, Messrs. Crump and Sinclair, respectively chairman of the board of directors and president of the company, with treating offhandedly those who are responsible for the commonweal, the members of the provincial legislature and the members of parliament, the members of our municipal councils and those who are responsible for the intermediary organizations.

I charge the Canadian Pacific with preparing systematically and diabolically the degradation of its system, of its passenger services, probably with a view to getting rid of it eventually and throwing it into the lap of the government.

If they tell us those services are not profitable, it is precisely because they neglected them so much for years that they turned their users away from them.

• (10:10 p.m.)

But because of this particular time, with Expo drawing near, the Canadian Pacific should co-operate with us more fully.

I charge the Canadian Pacific with making fun of the authorities by writing letters containing misleading arguments, withholding part of the truth and failing to reply to our specific requests in order to obtain an interview and state our case.

I ask the minister to give us more than the moral support he has been granting us generously up to now, because I shall tell what we intend to do from now on. As a matter of fact, this very week, we shall make arrangements to meet the Board of Transport Commissioners and ask them quite earnestly, while putting forward every possible argument to act as mediator in that dispute.

We will go further, Mr. Speaker. We are going to prepare documentation for an overall inquiry to be conducted into all the shortcomings of the Canadian Pacific passenger service, which are intended in a very systematic way, and I intend to use whatever means placed at my disposal by the parliamentary procedure to have an over-all inquiry carried out across the country. And if Messrs. Crump and Sinclair, respectively chairman of the board of directors and president of the company, keep ignoring our request to be received in delegation, the members of the provincial legislature, of

the federal parliament and of municipal councils will go and stand on their doorsteps as long as they do not show up to hear us, and this precisely for the purpose of coming to a solution before it is too late, because Expo is opening on April 28.

I dealt with that matter four or five times and I will bring it up 20 more times, if need be. I urge the minister to support us as much as he possibly can. I thank him for what he has done for us so far, but I see that to get action from the high priests of the C.P.R., who feed on the wealth of Canada and do not realize that they have a moral obligation toward the people, all the tact of the Minister of Transport will be needed and probably also all the energy of a great number of hon. members who see that their constituents are deprived of a service and that they themselves are treated with arrogance and contempt.

[*English*]

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, in replying to the hon. member for Trois-Rivières I draw to his attention that this matter was brought to the minister's notice only last Friday afternoon. At that time the minister replied that he would bring the matter before the officials of the Canadian Pacific. The week end has intervened and it is perhaps early to have anticipated a detailed reply. The minister was not aware until an hour or two ago that the hon. member would again raise this question this evening. We regret again that there is not a confirmed reply for the hon. member, even were such obtainable from the Canadian Pacific, which is not directly under the jurisdiction of the minister.

The minister has asked me to assure the hon. member that his remarks this evening, made forcefully and directly, will be drawn to the attention of the officials of the Canadian Pacific. I have also the assurance of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, sitting near me this evening, that he will add his good offices to the request to be made, since he is greatly concerned with the success of Expo.

DIVORCE—REQUEST FOR IMMEDIATE RELIEF IN CASES OF PROLONGED DESERTION

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a letter from a young woman with five children who had been deserted for over five years, asking about the prospects for changes in the divorce law. I think my experience in receiving this letter is no different from the experience of most other hon. members in this chamber.

However, that is not why I raised this question earlier this afternoon. I thought about it for approximately a week because it seemed to me it would take some time for the joint committee to bring in its recommendations to this chamber and to the other place; and then, of course, the government would need time in which to study the recommendations. There are good and sufficient reasons in my opinion for establishing wilful desertion of three years or more as an immediate ground for divorce, and I should like to present these reasons to the Minister of Justice. Before I do so may I compliment him, as many other members have done and will do, on his appointment to that position. We have great faith in him and great hopes for the work he will carry out.

I shall set out some of the reasons for my thinking we should pass a divorce measure without waiting for a full bill, which in my opinion could not come before this house until much later this year, either in October or in November. First there is the burden on the courts. There are some 60,000 people in Canada who have been deserted by their spouses, and since our divorce rate is about 8,000 a year one can see that a considerable burden will be thrown on the courts by applications in connection with this class of case alone.

My second point is that courts have to establish rules with regard to cases of desertion. In many of these cases one of the parties has either bolted from the province or established himself, or herself, a long way from his or her home. This will mean the establishment of special rules which I do not think will need to be established in connection with most of the other classes of application now being considered by the divorce committee, with the possible exception of cases involving people suffering from incurable insanity. The courts need time in which to establish rules, and this alone would eat up several precious months.

In the third place, my mail would indicate that the class of deserted people is the largest single class—with the possible exception of cases involving cruelty—which will have to be considered under the new divorce law. To my mind, when a marriage has broken up for three years or more it is up to this parliament to provide some relief for those who are left behind with the children.

Finally there is this question of the children. The Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition and others have indicated that in

our new divorce law we must of course consider the needs of the children. This will probably be the most difficult part of drawing up the new divorce law and one which will give the joint committee the greatest concern. But the fact is that after desertion has occurred for three or more years it is probable that any legal remedies which exist will either have been attempted and have worked, or will have been attempted and have failed. So I do not think this particular aspect of divorce reform is a stumbling block in this class of case.

• (10:20 p.m.)

May I suggest to the minister that he admit limited judicial separation or divorce on that ground, judicial separation being favoured by the Catholic Council and by some of the Protestant faiths. I think we have to pay heed to religious thinking when we bring in our divorce reform. Second, may I suggest to him that this is best done by talking with the house leaders. If we are to have immediate reform in this one specific field it can only come if the members of this place exercise discipline, recognize a need, and say the measure will pass with very short debate. If that is not possible, Mr. Speaker, then that class will have to wait until the fall months come around. But if the minister, through the house leaders, is able to achieve an agreement on this class of case, which to my mind is the most worthy of immediate relief in the process of divorce reform, then perhaps we could have an interim measure presented and passed in a remarkably short time, even though we are in the dying hours of the session. In short, we could have a sort of special centennial project of which we can all be proud and then, later in the fall, take the more leisurely and long-term approach to some very difficult problems in the divorce field.

Hon. P.-E. Tudeau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. McCleave) for his kind congratulations and assure him he has introduced a subject with which I will be very much concerned in the months to come. I want to assure him that this is a matter which I and my colleagues regard as being of major importance, one which will get very serious consideration when all the facts are before us.

I think the arguments brought forward by the hon. member are well thought out and reasoned, and I will say quite frankly that they do merit consideration. However, the problem he is really raising is whether this type of legislation is better attacked piecemeal or when introduced as a whole, and whether the spirit of reform and the spirit of the law can be better preserved in one way or in another.

As the hon. member knows, for some time a special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons has had the whole question of divorce, including the grounds for relief and the adequacy or otherwise of existing legislation, under serious study. It is expected that this committee will be in a position to report in the not too distant future, and I submit that it might be unfair to the members of this committee, representing as it does both houses of parliament, to introduce any measure of an interim nature which might imply government approval or disapproval of any recommendation which the committee may feel disposed to make.

It is essential that in considering the reform of Canada's divorce law the government should, in the interests of all concerned, view the problem in the broadest possible perspective. The needs of those who are suffering real hardship must of course be taken into account, but it is doubtful whether piecemeal solutions should be envisaged at a time when there is a serious attempt being made to solve the problem as a whole. This is a complex and sensitive problem, and one which must be approached in a spirit of mature deliberation if legislation in keeping with present day realities is to be achieved.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, April 11, 1967

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

MADAME VANIER

ANNOUNCEMENT OF APPOINTMENT TO CANADIAN PRIVY COUNCIL

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform the house, because I think it will be of interest to the house, that Madame Vanier is leaving Ottawa tomorrow to establish permanent residence in Montreal. I know I am speaking for all members when I say that during her years at Rideau Hall she won a place in the hearts of Canadians that was equalled only by that which had been gained by her distinguished husband our beloved Governor General. The words I have used to try to express our admiration, affection and respect for the late Governor General apply equally, I am sure, to Madame Vanier. She was one half of a perfect partnership in service to Canada.

The house may also be interested to know that this evening at 6 p.m. Madame Vanier is to be sworn in as a member of the Privy Council of Canada. She will be the first woman, apart from ministers of the crown, to occupy that honourable place.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the announcement by the Prime Minister concerning the elevation of Madame Vanier to the Privy Council is something for which there will be general support. It is unusual, but it is entirely justified. Her grace, her charm, and above all the fact that she never lost sight of the people as a whole, or in other words her lack of stuffiness, gave to Rideau Hall a distinction by which the term of office of her late husband will always be remembered.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, it is significant that when members in all parts of this house and editorial writers across Canada were commenting on the passing of the late Governor General, almost without exception reference was made to the splendid contribution Madame Vanier had made during the years she and her husband had occupied Rideau Hall. I think therefore it is most fitting that this house should pause in its deliberations to pay tribute to a very charming lady who brought to her position not only friendliness and kindliness, but also an intellectual capacity that enabled her to play an important role in the public life of Canada.

The Prime Minister is to be congratulated for having paid tribute to Madame Vanier by appointing her to the Privy Council. I am sure this gesture will be approved by Canadians in every walk of life. We think this honour well deserved and well earned. We wish Madame Vanier a long life, and we hope the gratitude of the Canadian people will always be for her an endearing memory.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, we wish to congratulate the Prime Minister for appointing Madame Georges Vanier to the Privy Council. This is welcome news. In addition to bringing to its meetings her usual charm which parliament and all Canadians have come to know, I am sure that Madame Vanier will make a worthy contribution to the Privy Council. I feel that the Canadian people as a whole will be happy to hear about that appointment which will give even more weight to the Privy Council of Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, we wish to associate ourselves with the words of appreciation to Madame Vanier for the splendid contribution she has made to Canada, and to join in the expression of best wishes as she leaves to establish residence in Montreal.

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

CONCURRENCE IN FIFTEENTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker: Do I understand that the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Macaluso) wants to return to the item "Presenting Reports"?

Mr. Joseph Macaluso (Hamilton West): If Your Honour please. I was somewhat tardy in rising in my place when the order was called, and I apologize to the house.

Inquiries of the Ministry

I have the honour to present the fifteenth report of the standing committee on transport and communications in English and in French, and with the consent of the house I intend to move concurrence in this report later this day.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Macaluso: Mr. Speaker, if the house gives its consent I move:

That the fifteenth report of the standing committee on transport and communications presented this day be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

SIR DONALD SANGSTER

TRIBUTE ON DEATH OF PRIME MINISTER OF JAMAICA

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with regret I have to call the attention of the house to the passing an hour or so ago in Montreal of the recently elected prime minister of Jamaica. Sir Donald Sangster had been ill for some weeks in Montreal, and in spite of all the efforts of a great Canadian medical institution they were unable to save the life of this fine and noble man. He had served his country over the years with great distinction and devotion. He was the servant not only of Jamaica but of the commonwealth. My own feeling of regret is increased by the knowledge that I have lost one who was a good, personal friend.

I am sure the house will join me in expressing sympathy to the relatives of Sir Donald Sangster and to the people of Jamaica in the loss of their distinguished prime minister.

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP

REPORTED SPEECH BY STATE SECRETARY RESPECTING METHOD OF OBTAINING

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Prime Minister whether the enunciation regarding Canadian citizenship made by the Secretary of State last evening in the city of Montreal represents government policy. She is reported to have said:

Citizenship, she said, should not be a status automatically accorded anyone born in Canada but should be obtainable only by a process of application, swearing in and the issuing of a citizenship certificate.

I ask the Prime Minister whether such a retrograde step is in the contemplation of the government.

[Mr. Macaluso.]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to discuss this matter with the Secretary of State to find out if in fact she used the words attributed to her in that report.

CRIMINAL CODE

INQUIRY AS TO AMENDMENT RESPECTING ABORTIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister and draw to his attention a report concerning a Canadian hospital showing that a number of abortions have been performed to protect the physical and mental health of the mothers involved. Considering there is reason to believe that such actions are contrary to the Criminal Code, I ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the government, as announced previously, to bring in legislation fairly soon clarifying the Criminal Code in this respect.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have already said to the house that consideration is being given to the introduction at as early a date as possible of legislation dealing with matters of this kind, including that matter referred to by my hon. friend.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Considering that matters of this kind are becoming acute problems which may lead to legal difficulties, can the Prime Minister not give us any assurance that such legislation will very likely be introduced before July 1?

Mr. Pearson: In view of what is happening in the House of Commons at present with regard to progress of legislation on the order paper, I cannot give that assurance, but I should like to think that it can be done before July 1.

Mr. Knowles: It could be introduced.

[*Translation*]

EXPO '67

PROVISION FOR ATTENDANCE OF PEOPLE ON LOW INCOMES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Is he seeking a formula to enable the destitute to visit the 1967 World Fair?

[*English*]

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I think I had better speak to the hon. member about this question; I am not quite sure what he has in mind.

BANKRUPTCY

INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF AMENDING LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Registrar General. Can the minister tell the house when he will introduce the proposed amendments to the Bankruptcy Act dealing with fraudulent bankruptcies?

Hon. John N. Turner (Registrar General): Mr. Speaker, I have asked the three man committee charged with the study of the revision of that act to accelerate that study. I hope to have a report from them some time toward the end of the year. It is a very complicated subject. In the meantime we shall continue to improve and strengthen the enforcement and administration of the Bankruptcy Act.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR DISCUSSION OF NEW DAIRY POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Agriculture.

The minister is aware, I suppose, of the reaction of Canadian farmers who find the dairy policy for 1967 clearly inadequate.

As milk producers are faced with financial problems, could the minister inform us whether on March 21 when he met the representatives of the farmers of the province of Quebec, he should not have been accompanied by the Minister of Finance and Receiver General (Mr. Sharp) instead of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand)?

Mr. Speaker: The question is out of order.

Mr. Godin: Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

GRAIN

REQUEST FOR STUDY OF HANDLING AND TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Can the minister say whether consideration is being given to initiating a study of grain handling and transportation problems, with a view to improving the methods being used?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, transportation does not come within the ambit of my department. The question of handling comes in some instances under my department and in others under the Department of Trade and Commerce. The whole matter is continuously under review. Considerable improvements were made during the past year, particularly in the port of Vancouver, and the government will continue to take all possible steps to improve the situation.

MR. JUSTICE LANDREVILLE

INQUIRY AS TO ACTION PROPOSED BY GOVERNMENT

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the other day I inquired of the Prime Minister whether he had replied to Mr. Justice Landreville's request for an opportunity to appear before the house. Second, I asked the Prime Minister whether the government intends to introduce a motion for the impeachment of Mr. Justice Landreville during the present session.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): The procedure to be adopted in respect to this matter, including the request of Mr. Justice Landreville to be heard before the bar of the house, is still under consideration. As soon as a decision is reached as to the best procedure to be followed I will be glad to make an announcement to the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the right hon. Prime Minister.

In view of the rumour that Mr. Justice Landreville was discriminated against because he is a French Canadian, is the Prime Minister considering the possibility of giving him an opportunity, not only as a French

Canadian but simply as a Canadian, to defend himself before the highest authority in the country, the federal parliament?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is repeating substantially the same question as that put by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition.

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

COMPLAINTS RESPECTING DIFFICULTIES IN HIRING TRANSIENT LABOUR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): I should like to address my question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the large number of complaints which I am sure all members of this house have been receiving from the farmers of Canada concerning the inconvenience, the added bookkeeping and the red tape that is necessary when hiring part time or transient help, has the minister conferred with his responsible colleagues in the cabinet to see what can be done to implement exemptions, thus making it easier for farmers to hire part time or transient help?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): This question is under active consideration. I take it the hon. member is referring in particular to the requirement for the registration of transient workers for unemployment insurance. We are taking up this matter with the commission, and if procedures can be evolved which will be less burdensome to the farmers, we hope they can be put into operation by the commission.

Mr. Hales: I have in mind the obligation imposed on farmers to secure, first of all, the social security numbers of those they hire, then to pay part of the Canada Pension Plan contributions and then the unemployment insurance—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

ARDA—INQUIRY AS TO AGREEMENT RESPECTING MANITOBA INTERLAKE REGION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric Stefanson (Selkirk): I have a question for the Minister of Forestry and Rural Development. Has the agreement for the comprehensive program to be undertaken under ARDA and FRED in the interlake area of Manitoba been signed by the federal and Manitoba governments? If it has not already been signed, when will the signing of this agreement take place?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry and Rural Development): It has not yet been signed, Mr. Speaker. I expect that some time in the month of May there will be a ceremony in the interlake area to mark the signature of this agreement by the two governments.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

ACTION FOLLOWING REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ELECTION EXPENSES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): My question is directed to the Prime Minister. In October of 1966 a committee on election expenses made a report which contained a considerable number of suggestions for legislative changes. I think this matter was referred to the committee on privileges and elections, and the Prime Minister expressed his desire that legislation should be brought in before the next election.

My question is, would the Prime Minister discuss with the chairman of the committee on privileges and elections the urgency of having early hearings by the committee on this important subject?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I shall be glad to do this, Mr. Speaker. Of course we have lots of time before the next election to deal with it.

[*Translation*]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

TROIS-RIVIÈRES, QUE.—HOLIDAY ARRANGEMENTS TO PERMIT EXPO VISITS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Postmaster General.

Has the minister received in the last few days requests from the Postal Workers' Union in the Trois-Rivières area asking him to authorize that their holiday schedule be drawn up in such a way as to allow them to visit Expo '67 more regularly? If so, has his department reached a decision to that effect?

Mr. Speaker: Order. That question should be put on the order paper.

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Speaker, ten o'clock.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Speaker, I should like to rephrase the question I asked a while ago and explain to you why I think it is urgent. For administrative reasons and for the purposes of the union an answer will have to be given to those unions within a few hours.

Therefore, I direct again my question to the hon. Postmaster General. Did he receive any requests concerning holiday schedules, with a view to encouraging visits to Expo by postal workers' unions in my area and did his department reach a decision to this effect?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I recognize the urgency of the question, but I do not believe it is of national interest and, therefore, I hesitate to allow the hon. member to ask it. It might be easier to permit the minister to answer.

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I must say that following the representations forwarded to me by the hon. member for Trois-Rivières, discussions took place between the director of the Quebec district, the Trois-Rivières postmaster and the leaders of the union of postal employees in Trois-Rivières and they finally came to an agreement, whereby four or five times during the summer months, extended week ends will be granted to the employees so that they may all visit Expo.

WINTER WORKS

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PERIOD

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer a question which was put to me yesterday by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Béchard) with regard to our winter works program.

The hon. member asked if our department intended to extend the deadline for that program.

My answer, unfortunately, must be no. The purpose of that program is to fight recurrent unemployment during a certain period of the year and if we extended it for one reason or another, the very purpose of the program would be altered.

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

Is it not the opinion of the hon. minister that forced unemployment is equivalent to real unemployment? And, under the circumstances, the area represented by the hon. member for Bonaventure is suffering from extraordinary unemployment.

Mr. Speaker: Order. That is argumentative and not a proper question.

[*English*]

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is the minister able to answer the question I asked him the other day?

Mr. Marchand: If you consider this question in order, Mr. Speaker, I am ready to answer it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. J. Russell Keays (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the answer given by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, is the latter aware of the problems resulting from the hard winter experienced in the Gaspé peninsula this year? The people would be glad to perform such work until June 1.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, the winter has been hard not only in the Gaspé peninsula but in several other areas of the country as well.

[*English*]

GRAIN

QUEBEC—REQUEST FOR DELAY IN DISPOSAL OF ELEVATOR

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Agriculture in the absence of the Minister of Transport. Has the minister anything to report to the house about the disposition of the government elevator at Quebec city?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): No, Mr. Speaker. Any announcement in this regard will be made by the Minister of Transport, if one is to be made.

Mr. Hamilton: As a supplementary question, has the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Forestry and Rural Development been informed of the wire from the Coopérative Fédéral de Québec asking that a decision be delayed until they have been consulted?

Mr. Greene: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Inquiries of the Ministry

LABOUR CONDITIONS

RETRAINING OF WORKERS LAID OFF BECAUSE OF AUTOMOBILE AGREEMENT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, in addressing a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration I wish to congratulate him on his elevation in the seating arrangement of the house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Starr: I am sure he will now be more readily accessible to give advice to the right hon. Prime Minister.

In view of the statement he recently made in the house that there were not sufficient facilities for the purpose of training laid off workers in the city of Oshawa, has the minister been in touch with the provincial government of Ontario and has he worked out an agreement whereby additional facilities will be provided?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his congratulations. We keep in permanent touch with the Ontario department of labour, but I do not have readily available a report on our discussions. There is no question of signing a new agreement with the Ontario department of labour or education, but I can inquire and give a more complete answer some other day.

INQUIRIES OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Roger E. Régimbal (Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State, but in her absence I should like to direct it to the right hon. Prime Minister. Was the interview of a Cuban leader in Miami, Florida, on the national network last night, in which he warned people to keep away from Expo '67, the C.B.C.'s contribution to the success of Expo?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question as asked is not acceptable.

Mr. R. A. Webb (Hastings-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Finance. Inasmuch as it now seems evident that each Canadian taxpayer will have to pay an additional $5 to take care of Expo, will he consider charging an additional 5 cents per head to be used to pay the salaries of seal hunters, thereby eliminating this cruel practice?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

FISHERIES

REQUEST THAT MINISTER REPORT TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON RUSSIAN TRIP

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. I should like to ask the minister whether he would agree to appear before the standing committee on fisheries to give a report on his recent visit to the Soviet union if a suitable order could be arranged for the committee to meet at an early date for that purpose.

Hon. H.-J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): This would be a decision for the consideration of the standing committee on fisheries after discussion probably with myself.

OLD AGE SECURITY

INCOME SUPPLEMENT—GRATUITY TO RETIRED N.S. COAL MINERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. I should like to ask the minister under what formula or process did the department arrive at the decision that retired Cape Breton miners were receiving pensions?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the method of dealing with pensions by private companies is a matter for those companies. We have not taken any particular action. The same policy is in effect now with regard to these pensions as that which has been in effect in respect of all the pension increases made up to the present time.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Apparently the minister misunderstood my first question. I asked him by what process or formula the department decided that the retired miners in Cape Breton were actually receiving pensions as such.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that the department made any decision with regard to a determination that a particular class of income was considered as pension. If my hon. friend has any particular

cases in mind I would be glad to investigate them to ensure that the retired miners in Cape Breton are properly and fairly treated under the act which has been passed by parliament.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Is it the intention of the crown corporation, which is being set up, to protect the $75 a month the miners originally received from the company—not by way of a pension but, as I told the minister when his legislation was going through, by way of a gratuity and nothing else. He has sent out instructions in respect of the gratuity.

Mr. MacEachen: I cannot anticipate what action will be taken by the crown corporation in this regard, but I do recall that I did address a communication to the president of the Dominion Coal Corporation requesting that consideration be given to this particular matter. I will review the correspondence again and advise my hon. friend about the situation.

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR FEDERAL SUBSIDY ON EXCESS FLUID MILK PRODUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. A. Webb (Hastings-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Would he consider changing the dairy policy to extend the federal subsidy to excess milk produced by the fluid milk producers?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, all these questions were, of course, very carefully considered. With respect to the question of fluid milk producers who come under provincial quota it was deemed preferable, in order not to have mixed jurisdiction in this area, that jurisdiction over the manufacturing milk producers and the support of the manufacturing milk producers, which is clearly a federal responsibility in accord with the agreement reached with the provinces last year, be left with the federal department, and that jurisdiction over the fluid milk distributors, who are under provincial quota in all provinces or provincial authority, be left to the provinces on any question of product support.

Mr. Webb: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the minister whether he is aware, as I am sure he is, that many of us are receiving telegrams to the effect that if some drastic action is not taken soon there will be considerable unemployment in the fluid milk industry.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The supplementary question is argumentative.

[*Translation*]

BUTTER—CONSIDERATION OF RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF SUBSIDY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

In order to promote the consumption of butter rather than margarine, will the minister consider the possibility of restoring the subsidy on the consumption of butter?

[*English*]

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am not just sure what the hon. member has in mind. The policy was changed last year. Previously the subsidies were paid to the farmers by the creameries with the creameries being reimbursed. Since last year the subsidies have been paid to cream shippers or whole milk producers directly by the federal government. This policy has been retained this year on a higher base, having been increased from 85 cents to $1.21.

Mr. Ricard: I have a supplementary question. Perhaps I could also provide the minister with some information. There was a time when—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member could provide this information during a private conversation with the minister. He should not do so at this time.

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Will he indicate whether the highly lauded promise regarding a school milk program is about to be launched?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest that this question can not be asked at this time.

INQUIRY AS TO BASIS FOR FLUID MILK SUBSIDY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Ed. Schreyer (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Can the minister say whether the decision to discontinue the federal subsidy on surplus fluid milk was taken on a unilateral basis, or in conjunction with submissions of

farm and dairy organizations and provincial governments?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question as asked is not in order.

POTATOES—REQUEST FOR IMPROVEMENT IN SURPLUS DIVERSION PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture regarding the serious situation still facing thousands of potato growers in eastern Canada. When will he be in a position to announce an improvement in the surplus diversion program which the legislatures of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island have declared inadequate.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): The question of a program for the province of Prince Edward Island, with which I am sure the hon. member is concerned, is not concerning the adequacy of the federal legislation but rather is a question of the preparation of a provincial program to make use of the federal legislation. I am pleased to instruct the hon. member that we are in touch with government members and officials of the province of Prince Edward Island, and I think have achieved a program which meets with their approval.

INQUIRY AS TO HEADQUARTERS OF LIVESTOCK FEED BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent (Ont.)): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Forestry and Rural Development, based on the announcement he made in this house yesterday. Is the minister in a position to inform the house whether the location of the headquarters of this Canadian livestock feed agency has been determined yet as between Ottawa and Montreal.

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry and Rural Development): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The headquarters will be in Montreal.

[*Translation*]

ASSISTANCE TO GOLD MINES

REQUEST FOR INCREASED SUBSIDIES TO PERMIT HIGHER WAGES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

The minister said, not long ago, that if mine officials want to hire competent workers, they will have to increase the salaries paid to miners.

[Mr. Schreyer.]

Now, in order to achieve this goal, would the minister favour higher subsidies to the gold mines in order to enable them to pay higher salaries to their employees?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to send a copy of my speech to the hon. member for Villeneuve. He will note that I did not speak of "salaries", but merely of living conditions.

With regard to the assistance to gold mines, the act will no longer apply by the end of the present year, and I am sure parliament will have to decide whether it should be extended.

Mr. Caouette: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Does the minister intend to suggest that the subsidies to gold mines be increased?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, the policy will be announced in due course.

[*English*]

POWER

REQUEST FOR POLICY STATEMENT ON NATIONAL GRID

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. When will the minister be in a position to inform the house concerning the present government policy with regard to a trans-Canada power grid?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Well, Mr. Speaker, this policy has not changed. The Canadian government is interested in the construction and extension of that power grid. The hon. member knows very well that construction of hydroelectric facilities essentially comes under provincial jurisdiction. We endeavour, however, to protect the national interest in these matters.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

POSSIBLE INCREASES IN CEILING AND BENEFIT RATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. On two or three occasions I have asked him when we might expect legislation which would amend the Unemployment Insurance Act to increase the rates

of benefit under that act and also to raise the ceiling under which contributions are made. Can he say whether we are any closer to the introduction of this legislation than we were the last time I asked him?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, at the time this question was last asked I do not think reference was made to raising the ceiling. In this area, I would think that is something which would be done by order in council rather than by legislation. In respect of the other part of the question, good progress has been made in preparing the draft legislation to be laid before this house. The progress is encouraging. I stated in answer to the hon. member the last time or so that this question was put that I was doubtful whether it could be done during this particular session of the house, but that, if not, I hoped that it would be high on the priority list for the next session.

Mr. Knowles: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that this session has lasted longer than the minister anticipated, could this not now be brought before the house during this session?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The supplementary question is argumentative.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

PROTECTION OF NUTRITION STANDARDS FOLLOWING MILK PRICE INCREASE

On the orders of the day:

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the price of milk is to go up by 2 cents per quart within a month, what plans has the Prime Minister or the government to protect the nutrition standards of individuals and families on low incomes?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In my opinion the question as asked should not be posed on orders of the day.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUEST FOR INSTRUCTIONS ON OBTAINING TRADES TRAINING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the fact a change will take place as of April 1 in respect of trades training, would the minister issue or have his officials issue a press release or a statement of some sort advising those, particularly in Nova Scotia, who desire trades training what steps they should take?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to publicize the new program so everyone will know those things to which they are entitled.

HOUSING

REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW GOVERNMENT POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour in connection with housing. In view of the continuing and deepening housing crisis in Canada and the Prime Minister's reply to me last week to the effect that the government is considering new initiatives in an attempt to cope with this problem, has any decision been made and can the minister tell the house what the new initiatives will be?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, my first impression in respect of the hon. member's question is that he is not very well informed. While admittedly there is a housing crisis, I wish to make it clear that it is not an increasing one. Marked progress —encouraging progress—has been made in the house building program of late, and I think it is reasonably safe for me to assure hon. members that this year we will have the largest spring housing start program in the history of Canada.

Mr. Scott (Danforth): I have a supplementary question. In view of the fact that the houses which are being built under the National Housing Act are to a large degree totally beyond the competence of most Canadians to obtain—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows he has to ask a question.

Mr. Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, we must be allowed some preface to our questions in order to—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, in view of the nature of the interruptions from across the way I will start again.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member does not have to start again, even though there may have been interruptions. I am sure

the minister heard the prefacing remarks as well as I did.

Mr. Scott (Danforth): Your hearing is very good, Mr. Speaker. I felt that because of all the interruptions from across the way the minister might not have heard the question. In view of what I have said, does the government intend to adopt any housing initiatives in order to take care of the 70 per cent or 75 per cent of Canadians who cannot afford to purchase homes under the N.H.A.?

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, I could not possibly accept that premise and so cannot answer the question.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the Minister of Labour whether his department's estimates show that the number of house completions this year will be fewer than last year?

Mr. Nicholson: No, starts should be up by 20,000 or more.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a similar supplementary question relating to the question I directed last week to the Prime Minister in the absence of the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Will the department consider bringing forward legislation or an amendment to the V.L.A. in order to allow veterans in the country to build on a city or town lot rather than a half acre, as is now required?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this matter has been considered on a number of occasions, but no decision has been made to change the act.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I have a supplementary question. Since the minister's department has informed veterans across the country that a further change is contemplated, and in view of increasing pressures, does the minister consider that now is the time to make that change? I remind him that several changes have been made in the last few years.

Mr. Teillet: Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to answer a question which includes such an erroneous premise.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Minister of Veterans Affairs has just indicated that I made an erroneous statement. I intend to support that statement later by a letter from the minister's own department.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We have already heard four or five supplementary questions. I suggest that we should go to another subject and return to this one in perhaps a few minutes.

FINANCE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON RECOMMENDATION RESPECTING RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. K. H. More (Regina City): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the almost daily evidence that the recommendations of the Carter commission have created a climate of great doubt and uncertainty in the minds of those interested in the further development of our resource industry, can we expect a statement from the minister at an early date to give some reassurance to those engaged in this development?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, as I have said on several occasions the government will make an extensive study of this report before it reaches any decision or makes any statements about its policies.

THE BUDGET

INQUIRY AS TO PROBABLE DATE OF PRESENTATION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. I should like to ask the Minister of Finance if he can give the house and the country an indication of when we may expect the budget for 1967-1968.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have a date in mind but I do not know whether the progress in the house is such that it would be safe for me to make any prediction at all.

Mr. Fulton: I have a supplementary question. Is it the intention of the government to introduce the budget during this session, or during the next session of parliament?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I hope this session will end very soon. It is my expectation to introduce the budget at the next session.

[*Translation*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

MONTREAL—POSSIBLE INFRINGEMENT OF BILL OF RIGHTS BY MUNICIPAL BY-LAW

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

In view of the fact that a number of prosecutions have been undertaken in the city of Montreal under a municipal by-law which apparently forbids the employees of an establishment from talking with customers, is the minister in a position to tell us whether the officers of his department are making an exhaustive study of the present legislation to determine whether there is an offence from the federal viewpoint under the Canadian Bill of Rights?

Hon. P.-E. Trudeau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lotbinière knows that the Canadian Bill of Rights applies only in federal fields. The act itself provides that the officials of the Department of Justice must review the acts to make sure that they do not go against the Bill of Rights itself.

Mr. Choquette: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General for whom candidates for the bench now have great respect. Is the minister thinking of calling a federal-provincial conference to encourage the provinces to elaborate their own Bill of Rights?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much that the central government can suggest to the provinces what kind of legislation they should have, but I am convinced that the hon. member's suggestion is so good that it will be heard in various provinces.

[*English*]

REPORTED INFILTRATION INTO CANADA OF INTERNATIONAL MAFIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, last week I directed to the Solicitor General a question dealing with a series of reports that members of the international gangster organization known as the mafia were infiltrating Canada. I think he indicated at that time that he was going to investigate the matter and make a further statement. Has he done so, and has he anything to report on this very serious matter?

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I cannot quite recall answering in the vein suggested by the hon. member. I pointed out, in answer to a question put by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition, that there was continuous liaison and co-operation between the law enforcement agencies in Canada and the United States where a watchful eye is being kept on this situation.

Inquiries of the Ministry

NATIONAL DEFENCE

HALIFAX—REQUEST OF DOCKYARD COUNCIL RESPECTING PAY RATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister and ask him whether he is now in receipt of a rather lengthy telegram from local 273 of the Canadian Labour Congress, the men at H.M.C. Dockyard in Halifax. If so, can he indicate to the house what has been his reply to the telegram?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I shall have to check, Mr. Speaker. I believe I received that telegram yesterday, but I would like to check.

REPORTED NATO APPROVAL OF PROPOSED CHANGES IN CANADIAN FORCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Ed. Schreyer (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. When he indicated to the house last week during the defence debate that the restructuring of the Canadian armed forces met with the general approbation of the NATO military planning committee, was he speaking on the basis of documentation or was he expressing an impression that he had?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is asking a question about a matter which is now before a committee.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—REQUEST FOR PROGRESS REPORT BY MINISTER ON PEACE PLAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, we do not like to see the Secretary of State for External Affairs ignored throughout the question period. Can he tell us what progress he is making in connection with his four point plan for peace in Viet Nam?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I suggest that my hon. friend read the evidence given before the external affairs committee this morning.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

STATEMENT ON STAMP COMMEMORATING VISIT BY THE QUEEN

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I should like to amplify the answer I gave the right hon. Leader of the Opposition yesterday regarding the stamp which will be issued by my department on the occasion of the royal visit this summer. The Queen's head which will be reproduced on the stamp will not be surmounted by a crown.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I believe the right hon. Leader of the Opposition said just now that the crown would be abolished.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I did not say that at all.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): That is what we heard on this side. Yesterday, following the answer I gave the right hon. Leader of the Opposition, he slipped in a statement, as he sometimes does during the question period, that he thought we were abolishing the Queen.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the minister state his question of privilege?

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege is that this is not the first time the right hon. Leader of the Opposition has tried to imply that this party wishes to establish a republic.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt very much that that is a question of privilege. I do not think it is.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): It is not the first time that—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think the minister has a question of privilege.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the minister insisting that he has a question of privilege?

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): I would just like to explain, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not want to be unfair to the minister, but may I point out that he has already indicated what he has in mind. His suggestion is that comments made by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition imply a position taken by the government. I really do not see how that can be construed as a question of privilege.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition said yesterday "I thought you were abolishing the Queen", I thought he was addressing the statement to me—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I ask for the minister's co-operation in this regard. I think I am in a position to say, having heard the preface to the subject he wanted to raise as a question of privilege, that there is really no question of privilege but rather a point of debate which the minister might want to take up at a more appropriate time.

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

• (3:30 p.m.)

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

AMALGAMATION OF NAVY, ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The house resumed, from Monday, April 10, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof—Mr. Hellyer—Mr. Batten in the chair.

The Chairman: Order. House again in committee of the whole to consider Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof. When the committee rose last evening clause 2 was under consideration.

On clause 2—*Canadian forces, Canadian armed forces.*

Mr. Thomas (Middlesex West): Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose last night I was making a plea that the government modify its position with regard to the pressure it is placing on the house for a fast passage of Bill C-243. I pointed out that there existed across this country serious uncertainty as to what was involved in this legislation. I also pointed out that those all across this country who oppose this legislation or parts of it and who wish it to be modified depend on the opposition to press home their arguments and make the points which they wish to be made before this committee.

Speaking of uncertainty, we have to go back to the issuance of the white paper on defence which outlined the government's intention with regard to the reorganization of our Canadian armed forces. I think it is right

to assume that the government obtained the best advice they could at that time. They called in the military experts of this nation, questioned them and discussed the matter with them. On the basis of the information obtained they drew up the white paper. However, it has not been made clear even yet just what is intended to be the ultimate effect of the proposals published in that white paper.

Let us consider the two words, integration and unification. I am depending heavily for my argument on the testimony given before the standing committee of the house by Air Chief Marshal Miller. I know that Air Chief Marshal Miller's testimony has been freely quoted and I can well understand that. Of all the professional military witnesses called before the standing committee, the experience of Air Chief Marshal Miller probably qualified him as the best witness called.

For those who are not familiar with his career, if there are any here, Air Chief Marshal Miller served from 1931 to 1955 in the R.C.A.F. He was a professional soldier. I think it is agreed by everyone that he was a professional soldier of the highest type, one of whom all Canadians can be proud. He was one of many such who were called before the standing committee. From 1955 to 1960 Air Chief Marshal Miller served as deputy minister of the Department of National Defence. If there is any place where any man can acquire more valuable experience than in the post of deputy minister of the department, I cannot imagine it. From 1960 to 1964 Air Chief Marshal Miller served as chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, as long as that body existed. When the joint chiefs of staff were abolished and responsibility was turned over to a single chief of staff as part of the integration program, Air Chief Marshal Miller was given that responsible position. He served as chief of staff from 1964 until 1966 when he retired.

There was no evidence produced to indicate that relations between Air Chief Marshal Miller and the government or the minister were anything but most cordial and most cooperative. Air Chief Marshal Miller defined integration as a force having a single defence staff, a single planning staff and a single budget procedure.

The program of integration, in contrast to unification, is widely supported. I think we can say it has been unanimously accepted by all of the officers and specialists in the defence department. Air Chief Marshal Miller defined unification as a single force having a single rank structure, a single administrative chain of command, a common uniform and a force wherein the trades and ranks would be called by common names. Air Chief Marshal Miller stated, as recorded on page 2326 of the committee evidence, that when the program began unification and integration were interchangeably used. These words were accepted as having approximately the same meaning. It was only when the program got well along that a differentiation was made between the meaning of these two words.

As Air Chief Marshal Miller pointed out in his definition, integration called for a single defence staff, one commander and one chief of staff rather than the three members of the joint chiefs of staff including the chairman. Instead of having three chains of command as we formerly had, there was to be one chain of command, one single administrative chain. There was to be a single planning staff, that is, you would have a commander of planning and one staff serving the three branches of the armed forces. In addition, there would be a single budget procedure. The budget for all our Canadian armed forces would be handled through one organization, one budget planning board. Now, this is acceptable to practically everyone.

Later a proposal was made that unification should take place. Unification has boiled down to the abolition of the three branches of the service, the army, navy and air force, through reorganization into one force under one commander, having a common uniform and with the trades and ranks called by common names. It was at this point that very serious opposition arose across this country. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that instead of diminishing this opposition is increasing. I plead with the government and I plead with the minister to take note of this fact. There is no reason, at least no evidence has been submitted by the experts in the field, why the government cannot stop now, having accomplished a very substantial measure of integration quite apart from what is now called unification.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Let the government stop now and subject the present state of integration to a substantial trial period. It can be tried out for whatever time is required, six months or a year. Some of the experts suggested from three to five years, and some even longer than that. The present state of integration should be thoroughly proved, I suggest, before we go on with what is now known as unification.

As for the advantages and disadvantages of stopping now or proceeding further, again I should like to quote from Air Chief Marshal Miller's evidence because as I have already indicated I do not think there could be any more valuable evidence. From the standpoint of experience and qualifications the Air Chief Marshal was more adequately fitted to provide information than anybody else. The testimony he gave did not stand out by itself. The testimony he gave—he was one of the last witnesses to be called by the committee—substantiated evidence which had been repeated by witness after witness among that talented array of military specialists whom the committee invited to appear before them.

We do not need to stop on this side of the water for evidence in this regard, because in the Montreal *Gazette* for Saturday last, April 8, Admiral Mountbatten was drawn into the controversy. He did not want to be drawn into the controversy and there was no inclination on his part to interfere in Canadian political affairs, but he sent a clarifying statement from London after he had been advised by Richard H. Gaunt, a retired Canadian naval officer, that he was being represented in Canada as an all-out supporter of unification. Admiral Mountbatten made his position clear, and if we want the evidence of a disinterested specialist, surely his evidence would qualify as such.

As reported in this issue of the Montreal *Gazette*, Admiral Mountbatten stated:

"Few people still oppose the integration of arrangements for pay, food, clothing, furniture, equipment, etc., since this must be a more economical way of providing them," he said in his statement...

Admiral Mountbatten pointed out, however, that in the British reorganization, great care had been taken to preserve morale and service tradition.

One of the chief complaints of the opposition at this time is that the government has not paid sufficient attention to the wishes of the personnel in the armed forces. Then the article continues with this direct quotation from Admiral Mountbatten:

"It has been accepted that to achieve this"—

I assume he means integration.

—"the three services must retain their uniforms and ranks with an identifiable professional head of their service," he said. "The idea of a single uniform and rank structure was also rejected as undesirable and unnecessary".

The Montreal *Gazette* felt so strongly about the matter that this morning's issue carried an editorial on the question. Part of it reads as follows:

Lord Mountbatten, too, is an advocate of unified command and integration of services...

[Mr. Thomas (Middlesex West).]

But integration and unification are two quite different things. Both men—

There the article is referring to Admiral Mountbatten and Air Chief Marshal Miller.

—come down strongly against haste in creating a single service with a single uniform.

Lord Mountbatten confirmed there was some talk of unifying the services in Britain, but it was turned down as "undesirable, unnecessary and"—

I am sure the minister will not like the last word.

—"ludicrous."

"No compensating advantages could be seen in attempting to impose so unpopular a change," he said.

Air Marshal Miller, speaking on the advantages and disadvantages of unification, said:

"I said I did not see a monetary return for unification, nor do I see any significant military effectiveness. I said I saw some unanswered questions associated with unification that perhaps should be spelled out before you could really get out and sell it to people."

These are honest doubts, honestly expressed. And they are grounds for caution in adopting in Canada a policy that can bring no monetary return, and which might be unnecessary, if not ludicrous.

There is evidence, Mr. Chairman, to indicate that there may be disadvantages. As reported at page 2297 of the minutes of proceedings and evidence, Air Chief Marshal Miller was asked this question:

Do you, yourself, see any financial advantage accruing from the proposed scheme of unification?

Again, there they are talking about unification as opposed to integration. Air Chief Marshal Miller replied:

There are no significant financial advantages whatsoever as far as I can see.

He was then asked this question:

Do you see any military advantages flowing from it?

He replied:

Again, there are no significant military advantages.

So there are no financial advantages and there are no significant military advantages. If the best expert in the field makes statements of this kind, Mr. Chairman, surely the government should pay some attention to them.

Again he was asked:

Do you see any military disadvantages coming out of it?

Air Chief Marshal Miller replied:

The disruption is an unknown factor, and one which I have always rated rather highly.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I do not know whether the word "highly" is a good word here. It might be interpreted as meaning that perhaps there is something commendable about this possible disruption, though quite evidently Air Chief Marshal Miller did not mean anything of the sort. He indicated that the disruption which might result from unification is an unknown factor and one which he had always rated rather highly or of great importance. He went on to say:

> I did not want to have anything occur that would cause disruption in the services. I felt a lot of careful planning was necessary, and that probably time to educate people was required before the next step of unification was taken.

There we have the advice of the leading expert in the field, a man who has served long and faithfully in our armed forces, a man better qualified than anybody else to speak.

> I felt a lot of careful planning was necessary, and that probably time to educate people was required before the next step of unification was taken.

That theme was repeated a number of times by other witnesses. I will not repeat their evidence because there is not enough time. Parts of their evidence have been quoted freely and widely.

I suggest to the government and the minister that a case has not been made out to show why we should not stop this process of unification, if one can call it that, at the present stage of integration. It has not been shown that it would be unwise to stop the process. Air Chief Marshal Miller and many other witnesses said that we should thoroughly test the process of integration for a period of years before taking the drastic step of wiping out our three services and combining them, with one uniform and a common rank structure. There is evidence to show that the prospect of unification is upsetting the morale of the troops and is disturbing people from one end of the country to the other. I suggest to the government that if there is no sound reason for not stopping the integration process now and testing it thoroughly before going on, the government should stop it and allow us to get on with the other business of the country.

Mr. Groos: Mr. Chairman, I begin what I hope will be my brief remarks with a sincere thank you to my friends on both sides of the house who sent their good wishes while I was in hospital recently and who welcomed me back to the house so kindly. To be personal for a moment, my condition turned out to be a temporary one at this time. I found from speaking to other members that a great many of us in this chamber have had a similar experience. I do thank you all and I hope that other members, if or when their turn comes —and I hope and pray it will not—will have as happy an outcome as mine was.

While I was away some remarks made by the hon. member for Kamloops appeared in one form or another in the press. I again wish to express my thanks to my hon. friends on both sides of the house who in this instance took up the cudgels on my behalf. I do appreciate it but I would like to go on to say that, having read a few days ago in the Victoria *Times* a further interview with the hon. member for Kamloops, I wish to clear the air right away and say that I accept without any reservation whatsoever his explanation of what it was he had in mind in the first instance. Part of the basis for the hon. member's remarks was that I was worried about unification. "Concerned" might better have described my feelings for, of course, I am concerned about unification. Aren't we all? That is what we are here for today; this is our job at this moment.

Unification is a big thing for Canada. When parliament entrusted the defence committee with the study of the bill on unification and its implications, surely it then became our task to hear evidence, to work on the bill and if possible to make it a better bill. That is what committees are for and that is what we did. We all became concerned about the bill.

While I am on my feet and in a thanking mood, Mr. Chairman, I hope you will allow me to use this opportunity to thank the very patient members of the defence committee who laboured with me as their chairman for most of the past 12 months. In particular I want to thank the steering committee which included, of course, the hon. member for Edmonton West, the vice chairman of the committee, and the hon. member for Vancouver East who always had a fair contribution to make to our committee's deliberations.

Let me say a word or two before I go on about the witnesses who appeared before our committee. I, of course, heard all those who appeared before my sudden departure and I think I have read all that was said by those who appeared subsequently. I know you will agree, Mr. Chairman, that we are indeed a favoured land when our nation can command the services of such men. I am not pretending that I agreed with all that was said but,

without exception, the witnesses had something valuable to contribute and they put forward their case with a sincerity that no one could doubt and with a dignity we can all envy.

I will not speak at length about the deliberations of the committee, the number of witnesses, the pages of evidence or even about the number of words as ascertained by some keen mathematical mind, which have been spoken on the subject. I will, however, describe to the house what I think are some far-reaching implications of this debate. Since last July and particularly in recent weeks thousands of words and endless repetition have been the order of the day on the precise definition of unification and what it means, and I think this has constituted a good part of the problem which we members and the public have faced. There is, of course, no such word as unification in the dictionary in a military sense, and I am sure in my own mind the Minister of National Defence will never again coin a new word to describe such a far-reaching and, if I may add my own view, such a far-seeing operation as that which is now before us in this bill. Since the word has no definitive military meaning we have been left to our own devices to interpret it in our own way.

My personal definition or view, which incidentally is the same today as when I started considering the matter many months ago, is that when we speak of unification we are talking about taking integration as far as it is practical to go. I understand my own definition, which is hardly surprising, but what is far more important, the people I talk to can also understand it and see more clearly what it is we are trying to do. From here on in my speech, then, I shall refer to what is before us as the integration-unification bill or process.

• (4:00 p.m.)

I think it is of the greatest importance when speaking on this matter to emphasize the following point, that the planning for integration-unification will be done by the men in the armed forces themselves. The minister has said so, and that, of course, is how it should be. It is the servicemen who will be affected by it so it is only right that they themselves should be the ones to draw the route to be travelled toward the general objective which will be given to them by parliament, I hope very shortly. Furthermore, regardless of what has been said here by both proponents and opponents of the plan, the very fact that the planning will be done by those who will both execute the plan and live with it is a guarantee, at least to me, that they will have a very large measure of control over the speed of execution of the plan. In addition, it is a guarantee to me that the plan in its final form will be a good one, coming as it will from men of such experience, ability and good sense as those who appeared as service witnesses before the committee.

The minister has not denied that in its final form the integration-unification plan may look a lot different from what it does now. He has told us he takes no immutable stand on the details, and there are few hard and fast details in the bill itself. One of the opponents of the bill, referring to the lack of planning, likened it to a man proceeding down a road in a dense fog, going from lamp post to lamp post. I have no argument with that. I find it a good simile. It all depends, of course, on whether you know where you are going and whether or not you start out on the right road. I believe we are on the right road and that we do know our objective, and I can imagine no better way of proceeding along this ill-defined thoroughfare than by taking easy steps from one recognizable point to the next. Is this not precisely what the service planners have been telling us they are doing, and in the bill before us is the government not asking for permission to continue this orderly planning progression toward the integration-unification objective?

In a task of this magnitude, particularly when it involves entering areas hitherto unexplored, areas where hidden dangers may well lurk, there will unquestionably be changes of route and method. But what of that? Does this mean that the task is one which should not be attempted at all simply because we do not know all the answers in advance? Must we Canadians really be, as Marshall McLuhan has described us—he is not an air marshal and, indeed, has nothing to do with anyone's armed forces—must we Canadians really be "mildewed with caution" as he said we are? I do not think so. We have been accused of destroying things which should be preserved. That is not our objective. We are not setting out to destroy anything.

Mr. Churchill: Only the army, the navy and the air force.

Mr. Groos: We are, however, trying to build something new and in the process of

building some things, some good things, I admit, have to be changed. Take the uniform. Much has been said about it but, no matter what has been said, service uniforms are not being completely removed. To emphasize the permanency of the integration-unification arrangements and the interpendence of those who serve in the new organizations it is proposed, however, that on many occasions all officers and men should wear what is basically the same uniform. What is wrong with that? It makes sense to me. I could certainly live with that arrangement. It means a change, but that is how things go. We see this sort of thing happening in all fields of life, so an explanation or apology is scarcely needed from me. It is a fact of life, and we have to keep up with the pace of life if we are to survive.

I believe this bill before us, this imaginative bill is one good example that Canadians are not always, to quote McLuhan again, "looking into the rear-view mirror and defending the status quo, which is outmoded the moment it happens." If in the process of opposing the bill we carry our objections beyond the realm of fact into the lush, tempting fields of speculation and fancy, it could well be a disaster for us all. For example, were the armed forces of Canada to become demoralized by protracted debate and ridicule lightly heaped upon this new idea by this house, we would all suffer.

Those responsible for a debate of that sort would have to be ready to shoulder a heavy responsibility. Can they be as sure of themselves in their objections as they claim in this house to be? I doubt it very, very much. Hon. members and others need no reminder from me that in the armed forces of Canada we are dealing with a group of volunteers who traditionally and rightly shun the limelight, who do the peoples' bidding without question and who voluntarily forgo, because of their love of Queen, country and adventure, a great many of the democratic safeguards which we civilians prize and about which we so endlessly boast. There would be no such freedom if there were no such armed forces in the free world. In return these men ask very little, but what they demand is sensible direction and at least some understanding by public and parliament alike of what their problems are. I have no hesitation whatsoever in saying that this house is in the process of creating, if it has not already partly created, a problem of morale in the armed forces which requires active consideration by all of us as members of parliament.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Groos: I would prefer to deal with questions at the conclusion of my brief remarks. A goodly portion of the comment in the House of Commons, in the press and outside the house has somewhat naturally been concentrated on the negative aspects of integration-unification. It could hardly be otherwise. But there comes a time when such comments have side effects far greater than were ever perhaps intended. If you keep telling a person he is sick, sooner or later he starts believing it. If this were to happen in our armed services, we would all be in trouble and every member in this house would share the blame.

Various hon. members on the opposite side have painted a dismal picture of the morale situation today within the Canadian armed forces and in particular in the Royal Canadian Navy on the east coast. I can only say that this does not fit in with the impressions I get from across the country and the position as I see it from the point of view of the R.C.N. on the west coast. Of course, there always were two navies in the Royal Canadian Navy—the east coast navy and the west coast navy. And I am quite sure that if things on the east coast are as bad as they are being painted by the hon. member for Halifax, then subject to the Minister of National Defence making a few new arrangements with NATO, which should not be too hard to do, the west coast navy will cheerfully take over some of the Halifax or east coast obligations and show once again in a spirit of friendly competition, the spirit which so often exists in this house, that anything they can do in Halifax we can do better in Esquimalt. In fact I think there really is a need within the R.C.N. for a readjustment in the division of the strength of the navy between the east and the west coast of Canada. Surely present events across the ocean in China and in other countries bordering the Pacific rim are convincing evidence enough to warrant such a change, and I ask the minister to give it his serious consideration.

• (4:10 p.m.)

In recent years the east coast navy has not, to my knowledge, been up to full strength. For years and years it has had to borrow sometimes reluctant sailors from the west coast navy. This is no reflection on any admiral, least of all on Admiral O'Brien, now maritime commander in Halifax, who must know that for many years he has had my

admiration and respect. He has, among other things, a tough problem with bad weather and lots of snow, which makes the west coast look pretty attractive to some sailors.

So much has been said about changes in uniform and so forth that I feel I must make some further comment and, if hon. members will permit me, I would like to say that within my own experience naval officers in particular over the years have been overly conservative in matters of changes of dress. For example, ask any old sailor what happened when in 1941, I think it was, we were issued with the Canadian Volunteer Service Medal with its little silver maple leaf to denote Canadian volunteers on overseas service. Many of us just did not wear it because it was different and other navies did not have one. This is true.

Ask old sailors about the time we were directed to wear "Canada" flashes on the shoulders of our uniforms to denote what country we were from. Once again there was great hostility to this, and for many months many officers just did not make the change.

What about the red maple leaf painted on the funnels of R.C.N. ships, an idea that spread like wildfire throughout Canadian ships abroad once someone thought of it? We were ordered to take it off, and on my ship —incidentally this was overseas so I do not know who was responsible for ordering it to be taken off—we went through a period of finding that it had been painted anonymously on the funnel by night and being obliged officially to paint it out by day. What a farcical situation that was. I remind hon. members that it was not until the war was over that this distinctive emblem was permitted to become official, and of course it has remained official until the present day and will not be changed under this bill.

Again, you should have heard the uproar in some quarters when, as a result of representation by the sailors, the navy's traditional tot of rum was allowed to be issued mixed with a cola drink instead of water. What a catastrophe that was going to be. Nelson wouldn't have liked it. As a matter of fact I think he would have liked it because he was a very progressive admiral.

I will not try to describe the feeling in some quarters when it was discovered that zippers were to be incorporated into the naval uniform, and would you believe that diagonal serge cloth for sailors' uniforms would cause any heartburn in anyone? Well, it did and many is the old sailor who will recall he was ordered to dispose of his "tiddley" uniform because he had had it made ashore of light weight comfortable diagonal woven serge. It wasn't quite regulation then but it is regulation now.

If hon. members are not too tired of these matters I can go on. We even put a zipper on the sailor's jumper. But here it turned out we were making progress. When we dared to put zippers on the sailors' jumpers the Royal Navy copied us, but it was not until they did so that suspicion of this innovation completely disappeared in some quarters of the R.C.N.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Groos: I would rather wait until I have finished.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I was under the impression the hon. member was a commodore. It appears he was a tailor.

Mr. Groos: For a moment I would like to talk about the rift which has undoubtedly and quite understandably been caused by the integration-unification process and all that it entails or, rightly or wrongly, appears to entail in the minds of its supporters and detractors. This, as we have seen, covers a whole heap of territory, as you, Mr. Chairman, might say in more grammatical terms. The rift extends beyond the service and well into civilian life. It is there and it bodes ill for the future of the armed forces if something is not done about it and done fairly quickly. I place the blame for a great deal of this on a quite unbelievable lack of understanding as to what it is we are trying to do. Even today I hear people, who should and in fact do know better, talking as if we were trying to turn over servicemen into all-purpose fighting paragons. Soldiers in kilts, climbing the rigging of ships—what utter nonsense! It is sad, but it is perhaps indicative of the lengths to which otherwise normal, rational people go when they are confronted with highly charged emotional matters in which they are very much personally involved. I do not blame them unduly.

Speaking personally, before we had the facts and were dealing with wild rumours I found some difficulty myself in being impartial and unbiased. But this is not the case today. Apart from pointing out that the vast majority of these rumours subsequently turned out to be quite false, I should also say that there was much about the old organization and the old way of doing things which we are now trying to change with which I

also disagreed and disagreed even more strongly. On balance I think I can say that from the start I have been in favour of the idea behind integration and unification, and now that integration-unification is with us I want to see it work in the best possible way.

How can we overcome the rift about which I speak and how can we best go about it after this bill in its final form is passed, as I believe it shortly will be? It may be of interest to some hon. members to know that in other countries' armed services in modern times there have been other emotional cataclysms and even deeper-seated rifts than in our own, but the unbeatable combination of good will and intelligence has healed the wounds. I cannot believe that we lack in Canada, particularly among those who are affected and are interested in integration-unification, either intelligence or good will. So I think we are going to come out of this situation in good shape all right.

Since the service which seems to have been zeroed in on, if I may use that expression, is the navy, I would draw the attention of hon. members to a situation which developed in the Royal Navy of Great Britain not long before world war I when Great Britain's far-flung empire covered so much of the globe and the Royal Navy was quite realistically called "Britain's sure shield" and was very largely responsible not only for defending the empire against all comers and all combinations of comers but also for policing the farthest corners of the empire's interests.

The schism in this case developed over a difference of opinion between two senior admirals, Fisher and Beresford, both very popular and both men of ideas and integrity. Fisher was the more senior of the two and he became the first sea lord of the British Admiralty. He was a reformer, and I think it is fair to say that in the light of history it can be seen that the great majority of his reforms have stood the test of time and, had they not been put into effect, the British Royal Navy would not have been as well prepared as it was when in 1914 and again in 1939 it was called into action. Many of the innovations Lord Fisher introduced, and he produced quite a few, are still with us today. Fisher had his supporters. Beresford, on the other hand, had his.

• (4:20 p.m.)

I will not go into the details, although there are many books in the parliamentary library which cover this subject. Those who are fond of history and who seek literary diversion could do worse than spend an hour or two following the course of this dispute. I am sure they will be struck by the quite astounding similarity between the development of recent events in Canada and those engendered by the Fisher-Beresford dispute. Many of the points put forward by both sides were equally contrived. Many of their fears turned out to be just as groundless and many of their methods were quite as farcical as some we have witnessed. I will stop there in the interest of time.

I am interested in bringing to the attention of the committee the aftermath of the controversy in Britain, the rift and the damage to naval and military discipline because, believe it or not, the dispute was still being talked about in the British navy when I arrived on the scene some 25 or 30 years later. In my opinion we can make no better start to mend this rift of ours than by getting on with our job of dealing with the clause by clause study of the bill and voting on it. Let us remove the heavy, deadly pall of uncertainty which now hangs over the armed forces. Let the servicemen know for certain where they are going. At least let parliament set the objective and let the armed forces get on with their job of planning their own route and timetable in order to get there.

To the members of this house I have this to say: In a venture as imaginative and far reaching as this I am glad to have a part. I happen to be playing my part today in the House of Commons, but with this sort of challenge I feel so strongly about this bill and what it will do for Canada that I would return willingly tomorrow to the navy, if they would have me, at my old or any lesser rank —I am not fussy. You can see from the amount of weight I am losing that I am getting ready to fit into some of my old uniforms. I am not just saying this, I mean it, and I know there are others who feel the same way. I mention this only to point out that there are many ex-servicemen who are as anxious as I to see this all-Canadian venture succeed and who are anxious to give Canada another "first" in the military field and another mark of prestige in international circles.

All hon. members now have a hand in this important measure. In speaking to hon. members opposite I should like to say that this is a better and more practical bill today than it was when it went to the committee, not that there were any changes made in the committee while I was there but rather changes made later by the members and by my

successor as chairman. There may possibly be other improvements still to be made. How can we tell unless we get into the clause by clause discussion?

The opposition undoubtedly has a duty to perform and as everyone knows I have never questioned that. But I am questioning it now. There is considerable, though as I have said perhaps unintentional, danger if we persist with this debate much longer. I think it can rightly be claimed that the opposition has played the game and has put up a fair fight with tangible and valuable results, but the time has come when we must get on with our task as parliamentarians and our job of making a decision. It may be difficult but we cannot delay it forever. The government has the responsibility and is prepared both to assume its responsibility and stand by the consequences. There are other consequences to be borne in throwing up a roadblock and stalemating this debate and for these the opposition has to judge its own responsibility.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) but I must advise him that the time allowed for his speech has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

The Deputy Chairman: There seems to be unanimous consent that the hon. member may proceed.

Mr. Groos: I thank hon. gentlemen. I promise I will not be more than a minute longer. I invite the official opposition and other members opposite to consider the details of this bill. From what I have seen and heard the present members of the armed forces are ready and, what is more, from what we have seen, ready and able to get on with the job when parliament gives its consent. Let us give them a chance and let us do it without further rancour or further delay. Once parliament has made its decision let us also again close ranks as we have traditionally closed ranks within the defence committee and give our servicemen our wholehearted and undivided support. They deserve it. I will have more to say, Mr. Chairman, when we are discussing the clauses in the bill later. I hope it will be soon.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, we are glad to see the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) back in his place. He suggested he is ready to join the navy again and has regained the sylph-like form appropriate to the uniform he wore with distinction. May I say that if the rank of admiral is still available he may be sure that after his speech today the Minister of National Defence will place him in that category.

There is one statement he made with which I am rather in agreement. I wonder whether he really meant it when he said, "Remove the heavy, deadly pall which hangs over the armed forces". That is exactly the position in every part of Canada. He expressed the view parliament is taking too long in committee. I can only take the figures handed to me. Yesterday there was some change; but as of Friday the number of Liberal members who had participated once or twice—and I count each separately—was 15, the number of Progressive Conservatives 18, the number of N.D.P., four, and Social Credit, one. Yesterday the number of Conservatives increased.

In listening to speeches about parliament I find the argument strangely reminiscent of 1957 about which the present Minister of Justice—a message has been sent to him that I am going to make some references to him as the philosopher of Liberalism—referred to in an article. In 1963 he wrote an article which appeared in *Cité Libre* in which he said:

• (4:30 p.m.)

I remember the Liberals of 1957. They were cynics who felt they enjoyed a personal claim to power and they came within a hair's breadth of putting parliament in bondage. One would have thought that six years in opposition would have had on those Liberals an effect somewhat akin to purgatory. Unfortunately the events of the last few months prove that this is not so.

We are faced with the same idea. In spite of the "honeyed" words of one hon. gentleman, we know what the government has in mind. They brought in a flag by closure and they intend to pass this legislation by the same means. That is their objective. The speech made by the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) today had all the earmarks of having been inspired from above.

Mr. Groos: That is not so.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The government is preparing once more to trample on the rights of parliament. The hon. gentleman said one other thing when he described this legislation. He said it was like blind men at night with lamp posts in the way but still travelling forward. No better analogy could be made in respect of this legislation.

I have read all of the evidence and all of the speeches and I summarize my views in a few lines. There is no basis for unification

from the view point of effectiveness, economy, defence commitments to NATO and NORAD, or on any other ground. Parliament is trying to get the facts but today it is very apparent what is happening, even though the minister and the Prime Minister have hidden behind a veil of silence. Our armed forces are going to be reduced to a major contribution to an international police force and Canada's defence is going to be almost completely dependent on Washington. That is my summary of the situation. Parliament is here to clear up this matter.

The hon. gentleman did raise the curtain a little when he mentioned that something new was being brought in. Within the last few hours the executive assistant to the Minister of National Defence underlined the following to a number of journalists.

> The bill on unification of the armed forces raises a problem as to whether Canada will have a British mini-navy, a British mini-army and a British mini-air force.

He then goes on to say after other words that this point has never been discussed in the House of Commons. That is exactly what we have been saying. The purpose of this legislation is to bring about an extended separation from all those things that are part of our traditions.

Already 450 green uniforms have been ordered. Yesterday the minister explained the purpose of that order as being experimental. That is not what was indicated to the manufacturer. He was advised that these uniforms were to be ready so that when Expo opens we will be able to show de Gaulle and all the rest that we do not wear the kind of uniforms that were mistaken in 1956, as the Prime Minister once said, for British uniforms. This matter has not been discussed in the house, suggests the director of policy for the Department of National Defence. Why should the press receive from the lips of this gentleman a policy that has not yet been discussed in parliament? One hears parliament condemned. This has been going on for years. Let me read a quotation from the London *Times*.

> The standing of the House of Commons in the country, it is said, has never been so low. The commons is criticized for its futility, for having lost effective control of the executive, for being a closed club intent on its own rituals and out of touch with the mass of the nation, for the partisan behaviour of its members, for the rudeness to each other of the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition.

That is the type of criticism mouthed in this country. The article then states that parliament has a place.

> In the first place, parliament still educates the nation.

It cannot educate the nation unless what is said here receives at least a modicum of coverage in the press and other media. Parliament is subject to condemnation to a great degree because of the failure to discharge their responsibility of those who should be disseminating what is taking place here. I have often heard all we need is a group of men who have never been in parliament and they will come up with the inspiration and forward-looking policies we need. The writer of this article states:

> A parliamentary statesman only emerges after long years of trial and winnowing in the "face to face" encounters of speech and action which constitute the essence of parliamentary life.

That is what we are doing. We are arguing a case but the government is hiding behind generalities. The Montreal *Star*, which seldom has anything good to say about the opposition or the Conservative party, carried this statement the other day:

> The government deserves the pounding it is getting on unification.

The article states that various ministers are arrogant and adamant. I do not have to identify them. The looks on their faces reveal their admission into that group. The article then states:

> We have become used to this from Mr. Hellyer, but now Mr. Martin has chosen to get in on the act.

I am sorry to have to add the next words:

> He did not help.

• (4:40 p.m.)

When will the guillotine fall? A number of members have spoken, including an independent member from Quebec whose independence is defined only by the description. The other day he said that nothing is to be gained from continuing the debate. The government knows that many hon. members to my left will line up in support. I listened to the defiant words of the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.), a moment ago when he said this government is prepared to stand or fall on this issue. The government never makes such statements unless it is sure to stand.

Defence is a tremendously serious matter in this nation. The increase in expenditure has mounted to an extent which few could have contemplated in the days of Beresford and Fisher to which he referred. When the hon.

member for Victoria (B.C.) mentioned the dispute between Lord Fisher, the fighting admiral, and Beresford, the philosopher of the navy, he did not add that both wanted to maintain and not destroy the British navy. Let me underline that.

Just before the second world war Canada's defence expenditures ranged between $17 million in 1935-36 and $34½ million in 1938-39. Today's expenditures run up to $1,658 million. This is something which adds materially to the weight of taxation in our nation.

Last July the minister as he went across the country issued regular statements regarding the danger in which he found himself. He said in Vancouver that it was terrible how the admirals were trying to get his head. That I am sure they would not have wanted at any time. The minister said when this legislation is in effect we are going to save millions and millions of dollars. The last year we were in office the amount expended on defence was $1,575 million. Today it is $1,658 million, and the estimates are up $115 million this year. I say to the minister, not in anger, that I thought better of him. His attitude before parliament indicates he has not been here long enough to know that one cannot deceive parliament, that it will not be accepted.

I am told that the Minister of National Defence was on the way to the leadership of the Liberal party. In the last few weeks his image, and it was a good image, has suffered as a result of his failure to tell parliament the facts. We have been used to this. One after the other the ministers of this government have told parliament matters that are not true. The description found in the dictionary of those who engage in this systematic practice is pseudologers. The minister withheld information. He did not give a true picture. He tampered with the evidence of a witness before it was given.

A moment ago the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) said: "We do not know where we are going but when we pass this legislation the men in the armed forces will certainly know what to do and they will go just as fast or as slow, apparently, as they wish." What will happen to them? What happened to Admiral Landymore who was condemned as a person guilty of treachery and disloyalty to his country? That went on for six long months. Then the minister, as a result of the intervention of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra who stated that there was no basis whatsoever for the allegation, rose and said, "I am sorry." He said, "I withdraw." I admired him at that moment, but that same evening he repeated on the C.B.C. the accusation he had withdrawn in the afternoon.

I can just see the opportunity these officers will have to determine the course of unification. The hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) mentioned a zipper. That is the best expression I know to indicate the attitude of the Minister of National Defence. He puts a zipper on the lips of those who say anything critical and he removes it from the lips of those who join in the hallelujah chorus.

An hon. Member: "Hellyerlujah."

Mr. Diefenbaker: The other day when the Prime Minister made his uncertain speech in Calgary he said that having read the evidence of Air Chief Marshal Miller he found it interesting. He gave everybody to understand that he was going to back down. However, the next day he said, "I will not back down."

The financial report of the Department of National Defence did not agree with the report of the Auditor General. The Auditor General was right. The minister had to apologize to Lieutenant General Fleury and he had to apologize to Rear Admiral Landymore. This government does not back down, it backs up, or fails to back up that which it has charged. We have never had a true picture.

The minister sits in his place day after day waiting for information from above, failing to give parliament the facts. We had to wait until his executive assistant leaked information to the press yesterday. In December he made a speech which appeared in *Hansard* with annotations and adornments. The people of Canada have paid for 45,000 copies of the speech.

It is a serious thing when in the matter of defence which is at all times difficult, those with expert knowledge are swept aside. That does not mean that the military authority should dominate the civil authority. Nothing of the kind. The civil authority must be maintained. No one has ever taken a stand to the contrary that I am aware of in the last 35 or 40 years. Everyone except the one who occupies the highest position in defence in this country today—I am told he has political ambitions—says that unification is not going to work out. But this does not matter; they go through with it regardless of the consequences.

• (4:50 p.m.)

I will read the list: Admiral Brock, General Foulkes—do not say these gentlemen are

Tories because Foulkes almost became a Liberal Candidate. He was anointed in Victoria.

An hon. Member: What about Brock?

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am talking now about Foulkes. If I am going too fast for the hon. gentleman, I apologize. Foulkes had been promised the nomination by the leader of the Liberal party and he turned up at the convention in Victoria.

Mr. Foy: I understand that you almost became a Liberal candidate at one time.

Mr. Diefenbaker: This is the first time I ever heard the hon. member speak, and I want to hear him now. If I have done nothing else, I have at least been able to hear the voice of the hon. member for Lambton West. I thank him for making it possible now to identify him.

I return to a reading of this list: Lieutenant General Robert Moncel; Air Vice Marshal Hendrick; Air Marshal Clare L. Annis; Lieutenant General Fleury; Admiral Rayner; Air Marshal Curtis; Lieutenant General Guy Simonds, who has been recognized in every military book on the second world war as one of the greatest tacticians this country or any country ever had; Air Chief Marshal Miller, and everyone knows his reputation is outstanding. I have already mentioned Admiral Landymore. These gentlemen have proven their dedication. In my opinion, the most irresponsible part of the whole affair has been the campaign of denigration launched against those who dared to express an opinion contrary to that held by those in authority. As Shakespeare said, they exercise "a little brief authority, most ignorant of what he is most assured".

Has Lord Mountbatten any reason to express his views, except to clarify the falsification of those views spread from the Department of National Defence? This man has been one of the greatest, if not the greatest, exponent of combined operations. They thought that they could misinterpret his view and the C.B.C. helped. The C.B.C. used an interview given by Mountbatten last fall and then misinterpreted it.

Has Mountbatten any partisan feeling in this matter? I am going to read two or three excerpts from his statement. I do not want to repeat, but they tell the story. If he had not been such an authority they would not have been using his name. They thought what he said favoured them. He was asked by Commander Groos of Victoria for an explanation of his views on integration and unification of the British forces. Lord Mountbatten's statement ends this way:

> In the British reorganization care has been taken to preserve esprit de corps and morale and those traditions which help to maintain this in the services and fighting units. It has been accepted that to achieve this the three services must retain their uniforms and ranks with an identifiable professional head of their service. The idea of a single uniform and rank structure was also rejected as undesirable and unnecessary.
>
> There was some talk of taking the uniform and ranks of one service and imposing this on the others but the idea of a man in say army uniform with an army title arriving at a foreign port in command of a warship was generally felt to be so ludicrous that it was not pursued.

They don't back down but they have started to back up. They will now permit members of the various services to wear their uniforms when off duty, if I understand the latest incongruous rule issued by the department.

They say we should not debate this matter, Mr. Chairman. There has never been any authorization from the Canadian people on the question of unification. It never came up in the election campaign. The Minister of National Defence was asked about it in Halifax on October 3 and stated that no decision had been made. According to a Canadian Press dispatch, he backed up his promise by stating to a press conference on Sunday night, October 3, that soldiers will always be soldiers, sailors will always be sailors and airmen will always be airmen. No wonder the Montreal *Gazette* today in an editorial entitled, "Even Ludicrous", points out this fact:

> And they are grounds for caution in adopting in Canada a policy that can bring no monetary return, and which might be unnecessary, if not ludicrous.

I am always here if it is possible, but the other day I was not privileged to be in the house when the Secretary of State for External Affairs decided that he would take part in the debate—Paul helping Paul. I read his speech very carefully. It was a hedged defence of unification. He is not often this way; he is generally direct. However, the other day a tinge of uncertainty found its way into his remarks as recorded on page 14562 of *Hansard:*

> I want to say now unreservedly that all of us in this house have every reason—

Then, there is an alteration in course.

> —even though all of us might not agree with his views, to have confidence in the capacity of the Minister of National Defence—

• (5:00 p.m.)

He repeated the objectives of defence policy. He had our defence forces spread all over the world as thin as margarine on a cracker. He had them going here, there and everywhere. He said we were going to support collective measures, we were going to participate in international organizations and support policies arising therefrom, and were going to protect and look after the surveillance of our territory, our air space and coastal waters.

When he uttered those words, Mr. Chairman, he must have known that these ideas were not practical in any way but were simply generalities. With the few people in our armed forces, how are we going to protect our northern areas, our vast empire of the north? We are now going to become the world profferers of forces provided with international duties, a proposition that has been turned down by the United Nations. We are going to say to countries: Do not ask and you shall receive.

What is Canada's policy, Mr. Chairman? Where do we stand on NATO? A general observation was made on this question, but it had a qualification that would have done honour to Mackenzie King. There are some today who say that we should not be in NATO any more, that as a result of the détente of the last year and a half a new relationship has been established with the U.S.S.R. The only reason for that is that the U.S.S.R. is more frightened of Communist China than of us. Communist China stands as a tremendous threat over the U.S.S.R. in Asia. If Mao Tse-tung wins, the division will continue. If Mao Tse-tung loses, those in charge of Communist China will desire once more to combine their ideology with that of the U.S.S.R. We cannot allow the bulwark of our freedom in NATO to be swept aside by anticipated peaceful relations. That is an ephemeral premise. If ever Communist China once again lines up with the U.S.S.R., there will be a return to that system of consistent probing to find our weaknesses by the U.S.S.R.

What is our image abroad? When I sat on the other side of the house those who today occupy the treasury benches said: "When we take over, all will be well". They were in error. Events show they were not justified in saying this. The Prime Minister of Canada went to Washington and was allowed to cool his heels while the president talked on the telephone. He might as well have been in the doghouse.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

What about France, Mr. Chairman? If ever a country owed much to Canada it is France. The blood of Canada was poured out in sacrifice in the first war. More Canadians were killed in action than were killed in the United States forces. We were, of course, involved in the war much longer. My classmates went down at Vimy, 19 of them in the ranks. There was no representative of France in any senior position at the recent ceremony. A brigadier general turned up. Surely there must be some reason for this loss of face by Canada in France.

When the Secretary of State for External Affairs arrived in Paris in 1963 there was no one to greet him. The French have a meticulous regard for protocol. The Secretary of State for External Affairs arrived on an important mission to take up certain matters with the French foreign minister and had to ride into town on the hurricane deck of a baggage truck. Only one possessing the dignity of the hon. gentleman—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): May I intervene simply to point out to my right hon. friend that the difference between his going to Paris and my going to Paris is that I was allowed in.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, I do not follow that observation. When I went to France I was received by General de Gaulle with the full honours accorded a leader of a foreign nation. I am not saying this in any desire to ridicule, but I do say it is wrong that a man occupying the high and dignified position of minister of foreign affairs should be so treated in that way. Mussolini did not ride into Rome in such fashion.

What is the attitude of the United States toward Canada? There has been a disregard for the greatness of this nation and its contribution. All over the world we are engaged in a spending spree in external affairs. I look, for example, at the costs of Canadian embassies. In France the cost since 1962-63 has gone up from $834,870 to $1,396,000. In the United States it has gone up from $698,800 to $1,252,000. The answer is that you cannot spend your way into the hearts of other nations unless you deliver the goods.

Why did General de Gaulle take this attitude, Mr. Chairman? When he received Premier Lesage I do not know how many guns were fired. I do not know how many guns will be fired when he greets Premier Johnson, but when Canadians as a nation turned up at Vimy nobody from France was there.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Mr. Prud'homme: The French people were there.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Nobody turned up except those poor, humble people French in heart who knew what the sacrifices had meant.

In all seriousness I asked the other day whether this situation would come about. The Prime Minister answered that the plans had not yet been completed. This simply means that this government has lost for Canada in a period of four years an international prestige that she has enjoyed through the years. Are we going to rebuild that by offering to supply Canadian forces for the United Nations. The United Nations last December brushed that suggestion aside. That was the greatest setback that Canada has ever suffered at the United Nations.

Can you place your trust in this government on the matter of defence policy in view of their record on nuclear weapons? I have the quotations when the present minister and those associated with him rose in their places to say we should not have nuclear warheads on the Bomarc, we should not permit our division in Europe to be armed with nuclear weapons. When the minister said that, was he sincere? Were those his true sentiments? That is what the Prime Minister said. Then in the twinkling of an eye something happened. In January, 1963, following a pilgrimage to Washington by one or two who are now ministers, the policy of the Liberal party suddenly changed. Was that not strange? There was the arrival of an emissary from Washington, one who had been President Kennedy's organizing genius. Some of the ministers opposite have knowledge of this fact. There were funds galore for the Liberal party in 1963.

An hon. Member: That is unworthy.

Mr. Diefenbaker: One wonders what portion of the funds came from the United States. One wonders whether the C.I.A. was straightening out Canada because we dared to stand on our own feet.

An hon. Member: Oh, no.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, yes. It was a very strange situation, sir. The United States ambassador stuck his nose in. On January 30, 1963, Washington issued a statement that was an obvious interference in the coming Canadian election.

I have wondered about this. Where are we to obtain the truth? We shall obtain it from the lips of one who sits today in the Privy Council of Canada—I told him in advance I would refer to him—a man, as I said the other day, of high integrity, the Minister of Justice. He told the story and I shall read a few portions of it. If anybody wants more I shall be glad to read on. I refer to an article by the present Minister of Justice.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I join in the applause. Hon. gentlemen opposite will not be applauding in a moment when they hear what was said. They have not read the article. I want to hear them applaud later. The article begins with the words, "Lester B. Pearson—the unfrocked priest of peace". He says that the policy turnover did not come before the Liberal party before it was announced. I have the words here. I can quote the entire article if necessary. This is what was said:

> I am not at the moment concerned—

This is the minister.

> —with the merits of Liberal party nuclear policy. I am only concerned with the anti-democratic reflexes of the spineless Liberal herd.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Monteith: No applause comes from the other side.

Mr. Diefenbaker: On page 10 it is said that the leader of the Liberal party changed the policy, in the course of a speech in York-Scarborough on January 12, 1963. Then the article goes on to say:

> Thus the same man who denounced the NORAD commitments and refused to be bound by them . . . found himself two months later bound by an unexpected sense of honour—

All I can say is that the hon. member for York-Humber may yet qualify for membership in the Privy Council.

Mr. Starr: Say a few more things, Ralph.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The fact that the present Minister of Justice said these things is of interest. He also asked what the reason was for the change.

> The answer is not much of a mystery.

On page 15 we have the reason:

> Whence came then the scruples of Mr. Pearson related to the Bomarcs? . . . The answer is not much of a mystery. Mr. Pearson's scruples were a matter of conscience—perhaps even subconscience—and obviously American.

This is very interesting. I made statements as to what happened in 1963 when the Minister of National Defence discarded everything he previously stood for. He had told us

about the only policy that could be good for Canada. He ditched that in a matter of hours in January, 1963. Why? Perhaps the minister could answer that now. What does the writer, now the Minister of Justice, say about where "conscience leads to dishonour"?

It was obvious for some time that the United States did not appreciate Mr. Diefenbaker. From the start he had proposed to revamp the Commonwealth and to loosen the ties with the United States. Commercially he proposed to swing to the United Kingdom 15 per cent of our external trade.

He named the O'Leary Commission ... he selected an external affairs minister (Mr. Green) who seemed more interested in peace than in pleasing the Americans. He—

Diefenbaker.

—was selling wheat to China and dealing with Cuba ... That was enough for American public opinion to hope for a Liberal victory last June 18. They were misled. Worse was to come. American opinion learned with stupefaction last October—

That is October, 1962.

—that the Soviets were placing in Cuba missile installations—

He wrote that we did not act fast enough on October 22 to please those in Washington.

Kennedy's hipsters could not tolerate this. At the very moment when the wind of freedom was blowing among NATO partners, especially France, was the time to make an example of those who would be independent by an exemplary chastisement.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I have not heard much applause from over there lately. I was to be chastised in an exemplary way for attempting to stand up for Canada. That is what the present Minister of Justice said.

There was an easy victim chosen. The word was given: "Diefenbaker must go".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: They always applaud that, Mr. Chairman. But in 1963, when they were allied with the United States administration—let hon. members opposite wait until I have finished because then there will not be so much applause. The Minister of Justice went on to say:

I am not being dramatic. Do you think that General Norstad, former NATO supreme commander, came to Ottawa on January 3 only as a simple tourist, when he accused the government of Canada of not living up to its engagements? Do you believe that it was only accidental that Mr. Pearson in his speech of January 12 based himself on the authority of General Norstad?

Do you believe it was by inadvertence that the state department on January 30 issued a communique strengthening the position of Mr. Pearson and boorishly treating Mr. Diefenbaker as a liar?

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Do you think it was only by chance that this statement gave the opposition leader abundant arguments with which he stuffed his speech in parliament on January 31?

Was it just simple coincidence that these events ended with the downfall of the government on February 5?

I go on from there:

Why should anyone think that the United States would act differently in the case of Canada than they did in the case of Guatemala where reasons of state demand it and conditions permit it? The reasons were there.

Then the writer explained the situation in some well chosen words:

On the other hand, Mr. Pearson was there, ready to step in. He was respected. He had worked for peace in the United Nations. The financial interests knew he was surrounded by a group who could re-establish economic order without reverting to extreme measures.

I am still quoting. I dislike quoting extensively except when necessary in order to place the record before hon. members.

What greater temptation, and what could be easier for the Americans than to add the last straw which would overthrow a government whose position had been shaky ever since the elections?

That is the election of 1962.

The circumstances were such that the blow must come from the Pentagon and required that the Prime Minister betray the program of his party along with the principle with which he had consistently identified himself.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: If I said that, it would be heresy. The paths of criticism lead up to the Privy Council. I have not heard much applause from over there lately.

The bagmen promised that funds would be forthcoming.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: These are not my words. These are the words of one who knew. He said:

Power beckoned to Mr. Pearson; he had nothing to lose except his honour. He lost it. And his whole party lost it, too.

Talk about a testament. Everything I have ever suggested during the campaign of 1963 has been proven. A little later—I have many more of these pages because this is a long article; it takes a long time to deal with it—we find the heading: "From Clownishness to Liberal Philosophy".

The series of farcical situations which arose following the apostasy of Mr. Pearson on January 12, 1963, found at last its justification in the position of Mr. Walter Gordon.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The article goes on to tell us about the hon. member for Davenport, now President of the Privy Council. I am not going into that. I have dealt with him on other occasions. The writer went on to say:

> The political philosophy of the Liberal party is simplicity itself. "Say anything, think anything you like, but put us in power because we are best fitted to govern". If Canadians cannot agree on a flag, very well, we will give them two. (Pickersgill).

It is an astonishing article. There are several more pages of this. If anybody wants to read the whole thing I would be very glad to let him have it. The writer sums up:

> The party is opposed to nuclear arms, but the leader says it is necessary to be in favour of them (Pearson); everyone will remain free to be against them (Pickersgill) although, in his heart, no one will be (the Young Liberals). Then again, all this does not really concern us (Lacoste). The ordinary Canadian has only to put his trust in the Liberal Party (Gordon). The leaders are always right (Choquette), and my husband has not changed his views—

That last statement was made by a certain lady. Oh, it is all here and it is summed up in these words:

> What idiots they all are.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The best show I have heard in this house for years.

An hon. Member: A very weak answer.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I will hurry on and refer to a later page. He goes on to say:

> I must keenly regret the defeat of a government of Canada in parliament—

This was the government I had the honour to lead.

> —on a question and following a strategy drawn up by the Americans.
>
> It is all right for Pearson and the Liberals to shout "Ready, aye ready" when the word came from across the border from the militarists and the fund raisers.

I suspected that many times. Bagmen. It would almost qualify some of these people for the Senate.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He sums up the whole thing in these memorable words:

> But I would have liked, at least for appearances sake that a few Canadian M.P's would have had the reflexes of a Herridge, or a Cameron, the old socialist.

Then it mentions doing the White House's "dirty work". There is much more I could quote from this article. There is an inexhaustible supply.

> What does morality say about those who buy votes with principles betrayed?

He is speaking of those who sit opposite.

> To corrupt spirits by reducing politics to a system utterly denuded of principles seems to me far more serious than having handed out a few presents to the electorate. Are there no electors among the people for whom courage, sincerity and public spirit maintain some attraction?

• (5:30 p.m.)

There are some, Mr. Chairman. I have simply outlined one set of circumstances. I am asking this question of the government of Canada. There they sit, the Minister of National Defence and the Prime Minister, who stood against us and said we were wrong, that the only policy for Canada was to have no nuclear weapons under any circumstances both here and overseas. The reason is now revealed why principles for which they stood were jettisoned. On the basis of what has been revealed by the Minister of Justice regarding these ministers—and there are others sitting over there who were here about that time—I think the Canadian people have the right to ask why they are hell bent to push this legislation through in time for Expo. The reason is that the minister threatened last July, according to the Canadian Press, that if he did not get it through he was going to resign. He wants to be at Expo with his 400 green apparelled men. "The Duke of York marched up the hill and then marched down again."

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, the right hon. Leader of the Opposition began his speech this afternoon by saying that as a result of unification it would be the policy of the government to develop a United Nations peace keeping force only.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Not only.

Mr. Hellyer: This has been categorically denied by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. This has been categorically denied by me.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): So what?

Mr. Hellyer: And yet the Leader of the Opposition repeats the lie—

Mr. Diefenbaker: You should never talk about lies.

Mr. Hellyer: —as his followers have on numerous occasions during the course of this debate. The answer, Mr. Chairman, does not rely just on the word of ministers of the crown, although that should be good enough for the right hon. gentleman. It is in the facts, in the facts about a $1½ billion five year re-equipment program for the Canadian Armed Forces which includes armoured personnel carriers, not just for the brigade overseas but for the Canadian army stationed in Canada as well; armoured reconnaissance vehicles, again not just for the brigade overseas and training scales at home, as was the policy of the right hon. gentleman when he was prime minister, when he was developing—as I may say later in the debate—a force which only had a capability for United Nations peacekeeping activities and when this was the official policy of the Department of National Defence, armoured reconnaissance vehicles not just for the brigade overseas and training scales at home but for the whole Canadian army; acquisition of self-propelled howitzers, 155 mm., for the brigade group in Europe and for the heavy brigade in Gagetown; anti-tank missiles and anti-tank guns; helicopter equipped destroyers in order to increase even further the anti-submarine capability of our navy and its ability to contribute to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in the anti-submarine role; the purchase of two additional operational support ships in order to increase by an order of magnitude the ability of ships to stay on station in anti-submarine operations and to make a real contribution to the anti-submarine role, as well as to provide the Canadian Armed Forces with a back-up capability to transport troops and equipment if required; ASROC missiles for our ships, fighter bombers for our mobile force, air trucks to carry our troops and equipment.

I ask the right hon. gentleman, is this the equipment list that one would buy for a peacekeeping force only? It is not. It is the list of equipment required to give the Canadian Armed Forces the flexibility that they require to enable them to do all of the tasks set out in the white paper and re-enumerated in my second reading speech earlier in this debate.

[Mr. Hellyer.]

Mr. Churchill: You talked about a peace restoring force. That is a punitive force which would require those arms.

Mr. Hellyer: As I said in my second reading speech, Mr. Chairman, our force is a force for the 1970's, a force which can contribute to NATO and to NORAD as well as to United Nations operations or to any other demand placed on it by the government of Canada in the national interests of this country. Even Air Chief Marshal Miller dealt with this myth in his testimony before the defence committee and I am surprised, therefore, in view of the reliance that the right hon. gentleman places on his testimony, that he should repeat this afternoon in this committee the misstatement of fact which has been repeated over and over and over again by his supporters for weeks and months during the course of this debate.

Another charge which he made this afternoon was that defence expenditures were increasing. Well, of course this is true in current dollars, Mr. Chairman, but as the right hon. gentleman knows, and if I recall correctly, the defence estimate for the last full year of his government was $1.63 billion. Translated into terms of present dollars on the basis of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics index for governmental expenditures, that is the present equivalent of a budget of $2 billion. I think that the right hon. gentleman should try to give the people the facts in this regard and not try to confuse them by mixing up in his mind current and constant dollars.

Then he made an allegation which I could only interpret as being a slur on the chief of the defence staff, General Allard, making some vague suggestion that he had political ambitions. This is a contemptible slur on a distinguished soldier, but it is understandable from a man who conducted witch hunt after witch hunt after senior military officers in the defence department at the time he was prime minister of this country, when there was an aura of fear pervading the senior military establishment because of the then prime minister's well known fear of military men.

General Allard is a distinguished Canadian soldier. He is a distinguished son of this country who has played his part in war and in peace and who was the first Canadian to command a British division. I think the right hon. gentleman should do him the courtesy of a gallant gentleman and not cast slurs on his integrity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Did the Minister of Justice tell the truth?

Mr. Churchill: Tell us about Admiral Landymore.

Mr. Hellyer: Then there was the suggestion that the unification of the armed forces was not an issue in the last election and therefore the Canadian people had no way of judging whether or not they were in support of this measure. It was a plank in the last Liberal party platform and certainly the men and women of the armed forces knew it was part of the Liberal platform, as was stated so eloquently in the testimony given before the defence committee by a number of recently retired senior officers.

Mr. McIntosh: Air Chief Marshal Miller did not know, your chief of staff.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Mr. Hellyer: The most incredible part of the speech by the right hon. gentleman this afternoon to this committee throughout the whole time he took—I do not know how long it was but it seemed like a long while—was that he did not give one cogent reason why this bill should not be proceeded with. He did not give one cogent argument contrary to the principle of unification. He did not in any way address himself to the principle of the bill but sought rather to indulge himself in some sort of electoral nostalgia. Then he cast aspersions on the motive for unification, the reason for it. The reason is to increase the military effectiveness of the Canadian Armed Forces. It is to give the absolute maximum in military effectiveness for the Canadian tax dollars which are being spent. It is to refine and design a military force with the maximum of flexibility and capability to carry out its tasks in the decades which lie ahead. This is the reason for the military reorganization.

However, even in the reorganization, Mr. Chairman, there is an element of Canadianization. I do not think this should be objected to by the right hon. gentleman. This will be part of the consequences of reorganization because in so far as military organization is concerned Canada will be leading the world and will be out in front of all other nations.

Again this afternoon the right hon. gentleman made a very serious charge. He said I had failed to give parliament the facts.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Absolutely.

Mr. Hellyer: But he did not go on to give one single example of the facts I have failed to give to the house. Where is his sense of British justice?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Hellyer: Where is his regard for the bill of rights?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, this is the first time the British have come into it.

Mr. Hellyer: Is he so completely unmindful of the principles which he preaches in the bill of rights and from the platform that he would make a charge of that kind in this house and then not give even one suggestion of what he might have had in mind? It was a most extraordinary intervention. I was surprised most of all, however, by his new found love for senior military officers. This is a characteristic which I have never ascribed to him. I have never ascribed it to him because of his record when he was prime minister and because of his many public pronouncements, as well as some of the things he said this afternoon in his speech.

I think that it might be advisable to go back and review some of the relationship which existed between the military and the civil authorities in order to put it into perspective. I should like to start with the cancellation of the Avro Arrow.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That was recommended by the defence chiefs.

Mr. Hellyer: The right hon. gentleman has just stated that it was recommended by the defence staff. Is that correct?

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is correct.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, on January 1, 1959, in his home at 24 Sussex Street he told Mr. Charles Templeton that he, the prime minister, was going to cancel the Avro Arrow notwithstanding the pressure by the military and by industry.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, on a question of privilege, so far as Mr. Templeton is concerned his veracity needs no assistance, but I should like to read the evidence of General Foulkes given before the special committee on defence.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Deputy Chairman: Order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am rising on a question of privilege and will not be howled down. I

wish to read from the evidence given before the special committee on defence on October 22, 1963.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. The Leader of the Opposition is rising on a question of privilege and should be given the opportunity to state his question of privilege.

Mr. Diefenbaker: This evidence was given by General Foulkes. He said:

> That is the story of the Arrow, but the chiefs of staff came to the conclusion that it did not make military sense to purchase aircraft at a cost of $8 million each when we could maintain aircraft with similar performance from the end of an American production line at something about $2 million.

There is the record.

Mr. Crouse: Apologize.

Mr. Hellyer: I thought the right hon. gentleman might take that point of view so I spent most of the morning reading the record. This was about three weeks after he advised Mr. Templeton that he had made a decision. Then the chiefs of staff took a decision in respect of it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is an unequivocal falsehood.

Mr. Hellyer: He was not going to be pushed around by the industrial military complex. He was going to show who was running Canada and he was going to cancel the Avro Arrow regardless. Those are the facts. The decision was subsequently confirmed by the chiefs of staff, as the right hon. gentleman has suggested. If I may say so, the whole Avro Arrow episode showed the lack of a unified approach in respect of defence matters and a lack of adequate priorities in respect of defence requirements.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. St. Laurent—

Mr. Hellyer: The hon. gentleman should not get emotional. This is precisely one of the reasons the defence reorganization was recommended to the House of Commons, so that there could be a unity of approach, a unity of strategy and an adequate set of priorities in order to reduce the likelihood of this type of problem recurring in the years ahead. It was quite right that the government should make a decision at that time. The government had the responsibility to make a decision. Nobody is denying to the right hon. gentleman the right to have taken the decision in the manner he did. I think, however, it should be pointed out that regardless of the merits of the decision, whether it was right or wrong, at that time the biggest brain drain this country possibly ever has seen started. It was much greater than anything that has happened in so far as the military is concerned because of the unification of the armed forces. The two are not in the same order of magnitude. Because of this great brain drain our country lost some of the most highly skilled engineers and designers this country has ever developed. I am sure that nothing will persuade them to come back as long as there is any prospect of the right hon. gentleman ever becoming prime minister again.

The second example I should like to give is the choice of the airplane for the strike role; I am referring to the CF-104. Here again, Mr. Chairman, there is a very unusual sequence of events. The choice that was made of the CF-104 was a government decision. It is true that eventually the chiefs of staff made a recommendation, but only after they had been directed to do so by the government of the right hon. gentleman and only after they had already said that this was not the best airplane to carry out the role and was in fact not suitable to carry out the role. I do not know who made the decision—I do not know whether it was made by the right hon. gentleman himself or by the late Senator Brunt, but someone made the decision and it was promulgated.

Even more important, however, was the role for which this airplane was acquired. The air force reversed itself in respect to its opposition to the CF-104 three days after the airplane was approved because it was afraid of rocking the boat in respect of the role that had been accepted by the government for the air division in Europe. The strike role was the military choice. It was accepted by the government of the right hon. gentleman. It was not a role which was assigned to the military by the government—quite the opposite—and it led subsequently to a very silly situation which has been referred to already this afternoon by the right hon. gentleman.

• (5:50 p.m.)

In an article written by the late Major General W. H. S. Macklin he said:

> Having made the strange blunder of ordering, at a price of hundreds of millions, a whole series of weapons needing nuclear warheads or rockets for effect, the cabinet refuses to arm them accordingly. They swallowed the nuclear camel and then

choked on its tail, and this has made them look uncertain, and even stupid.

That was a decision made by the government of the right hon. gentleman, and it did in fact lead to a situation which has been the subject of debate ever since.

The government of that day spent hundreds of millions of dollars on equipment and training for a strike role accepted by the government, the consequences of which it really could not have fully understood. Later the same government refused to acquire the atomic weapons necessary to make the role effective. At that time the consequences were quite different.

The right hon. gentleman asked me earlier why I had changed my position. Let me tell him again that I did so because Canada had accepted a commitment, through the government of the right hon. gentleman, and had told our allies we would fulfil this role. The government purchased the equipment with which to fulfil that role and when the time came to make a decision to acquire the nuclear weapons to make it effective it refused to act.

One of the other charges he made this afternoon was that we were letting NATO down and that there must be some reason for France's attitude toward Canada at this time. This represents an incredible lapse of memory on the part of the man who was the prime minister and who authorized the defence department to spend probably $1 billion for nuclear equipment and training and then welshed on our obligation by refusing to arm these weapons, thereby embarrassing our forces for the first time in Canada's role in NATO.

I do not think the full consequences of this act are completely understood by the right hon. gentleman. The Royal Canadian Air Force now has available to it in Europe an explosive power comparable to several thousand times that used at Hiroshima. This is the consequence of a role undertaken by the previous government without comprehending the advice given to it by its military chiefs.

The right hon. gentleman suggested this afternoon that this was the result of a decision arrived at in Washington. This was not a decision made in Washington. The recommendation that Canada adopt a strike role was made in our own defence department. It was decided on here by the military, submitted to the government, and approved by the government of the day without comprehending the consequences. It was also supported by the minister of national defence of that day.

My point is this: Was there any analysis by the civil authorities of this recommendation and was there any analysis by the civil authorities of the consequences of engaging in this role? Was there any independent analysis by civil authorities in the defence department or elsewhere in the government of the relative contribution that Canada could make to our allies by accepting this role as against some other role for the Canadian armed forces?

In my submission there was no independent civil analysis. I submit there should have been such an analysis before accepting this advice, with its consequences of staggering proportions, and rubberstamping it. There should have been an independent analysis of the consequences of placing Canada in a position of accepting a role without really considering any of the options available to us as a nation. This was done by an acquiescing government without the will or the facilities to exercise an independent judgment in respect of a matter of this tremendous magnitude. The government just went blindly along.

One important consequence of that action has been the determination the associate minister and I have had since we assumed reponsibility for this office to make sure that there was a much greater exercise of civil authority than had been the case under the previous government which was responsible for accepting the strike role on behalf of Canada.

Mr. Brewin: Would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Hellyer: Yes.

Mr. Brewin: I should like to ask the minister whether he thinks an independent civil judgment would have warned us against taking this particular role and whether he now has obtained an independent civil analysis which indicates that we should terminate this particular role?

Mr. Hellyer: I think that is a perfectly valid question. The answer to the first part is yes, in my opinion. I think an independent analysis would have brought to light the options and might have indicated at that time that the over-all stockpile of strategic power

available to the west or the alliance was adequate to deter and that under those circumstances the weakness of the west related to conventional forces. It might have indicated that we could have made a greater contribution by developing our conventional forces at that time.

We are now in a position of having the equipment and the trained forces and other resources necessary to carry out the role. This complicates the situation. We are not in the same position we were in before the role was accepted. The white paper suggests that we should reduce this role as the aircraft are attrited. I think this is a valid policy at this time. I am not the least bit convinced that if we were doing this over again a good analysis might not have shown a more appropriate military way for Canada to spend her funds to augment the total capability of the alliance, strengthening the alliance as a whole.

Let me give two contemporary examples of the situation in the United States between the civil and military authorities. On the basis of a newspaper article written by Mr. Joseph Kraft, which appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen*, it is alleged that there is a difference of opinion in the United States in respect of the bombing of North Viet Nam. According to this article:

> One side, led by Secretary of Defence McNamara, is sceptical, to put it mildly, about the value of the bombing. In their view, bombing the north has not achieved any progress in its political objective—which is to weaken the resolve of the Hanoi government to keep up the war. That assessment is apparently borne out by recent C.I.A. evaluations.

Later on the article states:

> On the other side, there are the advocates of the bombing, led by the joint chiefs of staff—

Would the right hon. gentleman accept the military advice, which I presume is unanimous, of the chiefs of staff, or would he accept the advice of his civil authorities and his minister in respect of the political and military effectiveness of the operation? The point is that the government has not only the right but the absolute responsibility to exercise independent judgment after reviewing all the military plans and proposals and after hearing all the evidence and the points of view. The government must then take a final decision and accept the responsibility for that decision.

• (6:00 p.m.)

My final illustration in this field is anti-ballistic missiles. Here again there is a very strong difference of opinion between the military and civil authorities. Mr. McNamara believes that the installation of an anti-ballistic missile system might not provide the protection that is suggested by his military chiefs of staff. I should like to quote from evidence he gave to Congress which I think puts his point of view better than I could. It reads as follows:

> It is the virtual certainty that the Soviets will act to maintain their deterrent which casts such grave doubts on the advisability of our deploying the NIKE-X system for the protection of our cities against the kind of heavy, sophisticated missile attack they could launch in the 1970's. In all probability, all we would accomplish would be to increase greatly both their defence expenditures and ours without any gain in real security to either side.

This is not the point of view of the military chiefs of staff. Their point of view is that the Soviets might not increase their offensive capability, that they might not want to divert the resources necessary in order to maintain an adequate deterrent. But I think the McNamara philosophy is straightforward, that if we on the western side depend for our security on the nuclear stalemate, on having sufficient offensive power to penetrate Soviet defences and to be able to inflict unacceptable damage on them at any time even after the first strike, then they will have the same philosophy that they on their side will want to maintain sufficient offensive capability to enable them to inflict unacceptable damage on the west, in spite of our defences in order to deter attack, and to be able to perform this even after a first strike, which of course we would never undertake. But again the point is this: Do military authorities in their submissions have the right to have their proposals accepted without proper scrutiny by the civil authorities, or do the government of the day and the responsible secretary of state or minister have the responsibility to investigate and satisfy themselves, or itself in the case of the government, that the proposal is in the best interest of the nation or the alliance?

Mr. Fairweather: Will the minister permit a question? I think this is a very interesting point but I have not been able to appreciate the significance of Mr. Kraft's article in the Ottawa *Citizen* from which the minister quoted stating that the secretary of defence is against bombing Hanoi and the recommendation of the United States joint chiefs of staff. Who wins in this difference of opinion?

Mr. Hellyer: I think it is obvious in that case that there are also others in that government who believe that the bombing should

continue and this is supported by the chiefs of staff.

In so far as the anti-ballistic missile dispute is concerned, it is not yet resolved. As the hon. gentleman knows, there are discussions going on between the United States and the U.S.S.R. in the hope that some agreement can be reached, and I for one certainly hope and pray that this will be the case. I do not think there is too much optimism, but at the same time it is by far the most sensible thing to be done because the consequences are almost unbelievable. I would like to talk about them for a minute.

The cost to the United States of introducing a heavy anti-ballistic missile system is estimated now at $20 billion. Those who are familiar with defence expenditures and the tendency for these expenditures to escalate believe that the cost would reach at least $40 billion by the time the system is made effective. An equal expenditure of perhaps $40 billion would be required in western Europe, and assuming that the Soviets introduce a system of equal complexity and sophistication when they have the technical know-how to do so—and there is no reason to believe they could not develop it because they have been doing research for many years—their cost would be comparable.

The Deputy Chairman: I regret to interrupt the minister but the time allotted to him has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

The Deputy Chairman: It seems that there is unanimous consent for the minister to continue his speech.

Mr. Hellyer: I appreciate the co-operation of the committee. The over-all cost of installing this system could be as high as $120 billion. In other words, it would represent the commencement of the greatest arms race in the history of the world. But this is not the end of it. In addition to the cost of deploying the anti-ballistic system there is the cost of the additional offensive capability on each side necessary to penetrate the defences on the other side in order to continue the atomic stalemate and to provide the measure of assurance of destruction which deters each side from using the offensive capability.

Mr. Brewin: May I ask the minister another question on the very point he is now discussing? Is it not true that, in addition to the expenditures he has mentioned, to render an anti-ballistic missile system truly effective there would have to be a system of shelters to deal with fall-out, and that this would be not only an added expense but would require a good deal of regimentation of people to get them to use the shelters when required?

Mr. Hellyer: This is true, but the cost is not great in comparison to the total cost involved for the anti-ballistic missile system.

The anti-ballistic missile question raises a number of considerations. First of all it raises a very serious moral question. I think we have to examine in the western world the advisability of spending anything like this sum of money on a defensive system which, as Mr. McNamara suggests, might not prove to be successful in doing anything other than maintaining the status quo. I think we have to look at the situation in the world and consider alternatives so far as the expenditure of sums of this magnitude is concerned. We have to look at it also from a strategic viewpoint. If the ultimate goal is to win the war of ideas, then I think we have to consider very carefully the possibility of diverting a large proportion of this expenditure to more useful purposes which would have a greater impact on the people of the world, and particularly those people who are uncommitted, to show them we are sincere in our intentions.

Again I ask my right hon. friend, would he accept what is obviously a unanimous suggestion of the United States joint chiefs of staff without the independent appraisal that has been given to it? I am sure he would not. I would not suggest for a moment that he would, and if he did I think he would be very unwise. It would, without question, be endorsing an escalation of the arms race, and I am sure he would be most reluctant to do that. Would he endorse the fantastic expenditures without a careful and independent analysis of the alternatives? I hope he would not, although judging from the position that he and his party have taken in this debate I would not want to put them to the test. Incidentally, the antiballistic missile system is an army system. As you know, the aerospace defences of this continent under the NORAD command are predominantly air force. I do not think I need to elaborate at any length on the problems that could conceivably arise in reconciling these two facts.

One must listen to all points of view and then decide.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is exactly what we are asking the minister to do.

Mr. Hellyer: Of course the chiefs of staff were predominantly opposed to the unification of the armed forces. Chiefs of staff all over the world are opposed to the unification of the armed forces. Chiefs of staff all over the world and those who have decided in their minds that they are going to become chiefs of staff are opposed to the unification of the armed forces.

Mr. Churchill: The minister is the only one in the world who is right.

Mr. Hellyer: They can be wonderful people. They can be dedicated public servants. They may have served their country with distinction and gallantry. They may be masters of the military art. But when they become chiefs of staff they take on an additional role. Then they become heads of service. Then they become party chiefs. Then they have responsibilities over and beyond those responsibilities they have had throughout their careers. They then carry in themselves the vested interests of their whole service, of its traditions, of its rank structure and everything for which it stands, including its fair share of appointments and of military expenditures. It is not unnatural then that men who have been chiefs of staff are—I should not say unanimous because there are some exceptions among chiefs of staff—in majority opposed to unification.

• (6:10 p.m.)

Mr. Diefenbaker: Which ones are in favour?

Mr. Hellyer: There are some.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Who?

Mr. Hellyer: I am going to come to that in a minute. There are some people who are in favour. I think the general statement I have made is a fair one. Once a person becomes head of a service he has a responsibility to that service which in his opinion supersedes his previous freedom of action.

Mr. McIntosh: What authority have you for saying that?

Mr. Hellyer: I think it is quite natural then that they should take this point of view. In addition, I believe if you were to select anyone in the whole world you could not find anyone who would be more biased in respect of military unification than a chief of staff, for the reasons I have given.

I must say I am surprised when I hear some of the endorsements of integration. I am all the more surprised when I hear some endorsement of integration coming from people who, when we started this scheme in 1964, were just as opposed to integration as they appear to be to unification now.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Who are they?

Mr. Hellyer: I have been trying to avoid personalities, Mr. Chairman, and it is very difficult for me to do.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Would the minister permit a question?

Mr. McIntosh: This is just more of your confusion.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Is the minister implying in his remarks that integration commenced in 1964?

Mr. Hellyer: No. If the hon. member will read my second reading speech he will find it is a historical process which has been going on for 20 years. I can say in fairness, I think, that integration prior to 1964 had not been very great and most of the integration has taken place since 1964.

I should like to quote from an editorial which appeared in one of our service papers written by a serviceman in respect of two points which have been raised. If I had more time I would quote from it at length. The two points I should like to make in particular are in respect of the pacing or timing of the unification process and, second, the question of integration versus unification. The editorial is entitled, "Let's Get On With It", and appeared in *Voxair*:

> The integration process began two years ago, and that, to the rank and file, seems a long time. The reason is that few things appear to have changed at the operator and unit level. This is easy to understand, since the process was designed to work down from the top, and only recently some results of these changes have been noticeable in the field.

Later we find this:

> More difficult to comprehend is the opinion, often expressed in the recent controversy, that the integration process is too fast. This opinion implies a comparison, and one can only wonder what it is compared to, since this is the first time any nation is integrating and unifying its forces.
>
> Most proponents of the "too fast" idea appear to be those who were against integration in the first place and who believed that integration and unification would not become a reality. When it now appears that it will, the natural reaction for anyone resisting change must be to attempt to delay the change.

I must underline that, Mr. Chairman, because this is exactly what my experience has

been. Those who now say "too fast" are in some cases those who have never really endorsed the idea of integration at all and in some cases were adamantly opposed to it. Later on the author of this editorial writes:

> As we stated above, integration appears slow to those in the field. This should make a good argument for speeding up the process as much as possible. Any change of the magnitude of the one undertaken is difficult and sometimes painful, but the quicker we complete the change the less painful it is going to be. If, on the other hand, the phase of change is allowed to go on ad infinitum we can be certain that morale will be adversely affected.

This view, Mr. Chairman, is not that of the associate minister or myself or the chiefs of staff now serving but that of one of the servicemen, and it is the view of many who have expressed opinions to me in respect of this matter.

Mr. Fane: Will the minister allow a question?

Mr. Hellyer: Yes.

Mr. Fane: Will the minister give us the name of the person who wrote that editorial?

Mr. Hellyer: I will send the hon. member a copy of the editorial and that will give it.

Mr. Churchill: Put it on *Hansard*. I think you should put the name on the record since you are reading the article.

Mr. Hellyer: I will send it to my hon. friend.

Mr. Churchill: Identify the article.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Put the name on the record.

Mr. Hellyer: I have no objection, but this point was raised yesterday by me and my hon. friend took exactly the opposite point of view then when he said it was not necessary.

Mr. Churchill: That was in respect of tabling a document.

Mr. Hellyer: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will send a copy to my hon. friend.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The argument yesterday was in respect of tabling a document which is done in the house when the Speaker is in the chair, not in committee. The minister is once again giving false information.

An hon. Member: Oh, sit down.

Mr. Churchill: I said nothing about this yesterday except in respect of the tabling process. What we are asking for now is the identification of a document from which the minister has read. We are entitled to the name of the author as well as the journal in which the article appeared.

Mr. Hellyer: I will try to provide it to my hon. friend. In any event, I accept responsibility for it in order to get it on the record.

Mr. Churchill: I rise on a point of order again—

Mr. Hellyer: This is not a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Diefenbaker: You cannot flout the rules.

Mr. Churchill: The minister is flouting the rules. When members quote from documents they give the name of the author. The minister is asked now to give the name of the author. Of what is he afraid? Whether or not he is afraid, this cannot be done under the rules of the house, refusing to give the name of the author of a document from which he is quoting. If it is an editorial from one of the newspapers which are daily circulated, that is a different matter.

Mr. Diefenbaker: This looks like self-serving evidence.

Mr. Churchill: So far as we are concerned, we should know the author.

Mr. Hellyer: I will try to get the name of the author. The only reason I cannot give it at once is that it is signed with the initials O.F. There is a list of the editorial staff and the publication is *Voxair*. It is published in Winnipeg and represents the views of a great many Winnipegers so far as this subject is concerned, so I recommend it to the hon. member.

Military opinion in respect of this question is obviously divided. The majority of the senior officers are in favour of what we are doing, but not all. The choice of witnesses before the committee meant that the point of view expressed would inevitably be contrary to the proposal to unify the armed forces. The scales were loaded in advance. The views of all the retired service officers who appeared were known in advance. I could have told my hon. friend almost precisely what they would say before listening to their evidence.

As I said earlier, these witnesses fell into the category of people who had held high,

responsible positions and who felt that all the interests of the services that they had served so well were vested in them. I feel that in many cases they still feel that way. I know they do as a result of talking to them. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, there are other views as well. I should like to read the views expressed by two ordinary people, and I think they express very well some of the things I should like to say to the committee.

The first article I should like to read is entitled, "Thankful Hellyer Is "Jet Age", Not Nostalgic For Cavalry Stables". The article reads in part:

The stubborn opposition to the unification of the armed services by older generals and admirals is not surprising to many of us who served in both world wars.

In his memoirs the British writer on military matters, B. H. Liddell Hart, gives statistics which prove that between the two world wars, the general staff spent more money for hay and oats than on gasoline and oil. They still believed that the cavalry divisions were more important than developing armoured divisions.

• (6:20 p.m.)

He states: "It was disturbing to find that—after six months in office, and a war crisis so obviously near—Gort (Lord Gort, chief of staff, 1937-39) was still concerned with the reactions of military conservatism, and so anxious to avoid offence by moving faster than the older generals would tolerate".

Liddell Hart gives credit to Hore-Belisha, a war minister before 1939, for modernizing the army more in nine months preceding the world war II than had been done in all the years since world war I.

Let us not forget what two civilians, Lord Haldane and Hore-Belisha, did to shake the complacency and conservatism of the old generals who believed in fighting a new war with the methods of the previous one.

Let us the thankful that we have a jet-age defence minister in Paul Hellyer and not a world war I general who has nostalgia for the Ross rifle and the odour of the cavalry stables.

That was signed by Henry C. Hall of Richmond Hill.

I have another letter from a retired officer. The newspaper heading to the letter is "Unification Means Better Morale, Leadership—Brigadier", and the letter reads as follows:

What I find disturbing about the current discussions regarding unification of the armed forces is that there seems to be little, if any, reference to the basic principles involved.

The bitter arguments revolve around uniforms, ancient history and personal emotions.

Broadly speaking, the advantages of unification can be summed up as unity of purpose and, secondly, cohesiveness.

Unity of purpose from top to bottom, has growing significance with the development of modern and changing weapons and conditions. It has special relevance to the modern problem of "limited war"— the form of war (other than "peace-keeping") which is likely to involve Canada.

Cohesiveness ensures maximum effort in the direction of the desired "purpose". It includes such factors as the power to implement decisions in a comprehensive manner; ability to concentrate effort; flexibility; improved communications; effective economy in use of manpower and equipment, etc.

The commonest objections to unification are the anticipated difficulties in connection with expansion of part or all of the armed forces (if needed); ability, or lack of it, to co-operate with allies; morale.

For all major expansion the problems of unified and separate forces would be largely the same. This, therefore, is not a valid objection, as the scales tip somewhat in favour of unification.

Co-operation with allies, always difficult, seems to present no greater difficulties one way or the other.

Morale is the most important single thing in war. Many things go to make up morale but the one overwhelmingly important single factor is leadership.

It is significant that Napoleon's armies in their hey-day had a high level of morale, and it was because of leadership, not because they looked back into the distant past for inspiration and not because they wore old-style uniforms.

We must look to the future. Already we have Hovercraft which travel over land and water riding on a cushion of air; rocket harness for individual propulsion of foot soldiers over obstacles; reconnaissance "scopes" that see targets in the darkness; improved management and control techniques.

All these things call for modernization of the armed forces set-up. Canada with its small armed forces is in an ideal position to do this.

That is signed by Guy S. N. Gostling, Brigadier retired, of Niagara-on-the-Lake.

Mr. McIntosh: What has it got to do with unification?

Mr. Hellyer: It has a lot to do with unification. They are the principles which are required to build a single service and to make it cohesive and effective, and I commend them to my hon. friend.

As I indicated, Mr. Chairman, military opinion is by no means unanimous, but these two letters to which I have just referred and read into the record are indicative of dozens, perhaps hundreds, that I have received.

I might add that there are other high ranking officers who have spoken in favour of unification. For example, there is General Churchill-Mann who has spoken in favour, as well as General Keefler of Montreal. The other day an excellent article by General Worthington appeared in the paper and I commend it to my hon. friends.

Mr. McIntosh: I do not think it was excellent.

Mr. Hellyer: Then my hon. friend might reread it because it has a moral in it which is worth thinking about.

Mr. McIntosh: It was also based on false premises.

Mr. Hellyer: There are many retired senior officers who believe in unification of the armed forces. Perhaps it is regrettable that we did not have the opportunity to call more of these officers to give evidence in order to give some balance to the testimony instead of just calling recently retired officers, many of whom, on their own statement, retired because they were no longer in accord with the policy of unification of the armed forces.

Ministers of national defence are, by law, responsible for the armed forces. I believe I have to listen to all of the advice that is available. That is essential and fundamental. But having listened to it and evaluated it and analysed it, it is then the responsibility of the minister to make a decision and to recommend that decision to the government. Then, of course, he must persuade the government that his is the correct decision.

In the case of integration-unification, the chiefs of staff were heard when Bill C-90 was first presented. When the white paper was presented, believe me, Mr. Chairman, some strong views were expressed on the whole proposal. I had to be able to convince the government that the point of view being put forward in the white paper was the right point of view. That was my responsibility and I was able to do that. I am still able to do it.

Later, Mr. Chairman, when this Bill C-243, was presented to the government, the chiefs of staff endorsed what was being proposed and they have fully participated in the preparation of the bill right from its earliest stages. The bill was drafted with the complete cooperation of the senior military officers and commanders in the field who were part of the process. They participated in the drafting of my second reading speech. I think it is fair to say that more senior military and civil authorities in the defence department participated more fully in the preparation of my second reading speech than in any other speech given in this country by a defence minister since we have had defence forces in Canada.

Mr. McIntosh: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. Hellyer: Yes.

Mr. McIntosh: I should like to know from the minister whether he agrees with one of his members who said that integration and unification are the same thing.

Mr. Hellyer: I have given my hon. friend a definition in the committee and I do not wish to repeat it now. If he wants me to make another speech later on I will do so.

Mr. McIntosh: I did not ask for a definition. Yes or no, are they the same thing or not?

Mr. Hellyer: It is part of the same cycle. If I may use a physical analogy, you could say that conception and childbirth were separate but that they are all part of the same natural phenomenon. Once you start integration and proceed to the extent that we have and to the extent we intend to proceed, Mr. Chairman, you lead to unification. I think the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.), summed it up very beautifully this afternoon when he said that unification is carrying integration as far as is practicable. In other words, it is carrying it to its logical end of a single service. I think that is undeniable logic and I commend it to my hon. friend.

My last point, Mr. Chairman, is this. Having listened to all of the points of view which have been expressed, I think it is incumbent on members and ministers to make up their minds on this matter. We have to use our own God-given intelligence to take a decision instead of simply relying on evidence of people in favour or the evidence of people not in favour. Of course that evidence is relevant, but when the crunch comes we have to use our own intelligence and, believe me, Mr. Chairman, this is all I have done and it is what the associate minister has done.

Speaking of the associate minister, Mr. Chairman, I regret more than I can say the attack that was made upon him in the press the other night by Charles Lynch, and I hope that Charles will have the decency to apologize to him in the way he apologized to the late Governor General. One does not have to have served during the war with high rank. One does not have to be a genius. One does not have to be a professor. All I ask, Mr. Chairman, is that we use our own God-given intelligence and examine all of the changes in technology which have taken place during the last 20 years. Looking at all the changes and evolutions in the world about us, I have come to the conclusion that this is a good measure. I strongly support this bill; I think it is right

for the armed forces of Canada. I believe it is good for Canada, and it is good for our servicemen. Once it has been implemented I am sure they will find that it works effectively and that they can be part of it and proud of it. It is a policy that builds on the past but looks to the future rather than to the past.

• (6:30 p.m.)

I believe that Bill C-243 will come to be regarded as one of the most progressive pieces of legislation to have been passed in the history of Canada. We shall all be proud of it. I ask that the committee be allowed to conclude its deliberations and let the government accept its responsibility, let the Department of National Defence get on with the job.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: Is the hon. member rising?

Mr. Nugent: I want to take part in this debate, merely to follow up the minister.

The Chairman: The hon. member for Villeneuve.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon I followed very closely the contribution of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) to the debate on Bill No. C-243 without, however, noting anything special, anything new in his attitude towards the unification of the Canadian armed forces.

He started saying that the government would probably resort to closure once again to gag the opposition to the bill, in an outright sabotage of the rights of parliament. He overlooked the fact that the way in which his party has been handling the debate in the last several days constitutes in itself a "gag" which prevents parliament from exercising its right to reach a decision on any bill whatsoever.

He stated emphatically that the people on his left would support the government in passing Bill No. C-243. Now, the Leader of the Opposition surely does not have to worry about the rights of those members, or the intention he ascribes to them, saying they will vote with the government on this bill. Mr. Chairman, we vote for sound legislation, deserving the support of such people as are not restricted by political considerations, as do not wear blinkers that keep them from seeing beyond their own narrow political interest, as do not try to play politics with any issue.

[Mr. Hellyer.]

The Leader of the Opposition also tried to appeal to the emotions or feelings of French Canadians and English speaking Canadians, by mentioning France, Vimy, etc., although that has nothing to do with Bill No. C-243, with the unification of the armed forces.

What I most regretted in the statements which have been made during this debate, is the fact that once more, General Allard, the Chief of Staff of the Canadian Armed Forces is attacked. Unfair accusations are being made against him and, earlier, I acquainted myself with remarks made on April 4 last by the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) when he related the military career of General Allard. As shown in *Hansard* on page 14516, he said:

> November 1961: Her Majesty the Queen approved the promotion of General Allard as commander of the 4th division of the British Army on the Rhine, in Germany, the first Canadian to hold such a post.

The Leader of the Opposition who not only enjoys passing himself off as the leader of the loyal opposition of Her Majesty but who enjoys repeating it to us week after week and even in nearly all his speeches, should at least show some respect for the decision of Her Majesty the Queen who approved a promotion of General Allard as commander of the 4th division of the British Army on the Rhine.

And if General Allard deserved at that time—and I am sure he did—the confidence of the Queen, I think that the Leader of the Opposition and the members of the Conservative party should stop their smear of General Allard, imputing motives to him or charging him with remarks he may never have made or, at least, whose meaning is not that which was given to us in this house.

Besides, General Allard himself said that he had no interest in politics. We hear others, for instance, who are not actually serving in the army but who are former admirals, bluntly state before the standing committee on defence that they belong to the Progressive Conservative party. I am thinking, among others, of former Admiral Brock, and no one, however, would think for a moment to run him down or to discriminate against him. Why then discriminate against General Allard?

Is it because General Allard has his own ideas in politics? We do not know, but that is not the problem. How does General Allard come in this debate, since he has as much right as anyone else in Canada to his own

opinions, even as chief of the Canadian armed forces?

Mr. Chairman, we in the Ralliement Créditiste will certainly vote for Bill No. C-243, and here are our reasons.

It is true that we are facing a dilemma. Should we favour the amalgamation of Canada's three services, or keep the status quo and maintain Canada's present defence organization?

If the present Leader of the Opposition was on the other side of the house, I am sure that, on the basis of the recommendations being made by the three services, he would bring down a bill similar to that now under consideration and that he would ask parliament to approve it.

But because it does not come from him and because his role is that of leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, he has to say no when the other says yes, and that is one of the main reasons for his opposition to Bill No. C-243.

• (6:40 p.m.)

Now, Mr. Chairman, should we maintain the status quo or proceed with the unification of the three armed services of Canada?

That is the choice we have to make and we must make it in the interest of the Canadian people and not in the interest of a Canadian political party. And we have to make that choice according to the facts, to the possibilities of improving the administration of national defence like any other department. What is the interest of Canada? What is the interest of the Canadian people, which it is our first duty and responsibility to protect?

At long last, the Canadian people are waiting for something from their government and from their institutions. In fact, they want a healthy, progressive, thrifty administration as far as the economy of the country is concerned.

As far as the Canadian people are concerned it would seem at first sight that these three basic points do not apply to the present type of administration, if we are to judge by the financial statements of governments from 1939 to date.

The report of the Glassco commission, volume 4, page 61 rightly notes:

> —the dramatic change that has taken place in the level of federal expenditures since 1939, a twelve-fold increase, has two main sources—the broad enlargement of social services and the development of a peacetime defence organization on an unprecedented scale.

We are now provided in peacetime with a defence system the like of which we probably never had during all wars.

The votes concerning national defence increased to $1,652 million in 1962, from $385 million for the 1950 fiscal year. For the first time, Canada's total military strength in peacetime is more than 125,000 men, to which must be added about 50,000 civilian employees of the armed forces. Practically half of that is made up of civilian employees.

Another important feature of the armed forces is that the number, the quality, the organization of personnel are determined according to the wartime tasks, thereby constituting a problem as to their employment in time of peace.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we see that, in 1950, the defence estimates amounted to $385 million; in 1952, to $1,447 million; in 1958, to $1,687 million and that, under the administration of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), who was then prime minister; in 1960, to $1,537 million; in 1962, to $1,652 million.

That total of $1,652 million which the Department of National Defence (including the Defence Research Council), the procurement of equipment and the civil defence cost us in 1961-62, accounted for 25 per cent of the whole budget. But taking into consideration manpower, equipment and other operating costs, defence is accountable for a much higher proportion of federal government expenditures. Excluding statutory subsidies, payments to provinces and interest on debt, the government expenditures amounted to less than $4 billion in 1961-62. More than 40 per cent of that amount was for defence.

Those figures are very eloquent and tend to prove clearly that the status quo cannot be maintained any longer as far as this matter is concerned. It now constitutes the greatest drain upon Canadian finances.

But this is not all. In September 1960, the servicemen represented 26 per cent of the 465,998 members of the public service taken in its broadest sense. The civilian personnel in the Department of National Defence, in other words the non-military employees in the department, represented 26 per cent of all department personnel. Defence accounted for 87 per cent of all government expenditures allocated for the buying and upkeep of equipment in 1961-62, and for almost 60 per cent of the money spent on supply.

The armed forces occupy six million acres of land in the various provinces and more

than 140 million square feet of built surface, that is, about 80 per cent of all the building owned or leased by the government. These are the possessions of the Canadian army.

In view of these eloquent figures and the interest of the Canadian people, it behoves us to ask ourselves some serious questions and to find out whether the Department of National Defence answers the ardent desire of the people to have a healthy, progressive and economic administration.

Furthermore, the present administration obviously does not meet this basic wish of the Canadian people. We hear all sorts of recriminations, from all parts of the country, concerning the extravagant expenditures of the Department of National Defence.

The Glassco commission mentioned some enormous and foolish expenditures discovered within the Department of National Defence. One need only read the reports of the Auditor General. Unjustified expenses have been detected there for several years now.

The administration of the armed forces is now divided between three headquarters staffs. Thus expenditures are tripled at some levels and doubled at others. Were men created to serve peace or war?

We have reason to wonder when we have to pay in triplicate the expenditures of a department called the Department of National Defence.

It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that a country needs a defence structure. But spending more efforts and money on war operations than on peace operations is something else. That difference is seen, for instance, when the time comes to help other countries.

In the minutes of proceedings and evidence No. 1 of the standing committee on national defence, for Tuesday, March 1, 1966 and Thursday, May 5, 1966, one can see, on page 11, the following statements made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin):

I think it would be useful to discuss three that are of major concern to us in Canada: NATO, Viet Nam and Rhodesia—

Before doing that, I wonder if I could take advantage of this meeting of the committee to recall that on March 23, I announced that the government proposed to ask parliament to approve a major expansion in our food aid program to India; in the coming year, we had decided to play our part in helping India to meet its current emergency by providing one million tons of food to that country. There is to be a meeting in Washington late today or tomorrow morning, and I would like to make a further announcement in this connection.

[Mr. Caouette.]

• (6:50 p.m.)

And the minister went on:

I now wish to advise the committee the government proposes to take an additional step to assist India. A sum of approximately $19 million remains to be paid by India as principal and interest on two loans which the government made in 1958—

Nine years ago.

—to cover the purchase of Canadian wheat and flour. It is proposed to forgive the remaining payments on these two loans.

"It is proposed to forgive the remaining payments". And that forgiveness has just taken place.

The first of the remaining payments was due on March 31.

My colleague, the Minister of Finance, has signed an agreement with the Indian High Commissioner to postpone this payment pending approval by parliament to cancel the full amount of $10 million which is outstanding. The agreement provides immediate relief in the amount of approximately $3.7 million, which this payment represents.

The cancellation of the outstanding debt will be additional to the food aid for India to which I have referred and which will cost about $71 million in this calendar year.

Seventy one million dollars, Mr. Chairman, that Canada will contribute to India, as announced by the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, we think this unification will enable the government to save substantial amounts it can attribute, for instance, to the Department of Agriculture, so as to allow the latter to give our farmers much more help than they are getting at the present time. If we can provide $71 million in food and in kind during the 1966 fiscal year, we can surely appropriate over $120 million for our Canadian farmers in 1967 in order to give them, for instance, what they asked the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene), that is, $5.10 per hundredweight, of manufacturing milk.

If we can pay the millions I have just mentioned to India by reducing the expenditures of national defence, we could surely—and I feel it would be a kind of national defence effective for Canadians to save our farmers from complete failure and stagnation—give our farmers the possibility of meeting the needs of the entire population.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, concerning the unification of the three services, will be approved. And we are glad when we think that it will give us the opportunity to reconsider our national defence, to redefine it and to place it in the present international context of cold and threatening wars.

We are also pleased, because it will give us the unique opportunity, in my opinion, to reduce the expenses by establishing a rational administration within the department.

I would not like to see in five, ten or 20 years, some reports such as the one of the Glassco Commission on the exorbitant expenses of the Department of National Defence.

In our consideration of this bill, we must never forget that we must build a world based on peace and mutual aid. That is what we are doing in fact, when, in some countries, we try to promote relations of mutual help and conciliation, if you prefer, or those economic ties which may help us to be of assistance, not by providing weapons, but clothes, technicians, etc., to enable the people to work for a just and durable peace.

Let us promote peace and mutual assistance, and not threats, blackmail and war with its accompanying bloodshed.

This principle must prevail in our minds throughout the discussions, and let us not forget, moreover, that the whole Canadian people is involved, whether it is mentioned or not, in the defence of this country. Any sound administration cuts expenses to the bone and seeks maximum efficiency.

The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer) said earlier that the chiefs of staff oppose unification because heads will roll. But, Mr. Chairman, if it is to benefit of the Canadian people that they should roll, we must not hesitate a single moment, and I think it is bad taste for the official opposition to keep accusing the government of all kinds of things in spite of the fact that the latter consulted, as pointed out earlier by the Minister of National Defence, the senior officials of the Department of National Defence or the officers of the three services. People are recommending unification of the Canadian army, that is one force instead of three, in short a single command and not ten different ones.

All this makes us wonder whether the present organization and administration of our defence are in line with those basic principles whereby we should aim at maximum efficiency at the lowest possible cost.

In the light of the previously quoted figures that were confirmed by the report of the Glassco commission and by the Auditor General of Canada, we can only reply in the affirmative.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to say anything more. Further, we have nothing against army officers, far from it. We have now the air force, the navy and the army; let there be one command and one Canadian army.

Hours are being spent here to discuss whether the uniform should be green, red or some other colour; such is not the purpose of Bill No. C-243. Its purpose is to unify the Canadian armed forces so as to promote a better understanding and a greater unity within the Canadian army. It would enable our Canadian soldiers to better understand one another, to better understand the national defence problems, because the problems which arose 10, 30 or 40 years ago are not the same as those facing us today.

I feel it is important for Canada today to have an army which knows what it wants, an army which knows where it is going, an army which realizes the important role it has to perform for its country's future, that is, to maintain peace at home and to foster it throughout the world instead of waging war.

[*English*]

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes left before the dinner adjournment I would like to refer to the strange statements made by the Minister of National Defence and to the strange witnesses he called upon to support arguments that he advanced. He introduced the name of Charles Templeton. This amazes me because only a few years ago this same Charles Templeton wished a recession on the people of Canada in order to bring the Liberal party back to power. This is the kind of witness the minister depends upon to support his arguments, a man who, on national television, wished a recession on the Canadian people in the interests of the Liberal party. To me this is the most amazing thing that could happen in this chamber at this time. In addition, the minister harked back to the argument about the Arrow aircraft. It is amazing that he has re-introduced that argument.

I will call it seven o'clock, Mr. Chairman, and repeat this later.

The Chairman: Before suspending the sitting perhaps the committee would permit me to read the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment. They are as follows: The hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett) Public Works—Port McNeill, B.C.; the hon. member for Hastings South (Mr. Grills), Agriculture; the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin), Agriculture.

National Defence Act Amendment

Pursuant to an order of the house made on Thursday, April 6, this sitting is suspended for one hour. The committee will resume its work at eight o'clock.

SITTING SUSPENDED

SITTING RESUMED

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

The Deputy Chairman: When the committee rose this evening at seven o'clock clause 2 was under consideration.

The hon. member for Cape Breton South.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Chairman, we all realize that in the lobby there is something much more attractive going on. I, along with other members of the house, would like to have the privilege of watching it. However, business of the house must go on.

At two minutes to seven o'clock I was drawing attention to the obvious weakness of the Minister of National Defence, who found it necessary to bring in the name of Mr. Charles Templeton in support of an argument he was putting forward. What I was saying at that time bears repeating. Charles Templeton is a former Liberal candidate who, along with some of his supporters, had envisaged himself as a potential leader of the Liberal party. His political ambitions died the minute he appeared on television and told the country that he wished upon the people of Canada a recession in order to bring about a return of the Liberal government in Canada. Goodbye Mr. Templeton. This is the kind of man the Minister of National Defence now calls in to support his arguments.

The minister put forward some other strange arguments this afternoon. He specifically referred to the cancellation of production of the Arrow. He has put himself on record as to why at that time he considered this to be one of the worst disasters in Canadian history. Why did he consider it to be a disaster? He said it was disastrous because an air speed record could be established for Canada by the Arrow. He apparently was not concerned about the capability of the Arrow in a defence role.

The minister knows full well that the production of the Arrow was the subject of a decision on the part of the St. Laurent government prior to the election of that year, a decision which was not followed because of the pending election. Let me refer to the

[The Chairman.]

evidence of General Foulkes, another prospective Liberal candidate who did not make good in that regard. In 1963 when testifying before the defence committee, General Foulkes had this to say:

> This proposal was looked at by the St. Laurent government in the last few months and they decided at that time, with the election on their hands that this was one of the first things they would have to get at when they came back because it could not be carried on within the present appropriation.

That general in the army, a prospective Liberal candidate, told the committee that the St. Laurent government had already made a decision to cancel the Arrow. I do not know why the minister continues to revive these arguments, but it should be brought to his attention that they in fact contradict what he has been trying to shove down the throat of the Canadian electorate. General Foulkes then went on to say this:

> That is the story of the Arrow, but the chiefs of staff came to the conclusion that it did not make military sense to purchase aircraft at a cost of $8 million each when we could maintain aircraft with similar performance from the end of an American production line at something about $2 million. Furthermore, we could not see from where the funds were coming to finish the production of the Arrow.

This afternoon the minister suggested that the cancellation of the Arrow was a disaster because Canada did not establish an air speed record. The minister took strong objection in this regard. I suggest if the truth of the matter were known he objected strongly to this cancellation because of some economic situation in the city of Toronto. Had he admitted that as being his reason for objecting, I should give him full credit. Every member of parliament should make every possible representation to see that the economy of his own area is looked after.

• (8:10 p.m.)

The minister said this afternoon that the Leader of the Opposition and members on this side of the house were repeating lies. That is the very thing the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development accused me of the other day when I was honest enough to say that I was interested in the financial welfare of my constituents. I do not mind admitting that I will take every opportunity in this house of making representations which will improve the welfare of the people in my part of the country.

Earlier in his remarks this afternoon the minister accused the Leader of the Opposition of repeating lies.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): That drew some applause from the Liberal side, but not a denial from the minister. If we are repeating lies, it has been confirmed that we are not originating them. Whose lies are we repeating? A good portion of what the Leader of the Opposition said this afternoon was direct quotation from the present Minister of Justice. Was the hon. member then repeating lies?

Who originated the lies that we are supposed to be repeating? Were they originated by the present Minister of Justice or by former serving officers such as Miller, Moncel, Landymore, Brooks, or Foulkes? Are those the people the minister had in mind? Is the minister or any member of the Liberal party prepared to get up and say that those gentlemen were lying? Apparently no one is prepared to make such a statement and therefore we can assume that we were not repeating lies when we quoted the arguments of those gentlemen.

The minister took it upon himself to single out a certain pressman. Is the minister prepared to identify the members of the press gallery whose lies we are repeating? Apparently he is not, so we may take it that he is not prepared to back up anything he said this afternoon. He simply voiced a bunch of words and now does not have the intestinal fortitude to support what he said only two hours ago.

The minister saw fit to single out a distinguished member of the press gallery and said he hoped he would have the honour or the gumption to make an apology. All I can say is that the minister in singling out this particular individual, as he has done on other occasions, has done a most cowardly thing, knowing full well the man to whom he referred has no comeback.

Mr. Hellyer: Are you kidding?

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): He asked him to apologize.

Mr. Hellyer: Have you read his column?

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): At least that gentleman, when he found he was in error, was big enough to retract his statement, but apparently the minister is not big enough to retract anything. He made certain statements this afternoon which he is apparently not willing to support at this time. Will the minister get up and accuse the present Minister of Justice of lying when he wrote the words quoted this afternoon? Will the minister get up and accuse the former serving officers who have been quoted of originating these lies? What the minister did this afternoon is exactly what he accused the Leader of the Opposition of doing.

Let me bring this whole thing a little closer to home. In quoting what took place in this house on March 3 hon. members have referred to a statement made by the chairman of the defence committee. In this regard I accuse the minister of deliberately supporting that lie told in this house. On March 3 the chairman of that committee caused a procedural argument in the house when he said that the committee had voted on a certain issue. The record indicates what happened but when I called upon the minister to get up and support that statement he failed to do so. By his failure to deny what we suggested happened, the minister has supported that lie. The fact that the statement was a lie can be proved by *Hansard*, or the records of that committee.

• (8:20 p.m.)

The lie appears in the evidence which is contained in *Hansard* and in the committee's record. The chairman of the defence committee lied to the house when the question of privilege was brought up, and the minister approved it. Now he accuses members on this side of repeating lies, and yet he cannot support that statement. I can and do support the statement that he has stood by in the house and allowed members of his party to lie on his behalf.

Recently we heard the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra say that he had the honour of leading the defence committee. I say he did not lead it with honour. This afternoon we heard from the hon. member from Victoria (B.C.), who chaired the committee during the first half of its meetings. We all know he had a distinguished war record. He has done honour to this country and has served this country well. Despite the fact that we are well aware of his record and of his rank, his speech sounded to me more like a speech made by a tailor than by a commodore. He spoke on matters which had nothing whatsoever to do with the unification bill.

I have not had a chance, nor has any other member of the house, to review the remarks made by the former chairman of the defence committee, but I do recall his saying something about looking in the rear view mirror and looking back on the outmoded defence methods. My understanding of his statement is that he must have been referring to the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany and all the allied countries as being outmoded, because they follow the tradition

of three services rather than the supposedly pathfinding unification bill which the minister is trying to put across.

The minister said that we are going to lead the way. The government has at every opportunity called upon every distinguished serviceman known to them to speak in support of the unification bill. However, despite the fact that the members on the Liberal side of the house have used the cowardly approach by referring to Lord Mountbatten as a supporter of unification, the fact is that Lord Mountbatten certainly does not support the concept of unification as the minister sees it. Not only does he not support it, he ridicules it. Lord Mountbatten, whom the government has tried to use as a witness on its behalf, has ridiculed the approach which is now being used by the minister.

Several speakers on the other side of the house, including the Minister of Transport, have advanced arguments on behalf of civilian control. I say that there is no need for argument on that basis. As was pointed out this afternoon, we know of no one who has gone on record as opposing civilian control. These remarks were made the other day by the Minister of Transport and they were also made on this side of the house. I agree with them; civilian control is important. As far as the Canadian forces are concerned, civilian control is exercised by the parliament of Canada, and the decision made here must be carried out.

I did not have the opportunity to hear General Allard's evidence before the defence committee.

Mr. Prud'homme: That is too bad.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I wish the hon. member for Saint-Denis would cease interjecting. If his interjections were to appear on the record we would have to print a separate volume of *Hansard*, but we would not have even one page for what he says when on his feet. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a good idea if you asked him to rise when he wishes to say something.

Mr. Prud'homme: I said it is too bad the hon. member did not hear General Allard's evidence.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I congratulate the hon. member for standing up at last.

To return to General Allard and the fact that when he appeared before the defence committee I did not have the opportunity of hearing him, let me mention that I do not know him. There is no doubt that he has served Canada well and has a distinguished war record. However, let me come back to what the Minister of National Defence, the Minister of Transport and many hon. members on this side have referred to, namely civilian control. Since the control of the services is exercised by the House of Commons I feel that I can rightfully stand up and criticize what General Allard may do outside of his particular line of duty. I do so, despite what the Minister of National Defence and the Secretary of State for External Affairs have said, namely that General Allard can speak anywhere on any subject and at any time without clearing his speeches with the minister. If the minister were to look into the rules and regulations he would discover that such is not the case. The Secretary of State for External Affairs can say as often as he wishes that he will not inhibit freedom of speech in this country, but let me hark back to what was said by the hon. member for Kootenay West, namely that the serving personnel in our armed forces or any visiting forces are not free to say what they like. The hon. member referred to the German officer who was to speak in Winnipeg, but then found out that what he wished to say was not in accordance with the rules and therefore he was not permitted to do it.

The minister should have learned his lesson from that. He is also aware of the fact that not only does General Allard have to clear his speeches with him, but he has to obtain the minister's permission before making them. How can the minister stand up in the house and say that he has so much confidence in General Allard that he will allow him to make any statements he may wish to make at any time? This is ridiculous. Since civilian control of the armed services is ultimately exercised by parliament, I maintain that we as members of the house are entitled to tell General Allard that according to the rules and regulations, and despite what the minister says, he is not permitted to make statements outside the house about any matters that are being discussed in the house.

Mr. Prud'homme: It is too bad the hon. member could not have heard General Allard's evidence.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Why does the hon. member not go out and watch the hockey game? He has his neck away out, whether he knows it or not. It is just because I do not want to embarrass somebody on the minister's staff that the hon. member got

away with it the other night. I would suggest to the hon. member that he behave himself because, whether or not he thinks it is funny, I can place him, the minister and some members of the minister's staff, in a very embarrassing position. When it comes to dealing with the minister I have no scruples, but I have sympathy for some members of the minister's staff. So I would advise the hon. member to behave himself, because it is not too late for me to do something about it.

To get back to what I was saying—

Mr. Prud'homme: You are lost.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I have had occasion to stand in the house and hear this type of interjection and interruptions. They do not bother me; in fact they keep me going. The hon. member is making a mistake if he thinks he is getting away with it. As I said once before with regard to the actions of the Liberal party, any time that the snake pit becomes active again I am prepared to wait it out. They do not bother me a bit. If the hon. member would stand up on his feet, something he seldom does, except on the bidding of the minister, I would appreciate hearing what he has to say.

• (8:30 p.m.)

In speaking today the minister has revived some old arguments. He is going to lead Canada and the world in the reformation of their defence forces. He is doing this by overlooking a solemn promise made by him and by the Prime Minister. One would have thought looking back a couple of years, that the first thing any Liberal defence minister would do on assuming office would be to carry out the solemn promises made to the effect that the Liberals were going to renegotiate Canada out of the nuclear agreement. This matter was mentioned this afternoon and brought clearly to the minister's attention. This is another broken promise. Then again, who but these Liberals could call breaking promises the successful operation of a government? There have been broken promises all the way down the line.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to deal directly with the minister and his unification bill. I return to the old argument that the minister has no confidence whatever in this bill. Again I say that if he had confidence in the bill, as he maintains he has, he would follow a different course. This afternoon he made an odd statement when he said that most of the senior officers were in favour of unification, but that some were against. Did he conduct a referendum? Did he get around to all the officers in order to arrive at this opinion? Unless he did, how can he say that these officers support it?

If the minister has the confidence he says he has in this unification bill, why can he not do what was done during wartime when all the serving personnel in the Canadian forces were reattested? This was done during a war. I think I quoted figures the other night which indicated that, of all those serving in the forces at that time, only five officers and 532 men refused to be reattested to go overseas. This is a time of peace, yet the minister and his supporters in the government have said that to reattest the men today would bring about chaos. Well, you cannot have it two ways. If it is going to bring about chaos, then you do not have confidence in this measure. The only chaos that could result would be the retirement from the service of those people who no longer wish to serve in a unified force. There would be chaos for those members of the army, navy and air force who had an opportunity to volunteer to go into this force and who supported the minister. This is the chaos to which reference was made. Either you are going to show confidence in the unification bill or you are going to reattest the men. The minister has not got the intestinal fortitude to test the servicemen on this bill.

The minister can dictate to the people of Canada through the press because he can get a favourable press. However he does not dare give the serving personnel of this country a privilege which belongs to them during war, when they have an opportunity to volunteer. The men came back from Europe and there was a war going on in the Pacific. Nobody had to go to the Pacific unless he specifically signed his name to a document indicating that he volunteered for service there. There was no compulsion whatever. However, today in a time of peace, when unification is under consideration, this minister is forcing down the throats of serving personnel of this country the obligation to serve with a unified force. This is compulsion. As I said before, during the committee hearings when members had an opportunity to vote on an amendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre that would give all our serving personnel an opportunity to volunteer for the unified force, members of the Liberal party, no doubt on instructions of the minister, said no. The minister has refused our serving personnel an opportunity voluntarily to join the unified force. In other words, I say it again,

Mr. Minister, you have brought about conscription in this country because every person serving in our army, navy and air force from now until his retirement time is serving under compulsion.

Of course, the minister will stand up and say this is a ridiculous argument, that serving personnel can get out on six months notice. My argument is that this opportunity should be given to each and every person in the service. They should be given an opportunity to belong to that service voluntarily. There should be no compulsion whatever. The Canadian government did not use compulsion during the war, but we have it now. This adds up to one thing, a dictatorial approach. We have ample examples of the minister's dictatorial attitude day in and day out in the House of Commons when members of his party stand up and read from prepared texts containing that which the minister wants them to put across. The fear is always present that if a member expresses an individual thought something will be said that will not be in agreement with the minister's approach.

The Chairman: Order, please. I must advise the hon. member that the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Nugent: I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that after listening to the hon. member for Cape Breton South the minister is going to be very pleased to hear that I have developed a sort of grudging admiration for him following his speech this afternoon. I want to emphasize, of course, that it is a sort of grudging admiration. Whenever one excels in something one gets a sort of grudging admiration. Since the minister has relied throughout this debate on the tried and true system of the big lie developed by Adolph Hitler, and since he is so adept in the practice of this system, I developed a sort of grudging admiration for the amount of skill he brought to bear in using the system.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I should allow that slur to go unchallenged. I am going to tell my hon. friend that if he ever says that outside the House of Commons I will have him prove it before a court of law.

Mr. Nugent: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is certainly a great advance for the minister. He is the only cabinet minister, perhaps the only member who ever sat in a legislative body such as this, who was charged before the house with an offence which would certainly have barred him from sitting in the cabinet, or perhaps might have been regarded by the house as an offence which would have rendered him unfit to hold a seat in this house. This statement comes from the minister who sits there now, who still sits there, under the charge I brought against him in this house. He, by his own voice, refused unanimous consent to the only method by which he could clear his name. This is the first time this has ever happened in British parliamentary history in any legislative body such as ours. Certainly, this is an indication the minister has climbed the ladder of honour to quite a degree since he in such cowardly fashion turned down the only way he could clear his name. Certainly, I am pleased to see that apparently he has now some regard for his name and reputation.

[Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South).]

However, in case the minister is interested, tomorrow I will be speaking in Manitoba. I will be back here on Thursday and I will repeat that I would be glad to meet the minister in a court of law. I assure the minister, in case he is unaware, that courts of law outside this house are not as tolerant as the house. If a person is charged with tampering with the evidence of a witness, he does not have a right to avoid a trial in a court of law no matter how much he may scream and try to avoid that trial he so richly deserves.

However, I was going to be kind to the minister. I had thought, since the only thing for which we can praise him is excellence in one regard, that is his ability as a salesman of the super lie, that certainly he did that which is most essential for one who wants to sell the big lie, and that is to give the appearance of utmost honesty and indignation that anyone should lie—

• (8:40 p.m.)

The Chairman: Order. I fear that I must interrupt the hon. member at this point in order to suggest that perhaps some of the phraseology he is using now is outside the limits of parliamentary language.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, the technique of the big lie is what I will accuse the minister of excelling in. This is a sales technique that is known, and I do not think it has ever been found unparliamentary. I might point out that I did not hear any complaint from the Chair when the minister had the effrontery to suggest to my leader this afternoon that he was repeating in this house this lie argument; so I thought I might very well make this my theme.

This paragon of virtue went on to repeat this lie, as though it was a terrible crime that no one should hear about. He then said that

my leader was casting aspersions on officers, but no one has cast more aspersions than has this minister of defence.

I would suggest that the epitome of hypocrisy on the part of the minister is for him to suggest that this appears horrible to him. All I was doing in complimenting him upon putting himself in the position of one who is bound to be the leader in this particular technique of selling the big lie, was suggesting that the minister was pretending he was a paragon of virtue. He carried this technique off very well. In fact, I detected genuine indignation in his voice when he talked about repeating the lie. He was not indignant because the lie was repeated; he was indignant because he understood that he was the only one in the house who had a stranglehold on that technique.

He proceeded to give us a perfect example of this, Mr. Chairman. He repeated a technique which he has encouraged the backbenchers in his own party to use in this chamber, namely the reading of newspaper editorials and other misleading documents which suggest that those who are opposed to unification belong in the horse and buggy age.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nugent: I do not mind that from the Liberal benches, Mr. Chairman. The minister of defence was also indignant at the remarks of my leader, suggesting that some reflection was being cast upon gallant gentlemen. The minister suggested that what my leader said could only be taken as a reflection on gallant gentlemen who have worked hard for integration and believed in it, who went as far as they could and then had to quit because they believed that the further step of unification would destroy what they had worked so hard and so long to achieve.

In the suggestion of the minister that those who were against his views belong in the horse and buggy age and are against progress, we see a great example of the technique of the big lie, and in two ways. First of all, we see his attempt to say that people like Moncel, Miller, Dyer, and so on, belong in the horse and buggy age, even though they may have been responsible for whatever savings and improvements the minister has been able to bring about.

Second, we have what I can only call the epitome of hypocrisy in the suggestion that what the Leader of the Opposition said could be taken as a reflection on gallant gentlemen. How much more striking example can we see of complete reliance on the big lie, Mr. Chairman? You clothe yourself in the garments of honesty, integrity and righteousness and then repeat things which are untrue, that would be said only by one who believes in the philosophy that the bigger the lie and the bolder you tell it, the more likely it will be believed. That is exactly what the minister is doing.

I should like to give a few more concrete examples of this, with some evidence to back them up. We have for instance the big lie so often told on the other side, that those who are opposed to unification are against progress; that they are opposed to defence planning to enable us to figure out where we are going, when previously there has been too much muddle headed thinking. Now for the first time, according to the minister, we are going to plan things properly: We will now get all the advice we need, we will know where we are going and will all pull together. This is what the minister calls the new spirit of progress.

Let me give some examples of how much planning there was in unification. The minister, who is so ready to suggest that some aspersions might be cast upon the honour of honourable gentlemen serving in our forces, proceeds to give the most all round condemnation of the chiefs of staff I have ever heard, with arguments which are not honest in support of that condemnation. Although the minister did not give us any names he suggested to us that in 1964 there were many who were opposed to the entire idea of integration. He is now surprised to find how many of them agree with it. We are supposed to believe that there has been a wholesale conversion, or something. He very conveniently omits to indicate how we can check these names, but of course we know that it is a figment of his imagination.

The minister then proceeds to quote the opinions of some anonymous servicemen, after having assured us that those who had risen to the highest positions in the military affairs of this country should be ignored because they belong in the horse and buggy age. These anonymous authors quoted by some unidentified newspaper say we should speed up the process and get on with the job. This is all to support the biggest lie of all which the minister has spread in this house, and on which both he and the Liberal government must rely today, namely that integration-unification is one package; that the great benefits of integration that we have been told about cannot be realized unless and until we

complete unification. When this grandiose scheme is completed we will then start to derive the benefits.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Having mentioned a few things with regard to which I thought some evidence should be placed on the record, I should like to mention one other matter before I turn to the evidence given before the committee. I listened very attentively while the minister told us that in 1964 it was his responsibility to sell the cabinet on the feasibility, the practicability and the advisability of unification as defined in his white paper. He stated he did that, and it was still his responsibility to do it. I wonder what the minister told the cabinet that was not revealed to the chiefs of staff? I wonder what he said. When the white paper came out in 1964. The evidence before the defence committee was clear that nobody in a position of responsibility appearing before the committee knew of or understood what the minister tried to call unification. This ought to be a clear warning to the cabinet that it has been sold a bill of goods. If what was proposed was clear to the minister, it was not clear to anybody else. It was not clear that back in 1964 the minister was considering the implementation of unification. Following that reasoning it is obvious that the bill of goods the minister sold the cabinet in 1964 is not the bill of goods he is trying to sell to the country today.

Volume 19 of the minutes of proceedings and evidence of the national defence committee contains evidence of Admiral Brock, the first man whose head the minister cut off. I wish to read several excerpts from that evidence. The minister this afternoon had the effrontery to say that there was no evidence to support what the right hon. Leader of the Opposition had said, when the right hon. gentleman said he had read every word of evidence, and that he had come to his conclusions on weighing that evidence. It is time to place some of the evidence on record here. The newspapers have not published it all and obviously many government members have not comprehended it or have not paid attention to it.

On page 975 of volume 19, about one third of the way down the page, we find this:

Mr. Churchill: You took the same conclusion from the white paper, then, that I did. The concluding remarks of the white paper, which I think should be quoted, are:

"In this paper no attempt has been made to set down hard and fast rules for future policy and development.

[Mr. Nugent.]

... The paper is a charter, a guide, not a detailed and final blueprint. The policy outlined in it is not immutable. It can be altered or adapted to meet the requirements of changing circumstances, national and international."

It is clear from those words that if the minister succeeded in selling his policy to the cabinet, he was given a blank cheque. After all, at that time the minister was the fair-haired boy. The machinations taking place in the defence department were not known to the public, though I expect some of his colleagues had their suspicions.

The evidence continues:

Did you conclude from that that there was no finality in 1964 with regard to proposals being put forward?

Rear Admiral Brock: I could not have come to any other conclusion, inasmuch as I had heard—from his own lips—assurances from the minister that his programs would be cautiously proceeded with and implemented.

That is not what happened. Senior officers found suddenly that they had to leave, because they could not agree with the minister's sudden decision to implement unification. Admiral Brock had had the minister's assurances, we know how much those are worth.

The committee heard the evidence of Admiral Brock. Members can draw their own conclusions about the minister's suggestions that he was trying to bring in a system where planning was paramount, where the services would be together, and where everybody would know where he was going. That was the plan for the 1970's. Unfortunately the rest of us are not clear about the meaning of this measure, and the minister has not explained it.

I wish to quote further from the evidence of Admiral Brock, the chief of maritime command, one of the senior officers in the entire Canadian Armed Forces. Certainly no one has had a more distinguished record of service. Though the minister may have slighted people, though he may have lectured them as he did this afternoon, he cannot cast aspersions on Admiral Brock's veracity.

At page 977 is the following:

Mr. Lambert: I want to thank the committee for letting me step in at this time. Admiral Brock, in July of 1964—which followed the passage of Bill No. C-90 by about a matter of six or seven weeks—had there been at that time any disclosure to commanders of your level any plan for the integration of either the headquarters in Ottawa, or in the field?

Rear Admiral Brock: So far as I am aware, the answer is no,—

Remember, the chief of maritime command is speaking:

—and so far as I am aware, no such plan existed. In fact, it is my understanding—and it was the understanding of most of us, that the minister meant seriously what he said—that he was going to work his way through this, that nothing was inflexible and the plan would be developed as we went along.

I expect that most members in the house recall the minister's saying that the big distinction he brought to his department was that for the first time in Canada's history the admirals or generals, and others of similar rank, would know where they were going. There was to be sound planning for the future. Unfortunately we have evidence from witnesses that no senior officer knew of any plan in the minister's mind at that time.

Then, to continue the quotation from the evidence:

Mr. Lambert: Nothing had been disclosed to you with regard to a single unified defence force?
Rear Admiral Brock: Certainly not.

This is referring to July of 1964, when the minister had referred to integration and unification as one package.

It continues:

Mr. Lambert: The reason I raise this is that such great reliance is placed upon the fact that at some point in the white paper there is one phrase that integration is the first step towards a single unified defence force, and that this was notice to all concerned, and what we are seeing today was apparent to everyone. What I am asking is: Was it apparent, or was it even disclosed in any degree at all to the senior commanders of the forces?

● (9:00 p.m.)

The answer was:

Rear Admiral Brock: No, not that I am aware of, and of course it would be quite unreasonable to expect 140,000 sailors, soldiers and airmen to read the white paper, even if they could have gained anything from this.

I myself asked him some questions on this point. In the course of his argument the minister has placed straight reliance on the contention that unification and integration were part of one big plan. The reason the minister wishes to tie them together is that there is much evidence before the committee that the services will benefit from integration, but none that they will benefit from unification. There is plenty of evidence that unification would be harmful, and my hon. friend from Calgary North has listed at least six different reasons why this would be the case. The reason the minister is trying to sell this big lie that integration and unification are all one package is that unless he can succeed in tying them together there is nothing which could be said in favour of the present bill, since unification is something which all the evidence condemns.

All the benefits talked about by the serving officers called by the minister are benefits resulting from integration. There is not one shred of evidence that unification will bring any benefits. I intend to quote from the record to show how unfounded the minister's argument is in this regard. Let me read from volume 19 at page 984, where I was questioning Rear Admiral Brock:

Perhaps I will put it more directly. You were in a position that with anything as startling as the unification proposal that the minister now puts forward—anything so far reaching—in your experience in a responsible command position did you feature such an innovation being brought in without a great deal of long distance planning with the best advice of all the senior personnel?

This is what the minister has just been talking about. He told us he had to do some real planning—get the best advice together and come up with a real plan. The question is based on exactly what the minister said he had been doing. Here is the reply:

Rear Admiral Brock: Well, Mr. Nugent, really there was not anything startling about it because anyone who has been involved in the military field has thought about these things. We know that the very same sort of proposition has been advocated by crackpots in other countries and discarded and, as far as we were aware, within military circles, it was thought to be just not on; Canada could not go this way.

The evidence continues:

Mr. Nugent: Let us suppose that it had been taken seriously, that the minister was going to implement it and that you had known about it; how much planning then would have been required, do you think, between the conception of the idea and the formulation of that policy by the minister and the advice given by responsible officials as to how long it would be before you would be in a position to complete the plans to start to implement it?

Rear Admiral Brock: I cannot give you a specific answer to this. This partly depends upon the stability of the government, for one thing. During my last period in Ottawa as assistant chief of the naval staff and vice chief, I served five ministers of national defence, and everybody wanted a radical review of defence policies.

This minister tells us he is the only one who has decided to get off the horse's back and drive forward. The answer continues:

It seems to me before we can decide how long it would take to formulate in detail the practical application of a new way of things we much have some consistency in the general national approach and outlook. The military establishment, interrelated with the Department of External Affairs, must be sure of their course and it takes a good many years to make a change as great as this.

I will skip two lines, an exchange between the chairman and myself, and continue:

Mr. Nugent: Then would unification, as the minister suggested bringing it in, be brought in in a responsible way without a plan and are you aware that there ever was a plan?

Rear Admiral Brock: I am aware that there was not a plan. There was not a plan that was made known to the then responsible senior military advisers.

I will pause there. I hate to rub it in. It is only the minister's speech this afternoon and his bragging about his planning innovations which prompted me to read this again into the record. Admiral Brock is surely one of the officers who must have known. There are others who knew, and I intend to deal with what they had to say.

The Deputy Chairman: I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Nugent: I am sure I will have sufficient information to enable me to make another speech or two.

Mr. Churchill: I am encouraged to say a few more words on this bill because of the intervention by certain people of some importance on the other side of the house. The chairman of the defence committee, the hon. member for Victoria, (B.C.), spoke earlier, and the Minister of Transport intervened on Friday. Once the Minister of Transport enters a debate like this one, it is wide open for anyone to speak because I do not know of any person on the government side who knows less about this particular matter than does the Minister of Transport. Then there was the intervention on Wednesday of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, a contribution which deserves some attention. Today we heard from the Minister of National Defence.

I think it is important that in a debate there should be an exchange of opinions. This is what debate is. Arguments are put forward by one side or the other. Whether or not opinions are changed in the course of these discussions is an open question. But I do know that a great many members of the House of Commons, to say nothing of the public, have learned much more about the unification bill than they knew before.

We have heard people announcing that a great many meetings of the defence committee were held and that a number of witnesses were heard, and that in these circumstances all that remains is for the issue to be decided here by a vote. I submit to you, sir, that all members of parliament should have an opportunity to find out what happened in the committee. Not every member of parliament has the time to read the voluminous reports which are prepared by committees, and sometimes a member will benefit by hearing a summary of what has transpired in a committee. I do that here, and have for many years. I do not serve on all the committees but I like to hear from members who serve on committees. I listen to their reports to the house, just what they amount to, and then if I am in doubt about some matter I refer to the detailed committee proceedings. This goes on all the time.

I found a great deal of interest not so long ago in hearing the debate on the transportation bill, one of the most important bills to come before the House of Commons in recent years. The committee on transportation had an enormous number of meetings. It heard expert evidence. We have been encouraged in the present debate to pay no attention to expert evidence. The committee on transportation had a different view. It called in experts and listened to them very carefully. Then the bill came before the house, having been amended to quite an extent in the committee, and was later amended in the house.

• (9:10 p.m.)

That debate was very interesting. A great deal of information was put in front of us, to such an extent that I found it was possible for me to participate in the debate, which I did, and the Minister of Transport will recall that it was on my initiative he got tripped up over the clause on the Crowsnest Pass rates and suffered what he later termed a humiliation—and it was, because he was very careless.

I give that as an example of what should be done following the meetings of committees. A committee brings back a report to the house. The members sitting in at committee hearings have an obligation to give a report to the House of Commons in order that other members who have not participated in the committee hearings may get a summary of what was done there. Then you have the other aspect of it, that there are members of the House of Commons who, for one reason or another, do not serve on committees in which they are interested but who have a great deal of knowledge of the subject matter before those committees, and those members should have the opportunity to debate the issues in the House of Commons. That is precisely the course of this debate. We have spent several

days on it, but not any more than are required, because of the nature of the subject and its importance.

An opportunity has been presented for members of the defence committee to state the case in the House of Commons, and there is an opportunity for other members who were not on that committee to express their views on this vital matter. Over and above that, each member of the House of Commons hopes that somebody somewhere in the general public will hear something about his views and perhaps be influenced by them.

I also think that in this particular matter of defence we have an obligation to speak on behalf of those people who cannot be heard, who have not the privilege of making their voices heard. That applies to all the people within the services, because under their regulations they do not have the privilege of making public speeches.

There is a widespread discontent within the services, and those of us who are aware of that think we are duty bound to bring it to the attention of the government and to the attention of the people of Canada. If not, you hear only one side. You hear only from the minister, telling the public that everything is fine within the services. Those of us on this side of the chamber know perfectly well that that is not the case. We have had too much information given to us, in one way or another, to show that there is massive discontent within the services and that it has been occasioned by the action of the government.

In the defence committee we drew attention to the very large number of officers who left the services prior to their normal retirement. Many of those people left the services because they were told by the minister that they either had to go along with his proposal or get out. A great number of junior officers left the services early because of what they saw going on—uncertainty in the Department of National Defence, too many respected senior officers fired out of hand, and great doubt as to the future in the services.

During the course of the committee hearings I had occasion to discuss with one of the witnesses the number of personnel who had passed through national defence headquarters. I think that in the space of two years 3,000 officers had passed through national defence headquarters: I call it Grand Central Station. A great number of those officers left the services entirely; others were shifted back and forth. I do not know of any business that could operate efficiently with such a large personnel turnover; and yet under the minister that is what was going on at national defence headquarters.

It is no wonder that General Fleury said he could not stand it any longer. He did not know from one day to the next what officers were going to be working with him at headquarters. That is the type of chaos created by the minister. It is quite proper that this should be brought to the attention of members of the house and to the attention of the public.

The trouble stems from the erratic behavior of the minister and his impetuosity to get this particular bill passed at the present time. I think he selected this as his centennial project. He had to think of something, and last summer he decided this would be his centennial project and he would end up in 1967 with a newly designed defence force, a unified force. Otherwise I cannot see any reason for the haste, because all the advice that was given to him was to the contrary.

The senior officers, even those still serving, have said, "Give us more time to work out the aspects of integration. We need more time to straighten out materiel command," which takes in the supply end of it. They have said "We need more time on Training Command." and there is the greatest doubt in the world as to whether Training Command is going to work, and work effectively.

The minister brushes all this aside as inconsequential. The people actually working at the job do not find it inconsequential at all; they find it a very difficult task. They are worried about the consequences, and if an emergency comes upon us this year, I have the gravest doubts as to whether the present organization could effectively meet that emergency. I think the minister would be forced back to the older system of three services.

The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, the chairman of the defence committee in its later stages, who operated moderately effectively after we had given him instruction as to how to conduct committee hearings, reported to the house yesterday with regard to this bill and made what I consider to be the most astonishing statement I have heard with regard to it. At page 14714 of yesterday's *Hansard* you find these immortal words of his:

> Only one thing of any real importance remained to be done and that was to give the new single force which we had created in 1964 a name. Bill C-243 asks us to do that. No clause in Bill C-243, other than clause 2 before the committee now, is of any real significance. I say that because clause 2 gives the force a new name.

Not content with a ridiculous statement like that, he repeated it about seven minutes later. That comes from the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, who acted as chairman of that committee. It comes from the man who reported to the house that there had been 55 meetings and 38 witnesses heard. He said that the only purpose of the bill was to give the forces a new name. Well, if his words are accurate, there has been a terrible waste of time here in parliament and in committee. But of course his words are absolutely inaccurate.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Far from just giving the forces a new name, the bill destroys the three services, the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force, and substitutes another force for those three. Clause 2 of the bill to which he referred does that by amending the present act, striking out those names, and making one service called the Canadian Armed Forces.

A little further on this same clause provides for the creation of a special force. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra did not mention that but I intend to mention it. Further on in the bill—and we will be coming to this later on—clause 6 provides for the compulsory transfer of the people now in the navy, army and air force into the single service, the Canadian Armed Forces.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one can readily realize the absolutely erroneous impression given by the chairman of that committee to the house when he spoke yesterday and said that it was just a simple little matter of changing the name. That is not so at all. On this side of the house we have said that we should retain the three services, work away at the integrated side of it, and see whether we can make a success of it. In 1964 I had doubts concerning that and opposed the legislation right down to third reading, just as I am opposing this. I still have in my mind a big question mark with regard to integration itself.

Mr. Hellyer: You are consistent.

Mr. Churchill: If I can be shown that it can be successful in respect of the integration of the supply forces and so on, then I am prepared to accept integration. I believe, however, that it is wrong to have just one chief of staff. I do not intend to repeat the argument I used in 1964, but I believe, now when integration has not been effected, it is foolish to go ahead with unification.

[Mr. Churchill.]

The bill of course does more than just change a name. It wipes out the three services and makes one service. We have been told that everybody in that one service will be—although not called sailors, soldiers and airmen—working quite a bit either at sea, on the land or in the air. We have been told there will be no transfer of people from one area to another. This is not accurate, because this clause 2 with which we are dealing, modifies section 17 of the original act. I will read the words:

> In an emergency, or if considered desirable in consequence of any action undertaken by Canada under the United Nations Charter, the North Atlantic Treaty or any other similar instrument for collective defence entered into by Canada, the governor in council may establish and authorize the maintenance of a component of the Canadian forces, referred to in this Act as the special force . . .

If this is passed the power will be given to the department and to the minister to create a special force. In that special force may be placed any person, officer or man, from the unified force. It does not state that those who have had their training at sea, in the air or on the land will not be required to serve elsewhere than in the area in which they received their training; it does not say that at all. It says that a special force may be created and in that force will be placed officers and men of the regular force. There is no protection here at all. There is nothing which states that a man who has been trained only for land operations will not have to serve at sea, or vice-versa. Yet, we have been told that none of this will happen.

As I say, right there in this bill is the evidence that it will be possible for the minister and his staff to do this. When the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra said that all this bill did was to change the name he omitted to draw the attention of the house to clause 6 to which the hon. member for Cape Breton South referred so effectively.

Why did the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, the chairman of the committee, not frankly tell the members of this house that in clause 6 a compulsory feature had been introduced which borders on conscription. This is a feature which will affect very seriously the officers and men now serving in the three separate services, because once this bill has passed the house and the Senate and has been proclaimed, it will become the law. On its becoming law some of the officers and men who now are in the Royal Canadian Navy will cease to be in the Royal Canadian Navy and will become members of the defence force,

and the officers and men who now are in the Royal Canadian Air Force will cease to be in that branch of the service and will become members of the defence force. The same will be true of the army. They will not have a choice. We brought this up during the committee hearings. We argued with the minister about this. We asked him whether he was going to give the men now in the present services a choice as to whether or not they would go into this newly styled single force, and he said no. He says no to almost everything.

I pointed out the experience we had in September of 1939. I appreciate the fact that I am not supposed to refer to any of the wars which have taken place in the past, but I will take the chance again. On September 1, 1939, when we were enlisting men in the Fort Garry Horse we signed them on into the Canadian field force. They were enlisted and attested into that force—the Canadian field force. In two or three days word came from Ottawa that a new title had been selected. That new title was the Canadian Active Service Force. It was necessary to reattest those men into that force.

Then, somewhat later, word was sent to us that under the Canadian Active Service Force there was no compulsion to serve outside the boundaries of Canada. Therefore it was necessary to take a third step. The officers and men were asked whether they wished to serve abroad. It was necessary again for them to indicate their desire by signing their signature. As the hon. member for Cape Breton South has pointed out, that was done in wartime and quite conceivably the cabinet of that period could have said, "Well, we have organized the Canadian field force and since we want to change the name to the Canadian Active Service Force, we will do it by order in council and that will be that, and all those who have enlisted to date will be automatically in the Canadian Active Service Force". Even in wartime, the government used its common sense and said that the men, having been attested into the Canadian field force, with that name being changed, would have the opportunity of saying whether or not they wanted to be in the Canadian Active Service Force. The government of that day did not say everyone in the Canadian Active Service Force must serve anywhere in the world. That government gave the officers and men a chance to make their own decision.

• (9:30 p.m.)

I hope it never happens, but if this bill becomes law and is proclaimed I hope the minister will give the officers and men of the three services an opportunity to say whether or not they want to serve in this new force and, if they do not want to serve in it, let them be retired or honourably discharged without any reduction in the pension to which they may be entitled at that time. These officers and men are all volunteers and this is how they should be treated. When we discussed this in the committee, the minister rejected the idea. That is another example of the typical, arrogant and domineering attitude of this Liberal government.

Let me indicate why this is important. The men presently serving in the three services made a decision when they enlisted in those three services. Some men went to the recruiting officers and said they wanted to serve in the army, while others said they wanted to serve at sea with the navy, or perhaps with the air force. Many of them have made a deliberate choice in this regard. Some people do not like the ocean and are not very comfortable at sea. I happen to be one of those. Some people do not want to fly and would much prefer to serve on land in a particular unit of the land forces. Very often the men in the army will make a specific choice. Perhaps they do not wish to be in the armoured corps because it means they will be shut up in a tank. Perhaps they suffer from claustrophobia. Thousands of people during the second world war had no use at all for the armoured corps from the standpoint of serving in it, because they did not want to be shut up in a tank, where they could burn to death if it was hit by a shell. Similarly some people in the navy do not want to serve in submarines.

All these people should be given a choice. But that is not the plan for this 1967 centennial arrangement. The officers and men will have no choice, but will be compulsorily placed in this new force. As I pointed out, if a special force is formed in an emergency, these men may be transferred at will from one branch to another.

In answer to the suggestion by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, that there was only one major change in this bill, I pointed out three. These changes involved the wiping out of the three services—the navy, army and air force; the creation, if necessary, of a special force to which anyone may be posted as the staff or minister sees fit, and the

automatic and compulsory conscription of these men from the navy, army and air force into one defence force. That gives you some idea as to why there is opposition to this bill.

The minister has given no indication of a willingness to yield on any aspect of this bill. In this respect he differs from the Minister of Forestry, the Minister of National Health and Welfare, and the Minister of Transport. I do not have any less admiration in this regard for those men, but I do know from their work in this house that they have modified bills at the request of the opposition, or when it became apparent that they were running into too much difficulty.

Perhaps I have said enough in respect of the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra. I should not have spent so much time dealing with his remarks, because really they are not deserving of any attention at all. I intend to pass over the references I was going to make regarding the Minister of Transport, and I shall do so with one exception. That minister interrupted the hon. member for Calgary North as reported at page 14658 of *Hansard*, when he said this:

> Mr. Pickersgill: I listened attentively to the extracts the hon. gentleman has just read to us, and they were news to me.

The hon. gentleman from Calgary North had been reading extracts from the testimony of Admiral Rayner. The minister was so ignorant of the committee proceedings he felt these extracts were new to him. It has been our impression that the greater portion of the committee proceedings are unfamiliar to members of the cabinet, and that the Minister of Transport is not the only ignorant person on the treasury benches. Apparently he had not heard the testimony of Admiral Rayner before. I suppose the same is true of all other members of the cabinet except the Associate Minister of National Defence and the Minister of National Defence. That is another reason it is essential to have a debate here in the House of Commons, in order to draw attention to those committee proceedings. I could say a great deal more about the Minister of Transport, but most of it would not be very complimentary.

Let me now refer to certain remarks of the minister for external affairs who entered the debate on Wednesday, April 5.

The Chairman: Order, please. I must advise the hon. member that his allotted time has now expired.

[Mr. Churchill.]

Mr. Churchill: My words of wisdom regarding the minister for external affairs are to be lost, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, on Friday evening last I drew the minister's attention to a very serious situation which has developed in one aspect of the maritime command in Halifax. I express my apologies to the minister if I became a little emotional and got carried away. Perhaps he will stop reading so I can make an apology to him.

Mr. Hellyer: I am listening very carefully.

Mr. Forrestall: Can you do that and read at the same time?

An hon. Member: It is not hard to follow you.

Mr. Forrestall: It is not hard to follow my remarks, but I am being sincere. I wish to express my apologies if indeed I was a little perturbed and disturbed with the loss of 100 jobs and the effect this has had on the families of those affected. This is of great concern to me. The minister has given his assurance that base consolidation, and plans leading to it, would not have an undue economic impact on the area. The other night he was reading, as he is now, and I lost my temper. I think the people of Halifax are deserving, and incompetent as I may be to express their views and opinions, I think they deserve at least to be heard. As I said the other night they deserve some kind of a reply. My words, which were possibly spoken in anger, were nevertheless very sincere and born of the desire not to see the Halifax area unduly affected by what, in the words of senior serving officers and indeed the minister himself, may be described as a natural sequence to the evolution of unification and integration.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Indeed if we are to follow this through to its logical conclusion, that is to say the saving of money, the conversion of this money into better and more sophisticated equipment, then it would be logical to look at base consolidation. I have indicated on a number of occasions in the house, as have more senior members of this party, the extent to which Halifax, Dartmouth and the municipality of Halifax depend upon defence expenditures. There is no need for me to repeat that.

I simply want to bring forward one or two points in the few minutes available to me tonight. I will mention again to the minister that we have not as yet had any explanation

of why the government has taken the second major step leading to the total removal of civilian employees at *Shearwater*. What is the government's intention? What is its plan? I will remind the minister that confederation was founded in no small way in the Atlantic provinces. The dollars and cents that led to its proper development were extracted from the maritime economy. This was quite true for many years following confederation, not to mention the years leading up to it. We are entitled to frankness. We are mature enough to accept rational decisions which the government might make. We are aware of the fact that it does represent the majority opinion in Canada.

We are prepared to accept the fact that possibly the minister might be right. All we ask from him is his honest evaluation of the studies which have been made, to date, with regard to base consolidation. We would like to hear from him whether or not he is going to close *Shearwater*, or whether he is simply asking quietly that civilians be removed so that when base consolidation comes to bear on that naval establishment he will be able to turn to the people in the area and say, "I am sorry, but there are no civilian employees involved; all we are doing is transferring the military establishment." Will he tell us, for example, whether it is his intention to close *Cornwallis*, transfer the training establishment to *Shearwater* and remove the flying training establishment from there to Greenwood? Will he tell us whether or not these moves are being considered? Much is at stake.

I raise this matter again with some degree of trepidation because, as I said at the outset of my remarks, I was somewhat flustered and concerned when I discussed it on Friday. I made some remarks in the heat of anger which I would not have made otherwise. However, today I received a telegram from Mr. A. Wesson, president of the largest union at Fairey Aviation, which reads as follows:

Situation unchanged. Notice given today to terminate employment of 60 more employees. Letter following.

I am concerned about that. I said before and I will repeat again that I am very concerned about the dialogue that we have established in connection with this bill. Like other hon. members in the house I believe quite sincerely that we have not got around to talking about what we should be talking about. Today I asked the Prime Minister whether he was in receipt of a telegram signed by Mr. D. A. Bona, president of local 273 of the Canadian Labour Congress setting forth very real concern regarding wage rates. Why should he not be concerned? This concerns 700 or 800 members in his union, many of whom are paid different wage rates. What lies at the root of all this is the total inability of the government and the minister to clarify not only the effects of integration and unification upon the service personnel but the effect on those civilians in Halifax and Dartmouth who are affected by integration and unification.

I am making these remarks because they are indeed important. I think Mr. Bona's telegram is important enough to be read into the record because it voices a concern. It is a reaction to a vacuum left by the minister—and I am sorry the associate minister is away. I am very pleased, however, that he has gone to participate in the events at Vimy; as a young Canadian I have great appreciation for that. I am not unmindful of it, nor do I think are other young Canadians of my age. However, I am sorry he is not here. I am sorry the President of the Treasury Board is not in the house. Indeed it is discouraging to note that only three members of the cabinet are here.

Mr. Turner: How about your side?

Mr. Forrestall: I am pleased to see the minister has now included our group among the government treasury benches.

Mr. Turner: How about your side?

Mr. Forrestall: I am sorry; I apologize to the minister. I think everybody is watching the hockey game. There are probably as many out in your lobby as there are in ours, so I apologize. I am sorry a minister on the treasury bench is not available because I think it is pertinent to read the contents of this telegram into the record. The telegram indicates the concern that exists because of a lack of adequate information, a lack of a basic plan and a lack of basic organization in connection with integration and unification.

• (9:50 p.m.)

This telegram is addressed to me, but it is a copy of a night letter sent to the Prime Minister and reads as follows:

In the past four months we have attempted to have the Department of National Defence our employer recognize the need to give fair play and simple justice to employees in federal local union 273 C.L.C. To date we have received sympathy and the reply wait until collective bargaining. The employees in ship repair at H.M.C. Dockyard have

received projected increases of 21 cents over and above the seven shipyards formula by an agreement signed January 31/67—

I do not need to explain that to the minister, he knows what it is.

—yet the department continues to refuse to even consider projecting any increases for labourers, motor transport in CFB Halifax and yard craft and auxiliary vessel employees. Certification and collective bargaining could be delayed indefinitely in reference to our members in the case of yard craft and auxiliary vessels. These employees have one of the lowest wage rates and fringe benefits systems of government employees. Labourers in this area have poor labour rates with the area rate 31 cents below the ship repair labour rate. Motor transport drivers receive 16 cents below the ship repair labour rate. We were informed that we would not be hurt by integration and this has been reaffirmed on subsequent occasions yet employees that were under the ship repair wage rate and those employees that after years of discussion finally reached a better wage rate have lost not only their purchasing power but the opportunity to continue to progress to a better standard of living by leaving the area rate. We appeal to you, sir, to rectify this grave injustice and consider the possibility of interim increases until the employees are able to bargain for themselves.

I think the telegram speaks for itself, Mr. Chairman. This was a direct threat to the real effect of unification and integration. There are 300 people in Canada who can tie up—indeed, there are 32 people in Canada who can tie up our entire maritime defence. This group of approximately 30 people can, under the guidance of local 273 of the Canadian Labour Congress, do this.

There is something else which has concerned me very deeply, and it has to do with some references made by the minister in the committee. I believe he had the unmitigated gall to cast some aspersions on the British defence posture. I refer to statements recorded on page 524 of the committee evidence, at which time Air Marshal Sharp had made some comments on the advances in science and their effects on modern weapons. It was suggested these advances could cut across the roles of the three services. It might be possible that an officer might make a recommendation to buy a piece of equipment which would enhance and maintain the status quo of his service but which would not be in the best interest of the country, if one looked at the total picture.

The witness had been questioned by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, and the Minister of National Defence interjected:

I will give you an example—

Here, Mr. Chairman, I am talking about an argument put forth by the Minister of National Defence that unification is not only desirable but is absolutely necessary.

[Mr. Forrestall.]

—and I do so with some trepidation because it involves another country. I think the recent difference in opinion between the Royal Navy and the Royal Air Force with respect to who was going to acquire tactical aircraft for the future, was conducted in a manner in which both services put service interest ahead of the national interest. Now, that is my opinion, and you can disagree with it if you wish.

I not only disagree with it completely, but I question the minister's responsibility in making a statement about the United Kingdom at this particular level. Indeed, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre replied to that statement in this way:

I certainly disagree with the Minister of National Defence for Canada criticizing something that has happened in Great Britain.

Mr. Hellyer: I think it is one of the best classic examples of the reason why the single service concept is inevitable, as well as being a good solution militarily and economically.

Mr. Churchill: This is a shocking statement coming from a minister of the crown.

Then, the chairman of the defence committee indicated his reaction by saying:

What is so shocking about it?

Mr. Churchill: Implying that the Royal Air Force and Royal Navy had a conflict of interest with regard to loyalty to their country.

These statements referred to difficulties in the United Kingdom and were dealt with in some depth by the one man in the United Kingdom who should know, Christopher Mayhew, the recently retired minister of national defence in the United Kingdom. Since it is getting close to ten o'clock, Mr. Chairman, I should like to quote briefly from appendix II, page 171, the resignation statement of Mr. Christopher Mayhew as it appeared in the Journals of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom:

The rigid fixing of a budget in advance placed a heavy strain on inter-service relations—not that inter-service rivalry was on anything like the scale that public opinion has been led to believe: It should be placed to the credit of the admiralty board that from the beginning to the end of the defence review it stoutly maintained that if we were to remain east of Suez we should need F. 111 A's for the job as well as the carriers.

Our Minister of National Defence has indicated that the difficulties in the United Kingdom were really the result of interservice rivalry brought about because the services were not unified or integrated. Christopher Mayhew says the difficulties were brought about primarily because of the rigid fixing of a budget in advance.

May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Chairman?

Progress reported.

• (10:00 p.m.)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

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

PUBLIC WORKS—PORT McNEILL, B.C.—REQUEST FOR BREAKWATER CONSTRUCTION

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to see that the Minister of Public Works is not here tonight because as Minister of Transport he visited the general area about which I want to raise this question. However, I am sure that the parliamentary secretary to the minister, to whom I have recently supplied a map of this area, will learn something from it and add his influence to what I hope will result from the question I am going to raise.

On April 5 I asked the Minister of Public Works whether he would endeavour to prevail upon his colleagues in the cabinet to provide a supplementary estimate for the construction of a breakwater at Port McNeill on Vancouver Island, I should say that this is the first occasion I have raised a question under this order involving proposed construction under the public works department, and I hope that the fact that I am doing so will serve to lend weight to the importance I attach to this matter.

I may say that it was with a great deal of regret that I had to advise the people of this area that this item was not in the estimates which were tabled for the current fiscal year. I was therefore not too surprised to find the lead headline in the next issue of the *North Island Gazette,* which is published in the neighbouring community of Alert Bay, read "Port McNeill Erupts!" The article went on to say:

> Village council was thrown into turmoil at its meeting last week when it learned that the community's long-expected breakwater was not included in this year's estimates of the federal public works department.

I may say that their anticipation that such would be the case was based, in part at least, on a letter addressed to me by the Minister of Public Works, a copy of which I furnished the council, under date of June 9, 1966, in which the minister said, in part:

> —it is proposed to consider an item in the 1967-68 estimates for the construction of a boat harbour at Port McNeill—

While I tried to make it clear to them that that statement meant nothing more nor less than what it said, that there was in existence, of course, the Treasury Board process of examination of proposed estimates, nevertheless I had indicated that I felt reasonably optimistic that this item would be included in the construction program for this year and that it would in fact go forward. I also indicated that until the estimates were actually tabled this was the most definite statement that we could expect on this subject. Their disappointment is, in my view, not at all over-rated.

I should explain, Mr. Speaker, that this community on northern Vancouver Island has recently become an incorporated municipality, as have some other places on the north island. I recognize that here in Ottawa it is perhaps a little difficult to keep up with the very rapid expansion which has taken place on the northern part of Vancouver Island. I should point out that the federal government took over in 1964 a wharf which had been constructed by the owners of a logging camp, and it is really from this date that the rapid development of Port McNeill as a community with shopping centres, banks, a modern hotel, and so on and so forth, has taken place. It has now become the centre for the new regional high school for the school district of north Vancouver Island.

I am sure the minister is aware that the Prime Minister and all of the members from the province of British Columbia as well as the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of my own party have received representations from that area since the item failed to appear in the estimates. Wires were sent from the village of Port McNeill, from the Port McNeill and district chamber of commerce, from the school district, district No. 85, which represents a large consolidated school district covering the entire northern section of Vancouver Island, and also from the Port McNeill Women's Hospital Auxiliary. I should point out that the only hospital in the district at Alert Bay is dependent on water transportation from Port McNeill.

I also point out that there has now been established a regional level of government for north Vancouver Island known as the regional district of Mount Waddington. This body represents the entire northern area of Vancouver Island's incorporated and unincorporated communities. Its members say unanimously that the immediate construction of this breakwater is essential to the continuance of development of ordinary life in these parts of Vancouver Island. The local member

of the legislative assembly who also happens to be the minister concerned with municipal affairs in British Columbia, has agreed that this is true.

One of the best letters to be sent to the Prime Minister and to be made available to me is from a local minister of the United Church of Canada who says:

> It is important for you to understand that this is not simply a pressure campaign based on the theory that "the squeaking wheel gets the grease." On the contrary, the need for a breakwater for Port McNeill is urgent and the many letters you have received from this community should be interpreted in this light.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a small matter. Ten or 12,000 people on the north end of Vancouver Island are concerned vitally with this facility as is evident from the many representations.

In 1871, when British Columbia entered confederation, its population was 36,247, all but 9,000 of whom were Indians. If 36,000 people were considered important enough to warrant the building of a railway to the Pacific coast, surely the 10,000 or 12,000 people on northern Vancouver Island warrant some consideration at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I can well understand the disappointment of the people of the Port McNeill area that this project was not included in the Department of Public Works estimates for the fiscal year 1967-68. My own impression is that much of what the hon. member has said is correct. I myself first heard about the requirements at Port McNeill last summer, when I was visited by a very persuasive man, a Mr. Joseph J. Cvetkovich, who talked with me about the situation there. He recounted his great difficulties in landing at Port McNeill in a small aircraft during a storm.

There is general agreement that the project would be helpful to the fishing fleet in the district and that an additional benefit to flow from it would be that it would provide a protected harbour for the movement of persons and goods. The Minister of Public Works is fully aware of the need. Certainly the consideration promised in his letter of June 9, 1966, was given. In fact, I believe the Minister of Public Works might have succeeded in having the work undertaken in the present fiscal year had a little more money been available.

[Mr. Barnett.]

• (10:10 p.m.)

I assure the hon. member that the Minister of Public Works continues to be keenly interested in this project and that he is a very persistent man. The hon. member and the people of the Port McNeill area may derive some consolation from the fact that the minister will continue to focus attention on this project. I feel confident that eventually the Minister of Public Works will succeed in having this work carried through.

AGRICULTURE—REMOVAL OF SUPPORT PRICE FOR MANUFACTURING MILK

Mr. Lee Grills (Hastings South): My reason for taking part in this debate tonight is to ask the minister or his parliamentary secretary why the support was removed from the surplus milk shipped by fluid milk shippers of this country.

First, I would suggest we consider who is affected. It is the producer of fluid milk, who has put more effort and more investment into his dairy operation than any other dairy farmer. I do not want to detract from the efforts made by other milk producers, but it is the dairy producer who has had to produce the highest quality and maintain a supply throughout the 12 months of the year. This means extra expense, extra investment and additional equipment.

No milk producer can produce an equal quantity throughout the year without having surplus milk at some periods. It would be impossible. So a producer finds himself with different quantities on hand. Some might be shipping 50 per cent to a fluid milk market; others, 75 per cent. In any case a considerable quantity goes to a manufacturing plant as what is called surplus milk. It is with respect to this portion of his production that the support he received last year has been withdrawn. I maintain that the fluid milk producer is being discriminated against, and this had led to further difficulties for the reason I have mentioned.

It is true the producer may get a premium price for the milk sold on the fluid milk market. But if 50 per cent of his production goes to a surplus market without benefit of a support price he finds himself in the unenviable position of having to produce milk during a 12 months period without adequate compensation, in the final analysis getting no more than the other person. So the fluid milk producer is questioning whether he ought to continue to ship his milk to a fluid milk market.

I read in this morning's paper that the price of milk in Ontario is increasing, and I am sure this increase will be followed in Quebec and in the other provinces of Canada. Why should this be so? It is because the fluid milk shipper is not getting support for his surplus. Other prices are advancing, so he is asking a higher price. It is suggested that the price of milk will advance by two cents a quart. I maintain this situation is brought about because of the insecurity of the fluid milk shipper. So this question affects the price of milk across the country, and as one involved in the dairy enterprise, I hate to see what is happening. I do not like to see the price of milk keep on advancing. I do not wish to see the price of anything keep on advancing. The cost of living is going up, and this is one more step.

I say there is no surplus. We have been importing butter, and that does not put us in a surplus position. I maintain that the minister and the government must take some action or further trouble will develop. My remarks are not intended to be critical. I hope what I am saying is constructive criticism. I also hope something will be done before it is too late, because already there have been threats to dump milk if the farmers do not get the proper price. I hope none of us see any milk dumped in Canada because I think that would be a sin. It would be something to be ashamed of in a starving world.

I do not like to say that the minister does not understand, but I am beginning to realize that he is not a farmer. He is a minister of agriculture learning as best he can. I would not like to say he does not care, because I think he does. I only hope he takes some action before it is too late. This thing has gone beyond the point of pushing it around in the House of Commons. It is time some action was taken.

Farmers across the country are getting older and older. I was talking to a cheese factory operator yesterday and he told me his production of cheese is down 25,000 pounds in the first quarter of this year, and he has no reason to think that this decrease will not continue throughout the year. As I say, our farmers are getting older, and they are getting tired of a seven day week operation.

As a result of my few remarks I hope the minister will give some consideration to this problem I have many documents on my desk which I can show him to establish that some farmers are shipping two thirds of their milk to a manufacturing plant, and the present situation is pretty difficult for them.

Mr. Bruce S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for Hastings-South (Mr. Grills) for bringing this important matter to the attention of the minister and the house. I can assure him, as one who has produced fluid milk for an important market, that the government is quite conscious of the fact that there are additional costs attached to the production of fluid milk and that there is a difficulty in maintaining continuity of supply.

There is, however, an important feature, in that we must determine the jurisdiction under which each of these areas falls. In the first place, fluid milk is produced according to provincial requirements and regulations. It is hauled in vehicles that come under provincial jurisdiction, and provincial governments are generally regarded to have accepted, and they themselves have accepted, the responsibility for fluid milk.

On the other hand we feel that manufacturing milk, part of which goes into an export trade, is our responsibility, and it has been agreed that it is the responsibility of the federal government. I think probably the federal government has assumed its full responsibility in measuring up to a very satisfactory degree, but maybe not to the full aspirations of the producers of manufacturing milk.

I only want to mention three salient points in connection with the federal policy. The first of course is that these jurisdictions have been defined. Second, $120 million has been appropriated to the Canadian Dairy Commission to assist in the establishment of a satisfactory price for manufacturing milk f.o.b. factory, and I would like to say that this is based on a buying price for butter of 63 cents per pound, and 20 cents for powder. This means approximately $4.75 f.o.b. factory to the farmers, and this is considerably more than has prevailed in recent years and recent months.

While the policy is not all that might be desired, I regret on behalf of the minister that we are unable to meet the requirements of the hon. member for Hastings South in suggesting we should further support fluid milk prices. This is clearly the responsibility of the provincial governments.

Mr. Grills: That does not answer the question.

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

• (10:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE—REQUEST FOR DISCUSSION OF NEW DAIRY POLICY

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, last March 22, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene) announced the dairy policy of the Canadian government to the effect that deficiency payments to milk producers would be raised to $1.21 per hundredweight, which would bring the price of milk to $4.75 f.o.b. factory. And the minister went on to say that there would be a 10-cent deduction per hundredweight for export costs.

As pointed out by one government member, it was really an increase but I suggest that increase was far below what was asked the day before by the thousand delegates who came to Ottawa from all parts of the province of Quebec to make their grievances known to their members of parliament and to appeal to the cabinet.

At the time, various regional associations of dairy producers were heard through their president, but the man who explained the farm problems more fully was without question Mr. Lionel Saurel, president of C.F.U., who summarized the tragic situation in which the farmers find themselves.

He did an excellent job; the farmers were proud of their president and all hon. members present listened attentively.

Mr. Saurel did not use high-sounding words; he gave the facts.

Even the Minister of Agriculture was impressed by his sincerity, because while Mr. Saurel was talking he managed to say to the Minister of Forestry and Rural Development (Mr. Sauvé) who was sitting next to him: If he could be with us to convince the others.

Those words were repeated to the 1,000 farmers by the Minister of Forestry and Rural Development when he was asked to speak to them.

At some other point during the meeting, the minister spoke to them again, this time without being invited to do so. He told them not to worry any more, that although he himself, a city dweller, did not know much about the situation, the government had many experts who already were aware of it.

It was after meeting one of those experts that I decided certains facts should be pointed out. The said expert seemed confined to 1963, at which time the Conservatives made way for the Liberals.

This person told me that milk was then sold at $2.66, while today the price is $4.65.

[Mr. Grills.]

Mr. Speaker, if experts can amuse themselves by making comparisons, I shall do the same. I should like to remind the parliamentary secretary to the hon. minister that in 1950, milk was sold at only $2 per hundredweight, but at that time, I repeat, a tractor cost $1,200 or $1,500. Now, to buy a tractor we have to pay $4,500 to $5,000. But let it go, as far as the tractor is concerned, since one only buys every ten years. However, in the case of meal and fertilizers which farmers buy seven months a year to feed their cattle, the price difference is still the same.

For example, today, for barley, oats and corn, the farmer pays $3.75, whereas he only paid $1.25 per hundredweight in 1950.

The farmer now pays $4 or $4.25 per hundredweight for bran and shorts which are just by-products of wheat, while in 1950 he paid only $1.25 or $1.35.

Knowing that the hon. minister is about to revise his policy, I hope that the 300 per cent increases on machinery and meal will be taken into account.

When the minister strongly hopes that Mr. Saurel will be at his side to convince the others whom does he have in mind? Who are those cabinet members opposed to the new dairy policy?

Personally, I thought that inadequate funds explained the inadequacy of the dairy policy. I am reassured in reading the minutes of proceedings and evidence No. 43 of the standing committee on finance, trade and economic affairs sitting on Monday, February 6, 1967, on page 3000.

This involves the Minister of Finance and Receiver General who was replying to a question by a member and I take the liberty of quoting the question and answer. The member asked:

> Mr. Sharp—Do you feel that at present in Canada the money supply is sufficient?
>
> Mr. Sharp: Shall I put it this way? I believe that during the term that I have been in office the money supply has been sometimes more than adequate for the purpose.

The member asked:

> I would just like to ask the minister to repeat his last answer.
>
> Mr. Sharp: I have not been concerned about a deficiency of money and credit. I may be concerned about that in the future but during my year or so in office I have not been concerned about that problem.

In view of the fact that finance could not influence the Minister of Agriculture in his dairy policy could the minister or the parliamentary secretary to the minister (Mr. Beer)

give, for the guidance of all farmers, the names of the cabinet members who hindered him in his work?

Since the minister has already expressed the wish of having at his side the president of the Catholic Farmers Union, in order to work up intrigues, could we know who are the others he was thinking about in a moment of sincerity?

It is essential that presidents and representatives of farmers unions or organizations apply to the right person if their intrigues are to be effective, and I hope that the freedom of action then given back to the Minister of Agriculture will enable him to review his dairy policy, while taking into account the price of tractors, and of feed grain. Since the indemnities of ministers and of house members have tripled, in all fairness, the price of milk should be increased to $6 per hundredweight, but the farmers are not asking that much. They are asking for $5. By accepting $5 per hundredweight, they are making a $1 gift to society, to consumers, whereas if the government adds $1 to the $4 granted last year, it is merely a payment on account of what it owes the farmers.

[*English*]

Mr. Bruce S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I regret first of all that I am unable to reply in the other official language, but I wish to thank the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin) for his important question. Let me assure him that no one could be more sympathetic to the cost-price squeeze in which the farmer finds himself than the minister or I, personally. Probably all of these factors were taken into consideration by the minister when he insisted on an additional amount of money to support the dairy program. We must recognize that the amount of money allocated to the dairy support program has been increased by 33⅓ per cent for 1967-68 over that for 1966-67. I am sure the hon. member would be the first person to agree that this is a substantial step forward.

I regret of course that the $1.21 of federal money in respect of every 100 pounds of manufacturing milk is not sufficient to meet the need. It was the feeling of the minister that this increase represented a responsible step forward at this particular time, and all that the government and the minister saw fit to work into the program for this particular year. I am not aware that there will be any immediate review, but certainly as time progresses the policy will be reconsidered.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.29 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, April 12, 1967

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

NATIONAL ANTHEM

CONCURRENCE IN SECOND REPORT OF SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

Mr. S. Perry Ryan (Spadina) moved that the second report of the special joint committee on the national and royal anthems, presented to the house on Wednesday, March 15, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

CROWN CORPORATIONS

LEGISLATION RESPECTING STATUS AS TO MUNICIPAL TAXATION, LIABILITY, ETC.

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic) asked leave to introduce Bill No. C-288, an act to amend the Crown Corporations Act.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to place crown corporations on the same footing as private businesses. More particularly, this bill provides that: (a) public corporations shall be subject to municipal taxes, just like private businesses; (b) in case of bankruptcy, public corporations shall receive payment on the same basis as other businesses, with no special privileges; (c) that public corporations should not enjoy privileges with regard to patents; (d) that a writ of mandamus should be served upon a crown corporation as to any private company; (e) that the penal laws should apply to public corporations as they apply to private companies.

In other words, the object of this bill is to bring public corporations under private law and take away from them the prerogatives of public law. When the state runs a business, it must be subject to the same statutes as tradesmen.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

[*English*]

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

23033—937

COST OF MOVING CENTENNIAL TRAIN

Question No. 2,623—**Mr. Horner (Acadia):**

Who pays for the hauling of the centennial train across Canada and how much is paid per mile to what railways?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the centennial commission as follows: (a) The centennial commission. (b) Payment is not made on a per mile basis. The centennial commission has entered into a contract through the Department of Defence Production with Canadian National Railways and Canadian Pacific Railway in the amount of $846,155, for the hauling, leasing and operation of a 15 unit train of which six exhibition units belong to the centennial commission. The contract includes all services from January 1 to December 5, 1967, allowing 83 stops for 315½ exhibit days throughout its journey across Canada.

RESEARCH INTO TELEVISION SERVICE THROUGH SATELLITES

Question No. 2,653—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. Is the C.B.C. conducting any research, either alone or jointly, into the feasibility of providing remote areas with television service by use of satellites?

2. Has either the McGill University's space research institute (HARP) or the National Research Council been approached to work with the C.B.C. or any other public or private communications media to launch a Canadian satellite which would relay messages for rebroadcasting?

3. Are there any plans to use these research facilities for such purposes?

4. Is the government aware of any plans by any Canadian or United States agencies to orbit satellites for telecommunicative purposes or other purposes in such positions over Canada that they may interfere with any present or future Canadian plans for relaying signals?

5. Does the C.B.C. have any plans to request any United States agency to orbit a satellite to be used for communicative purposes, either alone or jointly with other Canadian or United States telecommunication systems?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): 1. The feasibility of providing network distribution of C.B.C. programming to remote areas for radio and television services using space satellite facilities is being explored by C.B.C. in co-operation with the Department of Transport and others. The C.B.C.'s part of this work is to establish all

its requirements, including those for remote areas, so that the feasibility of meeting them can be studied.

2. No formal responsible request has been received by the National Research Council or the Department of Transport.

3. No.

4. No.

5. No final decision will be reached by the government until the C.B.C. and other requirements have been established.

C.B.C. TELEVISION STATION IN NEW BRUNSWICK

Question No. 2,715—**Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert):**

1. Has a decision been taken to locate a new C.B.C. t.v. outlet in New Brunswick and, if not, what criteria will be used?

2. Has the C.B.C. t.v. outlets in the largest cities in other provinces?

3. Will the important coverage area in Nova Scotia be considered?

4. When will the application be made to the B.B.G.?

5. Can representations be made to the C.B.C. before the board hearings?

6. Have any independent surveys been conducted and, if so, with what result?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by C.B.C. as follows: 1. Yes. C.B.C. has plans to provide television service through C.B.C.-owned facilities to the Fredericton-Saint John area of New Brunswick. Criteria used in such decisions are those developed by the corporation over the years and involving assessment of relevant engineering, statistical, cultural and socio-economic data.

2. The corporation has its own television outlets in the largest cities of all other provinces except Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island.

3. Yes. The C.B.C. expects to duplicate the coverage now provided to part of Nova Scotia by the present C.B.C. affiliate in Saint John.

4. No specific date has been set for the C.B.C. application to the Department of Transport or for subsequent hearing by the Board of Broadcast Governors, although it is planned to apply during the 1967-68 fiscal year.

5. Yes. Representations can be made to the C.B.C. at any time and to the B.B.G. when the C.B.C. application is before it.

6. Not to the C.B.C.'s knowledge.

[Miss LaMarsh.]

C.B.C.—NATIONAL RELIGIOUS ADVISORY COUNCIL

Question No. 2,735—**Mr. Haidasz:**

1. Is there in existence a national religious advisory council connected with the C.B.C.?

2. When was such a council established?

3. What are its terms of reference?

4. What is the composition of the council?

5. When was the last report made to the minister?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the C.B.C. as follows: 1. Yes.

2. 1938.

3. The council was set up to advise the corporation on all matters of religious broadcasting. It is free to comment on any programming matter.

4. The council is composed of 13 members nominated by the major denominations and appointed by the C.B.C. board of directors. Roman Catholic, Anglican, United, Baptist, Lutheran and Presbyterian churches have direct representation and the chairman of the council is charged with the responsibility of representing the interests of smaller denominations.

5. The N.R.A.C. does not report to the minister. It reports to the C.B.C. through the corporation's supervisor of religious broadcasts.

PURCHASE OR LEASE OF HOUSES UNDER BILINGUALISM EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Question No. 2,741—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

1. Has the government purchased houses in the cities of Quebec or Toronto or suburbs of either, for use by public servants engaged in the bilingualism exchange program?

2. If so (a) how many houses in each area (b) at what total cost in each area?

3. Is it planned to acquire more houses for this purpose?

4. If so (a) how many (b) at what estimated cost?

5. Do the public service occupants of these houses pay rent therefor?

6. If so (a) upon what basis is rent calculated (b) what is the total amount of rent paid in each area?

7. In each area, does the government lease houses from owners for use in this program?

8. If so (a) how many houses are leased in each area (b) at what total annual cost in each area (c) is the full amount of the rent paid by the government recovered from the public service occupant?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I have been given the following information by the public service commission: 1. Yes.

2. (a) 4 in Quebec city; (b) $107,500.

3. Yes.

4. (a) 23; (b) $780,000.

5. No.

6. Not applicable.

7. Yes.

8. (a) 1 in Quebec city; (b) $3,000 per year; (c) no.

PUBLIC SERVICE—UNIVERSITY TRAINING IN LIBRARY SCIENCE

Question No. 2,753—**Mr. Prittie:**

1. Concerning the Public Service Commission information circular No. 66-4110 regarding university training in library science, how many applications were received by January 9, 1967?

2. How many of the applicants were selected for interview?

3. How many applicants have been offered appointments as librarians in training?

4. How many of these applicants have accepted appointments?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: 1. 199 applications were received from candidates who had mailed them by January 9.

2. 114 candidates were called for interview.

3. No offers have been made as yet since interviewing is still in progress.

It is anticipated that offers will be made early in April.

4. See answer to 3.

*PERSONS RECOMMENDING PURCHASE OF PAINTING "SUNDAY AFTERNOON"

Question No. 2,756—**Mr. Herridge:**

What are the names of the three directors of the Canadian public art museums who recommended the purchase of the painting entitled "Sunday Afternoon" by Claude Breeze, to the Canada Council?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Canada Council that the council is not at liberty to provide the information requested. The arrangements by which the council is able to secure the advice of experts rest on the understanding that these experts will not be personally called upon to defend individual decisions made by the council. The council alone must accept full responsibility for each of its actions.

*REQUESTS FOR INCREASE IN MILK SUBSIDY

Question No. 2,781—**Mr. Alkenbrack:**

1. Has the government received requests for an increase in the present subsidy on industrial milk for the new fiscal dairy year beginning April 1, 1967?

2. From how many and which segments of the milk producing industry have these requests been received?

3. Has the government referred these requests to and consulted with the Canadian Dairy Commission?

4. Has the government referred these requests to and consulted with the stabilization board?

Mr. Bruce S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the answer to starred question No. 2,781 is divided into four parts. The answer to the first part is yes. The answer to the second part is, a total of 101 representations were received from producer organizations and local committees.

The answer to part 3 is yes, and the answer to part 4 is yes.

*REQUEST FOR MINIMUM PRICE FOR INDUSTRIAL MILK

Question No. 2,782—**Mr. Alkenbrack:**

1. Has the government received a message from 150 dairy farmers of Prince Edward-Lennox, who assembled at Bloomfield, March 13, in which they unanimously requested a minimum price of $5.10 per cwt. for industrial milk for the coming dairy year?

2. Will the government give this request favourable consideration?

Mr. Bruce S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the answer to this question is divided into two parts. The answer to part 1 is, yes; and the answer to part 2 is, all representations were carefully considered.

WEST COAST HERRING FISHERY

Question No. 2,797—**Mr. Webb:**

1. Did Dr. Taylor, who is in charge of herring fisheries on the west coast, forecast 1967 as a bumper year in the herring harvest?

2. How long did the season last?

3. Was the season closed earlier than usual and, if so, for what reason?

Hon. H.-J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): 1. No.

2. The 1967 herring season northern central Queen Charlotte Islands sub-districts closed March 5 instead of March 10; upper and middle east coasts sub-districts closed January 28 instead of February 5; lower east coast closed December 14 instead of February 5; west coast closed February 5 on time.

3. All early closures were made to conserve spawning stocks; the in-season closure from February 5 to 15 in northern central Queen Charlotte sub-districts was made to protect immature fish.

*REQUEST FOR INCREASED RETURN ON FARM-SEPARATED CREAM

Question No. 2,801—**Mr. Alkenbrack:**

Because of the current shortage of butter in Canada, will the government give the producers

of farm separated cream a better return for their product in the new dairy year than in the one now terminating?

Mr. Bruce S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the direct subsidy to producers of farm separated cream in the support year starting April 1, 1967, will be at a rate equivalent to $1.21 for 3.5 pounds of butterfat. The subsidy rate in the year ending March 31 was 85 cents for 3.5 pounds of butterfat.

The Canadian Dairy Commission is supporting the price of butter, as from April 1, 1967, at a carlot purchase price of 63 cents per pound. The support purchase price established under the Agricultural Stabilization Act on April 1, 1966, was 59 cents per pound.

AIR CANADA EXPENDITURES IN CANADA

Question No. 2,807—**Mr. Schreyer:**

1. Of the total expenditures by Air Canada in the last fiscal year, what proportion of that amount was spent in (a) the three prairie provinces (b) British Columbia?
2. Of the total Air Canada expenditures for maintenance and overhaul work in the last fiscal year, what proportion of this amount was spent in (a) the three prairie provinces (b) British Columbia?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Air Canada advises as follows: 1. (a) 14.6 per cent; (b) 5.7 per cent.

2. (a) 20.6 per cent; (b) 4.2 per cent.

COAST GUARD PATROL OF GRAND BANKS

Question No. 2,825—**Mr. Barnett:**

1. What provisions are made for patrolling the Grand Banks offshore from Newfoundland by the Canadian coast guard?
2. During what period or periods of the year are patrols maintained on a regular basis?
3. What particular coast guard vessels or other equipment are used in this service?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. At present no specific provisions are made by the Canadian coast guard for patrolling the Grand Banks area.

2 and 3. Not applicable.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

NATIONAL MUSEUM

Question No. 2,778—**Mr. Reid:**

1. Are all the functions of the National Museum consolidated in one building and, if not (a) for what reason (b) what are the other addresses (c) what functions or departments of the National Museum are housed there, and (d) what is the cost to the government for this space?

[Mr. Alkenbrack.]

2. Since April, 1966, has the National Museum acquired additional space and, if so (a) how much additional space (b) where is it located (c) what is the reason for this additional space?
3. What are the government's plans for the construction of the new National Museum building?

Return tabled.

PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS UNDER FEDERAL ACT

Question No. 2,837—**Mr. Laprise:**

1. How many public housing units have been built and made available to low-income families and individuals in each province since the implementation of the National Housing Act?
2. How much has been invested in each province, and how many families in each province are being assisted under this act?

Return tabled.

[*Translation*]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, motion for papers No. 215 is acceptable to the government.

Would Your Honour be so kind as to call motion No. 220?

I ask that the remaining motions be allowed to stand.

[*English*]

MCKINNON INDUSTRIES—LAID OFF WORKERS

Motion No. 215—**Mr. Barnett:**

That an order of the house do issue for copies of (a) a list of the names and social security numbers sent to the transitional assistance benefits board by McKinnon Industries Limited, St. Catharines, Ontario, as being laid off from employment since September 8, 1966 (b) a list of all those named in part (a) above who have been certified as being eligible to draw transitional assistance benefits (c) a list of all those named in part (a) above who have received or who are now receiving transitional assistance benefits payments.

Motion agreed to.

COLOUR TELEVISION SETS PROVIDED BY C.B.C.

Motion No. 220—**Mr. Smallwood:**

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of all correspondence, orders, receipts and other documents, since July 1, 1966, between the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the recipients of 107 colour television sets, conferred gratis, upon individuals within and without the corporation.

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed that there are no such things as colour television sets conferred gratis upon any individuals, therefore there is no correspondence. I suggest to the hon. member that he consider withdrawing the motion, since it would require a "nil" answer.

Mr. Smallwood: In the circumstances I cannot withdraw this motion. I placed it on the order paper so I might have information. I wish to congratulate the hon. lady for informing the house—

Mr. Speaker: Order. We cannot have a debate now. All the hon. member can do is ask that this motion be transferred for debate. Is that what he wants to do?

Mr. Smallwood: No. I will ask that the question be put to the house.

Miss LaMarsh: But I have informed the house that I have no objection to accepting the order, though it will have to be by a "nil" return.

Mr. Speaker: I suppose there is no alternative before the Chair but to put the question to the house.

Miss LaMarsh: I have no objection to accepting the motion, but there will be a "nil" return. That is why I suggested that the hon. member should withdraw it.

Motion agreed to.

WATER RESOURCES

REQUEST FOR DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE ON POLLUTION

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I direct a question to the Prime Minister. It has to do with the Great Lakes research institute and the conference which has set forth the growing seriousness of pollution and the intolerable levels reached at Toronto and other large cities, through the presence of concentrated infectious bacteria.

I ask the Prime Minister whether in view of the seriousness of this problem he would undertake to hold, or give consideration to holding, a federal-provincial conference immediately so that plans may be co-ordinated to deal with this growing and increasingly dangerous problem before health in the metropolitan areas becomes seriously affected.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): This matter, including the possibility of holding a conference along the lines indicated by the right hon. gentleman, has been under consideration, but in view of the urgency which he rightly attaches to it I will give consideration to the question he has asked me today.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I thank the Prime Minister for his answer, and ask him whether the government is prepared to commit the necessary resources to a program which would adequately and effectively come to grips with this major problem in industrialized society today.

Mr. Pearson: The matter is being considered with the provinces and when we are aware of the nature and scope of the problem and of the resources which will be required to deal with it effectively we shall then have to decide how best the expense can be shared among the three levels of government.

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): Would the Prime Minister consider putting this matter on the agenda to be discussed by members of the Canadian and United States governments when they meet at Expo this summer, with a view to opening up the boundary waters treaty so this question of pollution might be added to the responsibilities of the two nations, thus providing constitutional encouragement for both countries to move in this field?

Mr. Pearson: The matter is already being considered by representatives of the two governments on the International Joint Commission. I think this is the most effective agency for dealing with this matter, and I hope the commission will report to the two governments before long.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

VIMY RIDGE SERVICE—INVITATION TO PRESIDENT DE GAULLE AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR CEREMONY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of the public discussion which is taking place regarding the Vimy ceremony last Sunday I would like to ask the Prime Minister two questions. First, was President de Gaulle ever formally invited by the Canadian government to attend the ceremony at Vimy? Second, in view of the fact that the ceremony was taking place within the territory of the Republic of France, were there any discussions through diplomatic channels with the French government regarding the arrangements for the ceremony prior to the plans being finalized?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker. This matter was discussed on the diplomatic level by representatives of the two governments, and it was made quite clear to the government of France that if the

representation of France on this occasion could be at the highest level that would have been very welcome to the Canadian government. If my hon. friend would put his question on the order paper I might be able to provide a more detailed written reply.

Mr. Douglas: Would the Prime Minister answer the first part of my question? Was a formal invitation ever extended to President de Gaulle to attend the ceremony?

Mr. Pearson: Well, Mr. Speaker, the French government was invited to participate fully in the ceremony, and it was made quite clear that if it had been possible for General de Gaulle, as head of the French government, to be there, that indeed would have been most welcome to the Canadian government.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Is the Prime Minister in a position to tell us whether, in the course of those diplomatic talks preceding the Vimy ceremonies, all the suggestions of the Canadian government on this ceremony were accepted by the French government?

[*English*]

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the arrangements that actually took place were worked out in collaboration with the French government and by agreement with that government.

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): As a supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Order. We have had a number of supplementary questions. This is a short day for questions, and I wonder if we could go on to another matter.

[*Translation*]

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

CONSIDERATION BY FINANCE MINISTERS OF USE OF BANK OF CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance and Receiver General.

Yesterday was the closing day of the federal-provincial conference on monetary questions in Canada which was attended by the provincial ministers of finance as well as by the federal Minister of Finance and Receiver General. On this occasion, or during the talks, was there any question of using the Bank of Canada to finance the public sector of the Canadian economy, without interest?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): No, Mr. Speaker; none of the provincial ministers or myself supported the position taken by the hon. member for Villeneuve.

Mr. Ricard: You voted for it a few years ago.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question.

Would the hon. Minister of Finance and Receiver General be kind enough to tell us what the bright suggestions were on that occasion?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is now asking the hon. minister for a general statement, and I do not believe this is the proper time for it.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

Would it not be important for the hon. minister to advise us, in view of the importance of the matter, of the result of that federal-provincial conference, or at least tell us whether the provincial ministers of finance disappeared, as if by magic, without knowing what happened?

[*English*]

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to make a statement on motions if the house would be interested, but I do not think it would be appropriate for me to make a statement at this time.

FINANCE

REGULATIONS UNDER DEPOSIT INSURANCE LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. Can the minister tell us whether the regulations envisaged under the Deposit Insurance Act have yet been formulated, since we hear that the act is to be put into force by the end of the month? If so, when will he be in a position to table those regulations as he undertook to do in the committee on finance, trade and economic affairs?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it is the intention to bring the act into force on the 17th of this month. I shall have to inquire about the particular

point of the regulations, and I know the hon. gentleman is reminding me that I had promised to refer these to the committee.

REQUEST FOR STUDY OF CORPORATION LAW REFORM

On the orders of the day:

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister based on an answer he gave to a question I asked him a week ago today in this house. The question I asked at that time, as recorded at page 14548 of *Hansard*, was:

In view of the success of the committee established by the government of Ontario in outlining the reforms needed in Ontario corporation law to provide better protection for the public in that province, does the government intend to initiate a similar study at the federal level with a view to providing better protection for the public in all parts of the country?

The Prime Minister replied as follows:

We have already done that, Mr. Speaker, as the result of a decision to hold a meeting to consider this matter I believe next Monday.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is my question to the Prime Minister. Knowing that that meeting has been held and that the matters considered were only a very minute part of the inquiry which took place in Ontario—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member now is making a speech, and I think he should ask his question.

Mr. Hees: In view of what I have said, may I ask the Prime Minister whether the government of Canada intends to initiate a similar study so that all citizens in all parts of the country may receive similar protection.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): The meeting was held last Monday after studies had been made by the provincial and federal governments. As a result of this meeting the studies are being continued.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, that is not in connection with corporation law. The meeting which was held last Monday, as I am sure the Prime Minister knows, dealt with a very small section of corporation law dealing with securities, not general corporation law.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING NEW MILITARY COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, may I ask what I am sure you will accept as an important question. I should like to direct it to the Minister of National Defence. Will the minister advise the house whether it is correct that without a policy statement, without a reference to the committee on national defence or a supplementary vote, negotiations are under way or have been concluded in respect of a new military communications system within the southern hemisphere to be known as "battleground communications", to which Canada is to be committed for 4 per cent of the capital cost? If so, may I ask what is its purpose so far as Canada's alliance commitments are concerned.

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): This is a rather complicated question. I am not sure whether the department has issued a press release on this, but I will inquire and if so send a copy of it to my hon. friend.

Mr. Winch: What did the United States do? That is my question.

Mr. Hellyer: If they have a press release we will have one as well.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Explain.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I had better explain for my rather cynical friends opposite. This was a tripartite arrangement involving ourselves, the United States and Australia. It was agreed that we would release the news to the press simultaneously. As sometimes happens, a leak occurred in another country in anticipation of the press release. There is, however, nothing very unique in that situation in an open society, as my hon. friends on both sides of the house are aware.

This is a development project which Canada has entered into with the United States and Australia. We have committed ourselves under the development funds which are available to us to participate to the extent of 5 per cent of the project definition stage of this program. At the end of that time the program will be reviewed and we will then decide whether we will continue in the development stage.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question. I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence just how this ties in with our alliance commitments.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question might require a somewhat complicated answer. Perhaps it should not be asked at this time.

Inquiries of the Ministry

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

MONTREAL—APPARENT ELIMINATION OF PRODUCTIONS IN ENGLISH

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. R. Keays (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State. It appears that the C.B.C. is following a course of action which is leading to the elimination of English productions in the Montreal studios. May I ask whether the government concurs in this policy of the C.B.C. and, if not, would it see that we at least preserve what we have in the province of Quebec of a bilingual and bicultural capability?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I am sure there would be no such policy. If there were the government would not concur in it. I am sure no management of the C.B.C. would ever make such a decision.

INQUIRY AS TO CONTROL OVER HOCKEY BROADCASTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. M. Brand (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Secretary of State. In view of the statement made today by an official of CBOT television that all decisions as to which hockey games are to be shown on which networks are to be made by that rather partisan group, MacLaren Advertising, rather than by the C.B.C., will the minister do everything in her power to prevent such further usurping of the rights of parliament and the taxpayers who pay for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I am not certain of this, but I suppose this is another case where the MacLaren firm has purchased the rights and sold them to the highest bidder. However, I will certainly ascertain the facts.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, does the minister agree that such an important matter to Canadian culture as hockey broadcasts should be in the hands of the MacLaren Advertising Company, which has such close relations with the government?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That question is not in order.

[Mr. Speaker.]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

REQUEST FOR ADJOURNMENT SO MEMBERS MAY ATTEND EXPO PREVIEW

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Will the Prime Minister consider adjourning the house on April 27 so that all members might have an opportunity to attend the preview of Expo on that date?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I think this matter should be given consideration, Mr. Speaker.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

INQUIRY AS TO DESIGN OF NEW INSIGNIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Postmaster General, asking him whether the report is correct that he has now designed another insignia for use by the Post Office Department. If so, when does he intend to introduce it?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This question should be placed on the order paper.

TORONTO—MAIL ADDRESSED TO DISMISSED CHIEF CORONER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Postmaster General. I understand that on instructions from the minister's department mail addressed to the dismissed chief coroner in Toronto, Dr. Shulman, is being forwarded to Dr. H. D. Cotnam, the Ontario supervising coroner. In view of the fact that the dismissal arose out of a controversy between those two gentlemen, will the minister consider some more appropriate way of dealing with Dr. Shulman's mail?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think the question can be asked at this time.

EDUCATION

FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN CONFERENCE ON EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. Will the minister, the parliamentary

secretary, or officials of the department be taking part in the Canadian Association for Adult Education conference on educational television to be held in Toronto tomorrow?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Yes, Mr. Speaker; there will be representatives from the B.B.G. and the C.B.C. together with individuals from other departments of government and from the staff of the under secretary of state.

[*Translation*]

POSTAL SERVICE

REQUEST FOR IMPROVEMENT IN GASPÉ AND BONAVENTURE CONSTITUENCIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Postmaster General.

In view of the large number of representations received from the far-away county of Bonaventure and a few communities in the county of Gaspé because of the long delays in the local delivery of mail, could the minister investigate to see whether such a deplorable situation could be corrected, if he is anxious to achieve the intended purpose in implementing the mail delivery by truck?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member has made representations which have been noted by the minister.

[*English*]

GRAIN

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Did he receive notice of my request for a statement in respect of the I.W.A. versus GATT regarding negotiations on wheat prices?

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did. This matter was communicated to me by the Prime Minister, and I read the reference in *Hansard* as well. I doubt whether you would permit me to make a statement at this time, but I am prepared to do so if it is your wish.

Inquiries of the Ministry

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REMOVAL OF UNIFORMS OF NAVAL PERSONNEL ATTENDING COMMONS DEBATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. I am informed that a dozen chief petty officers and petty officers from the Royal Canadian Navy, coming from the east and west coasts, are attending a supply course in the district. As one feature of that course they are at present in the gallery of this chamber. Before coming here they were told to remove their uniforms because the unification debate will be taking place and it would not be appropriate for them to be in naval uniform on this occasion. Can the minister explain this situation?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, not only am I unable to explain it, I had not heard about it until this moment. I will make inquiries.

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Can the minister say whether he has a couple of green uniforms floating around that these gentlemen could use?

Mr. Hellyer: I will see whether I can find some.

HALIFAX—REQUEST OF DOCKYARD COUNCIL RESPECTING PAY RATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister and ask whether he is in a position today to indicate to the house the content of his reply to the dockyard workers in Halifax?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have the reply on my desk. I will try to make it available tomorrow.

C.F.B. SHEARWATER—ASSISTANCE TO CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES LAID OFF

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration may I direct this question either to the Minister of Labour or to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that some 60 or more civilian employees at C.F.B. Shearwater are being laid

off this Friday because their work is being transferred to armed forces personnel, are steps being taken by any government department to assist these employees to secure other work?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to take the question as notice and take it up with my colleague for reply later.

[*Translation*]

EXPO '67

INQUIRY AS TO INVITATION TO HIS HOLINESS THE POPE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Has the hon. minister approached again His Holiness Pope Paul VI or asked officials of his department to do so, with a view to persuading him to come to Canada in 1967?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I refer the hon. member to the replies I gave a few months ago, as well as to the reply of the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson).

Through the Apostolic Delegate, the Pope advised that he did not intend to come to Canada this year due to prior engagements.

[*English*]

INQUIRY AS TO SITE RENTAL CHARGES AND SECURITY GUARANTEES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Nicholas Mandziuk (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address my question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce and ask whether the right hon. Prime Minister discussed with him the question I asked last Monday, as to whether anything was paid for leases by those setting up pavilions at Expo, and what guarantee of security was given to these nations. Is the minister prepared to answer the question today, or when can we expect an answer?

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister did bring this question to my attention. I think the question was in two parts; one dealt with security and the other dealt with rental rates on the site of Expo. The answer to the latter part of the question is that the sites are provided free to any nations building pavilions on them, but Expo does undertake to service the sites and the servicing is at the rate of $2 for every square foot of exhibit space.

Mr. Mandziuk: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What are we to understand by "servicing"? Does this mean security? Do we provide R.C.M.P. protection, will the Quebec provincial police provide it, or what is the situation?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is now asking for a detailed statement.

Mr. Mandziuk: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, we would like to know what "servicing" means; whether it is just giving them water and electricity, or do we give them anything else?

Mr. Winters: I am prepared to answer the question, Mr. Speaker. The security arrangements are still under discussion, and this is a matter of co-operation among all levels of government. However, basically each country is charged with security within its own building. Outside the building the security falls on the appropriate level of government. The city, the security force of Expo, the province and the federal government work in co-operation.

Mr. Mandziuk: Thank you. That is what I was after.

CONSUMER CREDIT

INQUIRY AS TO CONSIDERATION OF COMMITTEE REPORTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for Montreal's answer to Kennedy, the Registrar General. Can the minister tell the house whether his department carefully studies reports presented by the consumer credit committee, and will some of their recommendations be implemented?

[*Translation*]

Hon. John M. Turner (Registrar General): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to reply to our Canadian Charles de Gaulle. I have the highest regard for the hon. member for Lotbinière even though I do not fully share all of his opinions.

I have asked that the report of this committee be inquired into and thoroughly studied. Undoubtedly, the recommendations will be considered by the government and its decision on this point will be announced in due course.

Mr. Choquette: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Should the minister be considered as the future minister of consumer affairs?

Mr. Speaker: The question is out of order.

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): A supplementary question to the minister. Further to his consideration of the report of the committee on consumer credit and the cost of living, is it his intention to recommend to the cabinet the establishment of a department of consumer affairs?

Mr. Turner: As I have said, Mr. Speaker, that decision will be announced in due course.

[*English*]

Mr. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question I should like to address to the Prime Minister. Does the question asked by the hon. member for Lotbinière indicate that the brass is getting a little away from the grass?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That question is speculative.

Mr. Joseph Macaluso (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Registrar General. Will he assure hon. members on this side of the house that he will not follow the lead of the potential leadership aspirants of the Conservative party, but will give leadership to the formation of a consumer credit department in the manner—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

VIMY RIDGE SERVICE—INVITATION TO PRESIDENT DE GAULLE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, without in any way associating the hon. member for Lotbinière with General de Gaulle, thereby committing such a slander on the general—

Mr. Choquette: Thank you, Barry Goldwater.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether any representations were made to the government of France regarding that country's cold shouldering of the Vimy Ridge gathering. Is the minister in a position to tell the house frankly why General de Gaulle had no high-ranking official representative there from the French republic? Was this the fault of the government of Canada in failing to invite him?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has already answered that question—

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): —in reply to a question put by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam. The government of Canada has since Sunday had discussions with representatives of the government of France. The statement made last week by the Prime Minister, that the government of France had done everything that it could reasonably be expected to do, is an accurate statement of the situation; and so has the government of Canada. I suggest to my right hon. friend that his desire to promote good relations between our two countries is not enhanced by the questions which he continues to ask.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Does the hon. gentleman think those relations were enhanced because the Canadian government failed to invite President de Gaulle?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, relations between—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am just wondering whether hon. members on both sides of the house do not think we are now getting into a debate on this question. This is a period for questions, not a period for debate.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs if he can give the house a definite answer as to whether the president of the French republic was invited through the diplomatic channels, over which the minister presides, to attend the ceremony or to send a leading representative of the French government, or was this botched by his department and are we now trying to throw the blame on the French government?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is repeating the question that was asked previously.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I believe I should answer the question put a moment ago by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam.

Mr. Starr: Order.

National Defence Act Amendment

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I certainly do not want to interrupt the Secretary of State for External Affairs, but my impression was that the question asked by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam had been asked previously by the minister.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—PROPOSED PROTEST AGAINST USE OF FRAGMENTATION BOMB

On the orders of the day:

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, on Monday last I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether the Canadian government would protest to the United States government against the use of the anti-personnel fragmentation bomb in Viet Nam. The Secretary of State for External Affairs replied:

> Mr. Speaker, I have asked for a report on the exact situation. When that is received I will be in a position to reply.

May I inquire whether the Secretary of State for External Affairs has yet received a report.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not think an official reply has been received, but I have already dealt with this question in the external affairs committee.

Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, would it be too much to ask the minister to give a reply to the house on that point?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, what I said was that the Canadian government was opposed to the bombing, it was opposed to the infiltration from the north to the south, and it hoped that both parties and all concerned would endeavour to get to the peace table.

Mr. L. R. Sherman (Winnipeg South): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether, when he is investigating reports on the use of anti-personnel fragmentation bombs by American forces in Viet Nam, he would also look into reports carried in the Bangkok *World* and other newspapers in that part of the world as to the use of anti-personnel fragmentation bombs by North Vietnamese forces against the free world forces in the south.

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

AMALGAMATION OF NAVY, ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The house resumed, from Tuesday, April 11, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof—Mr. Hellyer—Mr. Batten in the chair.

[Mr. Starr.]

The Chairman: Order. When the committee rose last evening clause 2 was under consideration.

On clause 2—*Canadian forces, Canadian armed forces.*

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, last night at ten o'clock I was endeavouring to correct what appeared to me at the time, and which upon subsequent research and a little reading proved to be the fact, a misrepresentation of certain basic facts in connection with the recent review by the United Kingdom of their defence policy.

• (3:20 p.m.)

As I mentioned last night, the minister suggested in committee that the recent resignations and so on in the United Kingdom were, in his opinion, indications of valid reasons for a totally unified defence structure. I just wanted to complete my remarks on this aspect of the matter today and make one or two other comments on Christopher Mayhew, because I believe they are pertinent and they do indicate to us in Canada what is going on in at least one major area of this world.

In his book "Britain's Role Tomorrow", chapter 13, Christopher Mayhew deals with the question of whether the establishment of a single armed service is the best way to proceed. He has this to say in part:

> The major danger in unification is that a clear vertical chain of command on a "functional" basis can seriously weaken the links between different functions inside a particular service. Unifying the three service personnel departments could weaken the links between the air staff and the R.A.F. operational commands, between those who deploy the aircraft and those who fly them. A central logistics department could interpose a bureaucratic wall between the navy and its dockyards. A central training department could separate the army from its jungle warfare school in South Johore. In any defence organization, the most numerous and important ties are those between different functions inside a particular service, and not between the same functions inside different services.
>
> Put another way, the relationship between the "user" and the "producer" in a particular service is more important than the relationship between the "users" in different services and between "producers" in different services. This will remain true for as long as servicemen still have to specialize in order to fight in three different elements—land, sea, and air.

I commend the reading not only of Christopher Mayhew's statement of resignation in the house but of his book "Britain's Role Tomorrow". I think if that is done by some hon. members opposite they might have a

slightly different opinion about the merit of going ahead with full unification.

Now, Mr. Chairman, during orders of the day this afternoon the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre asked the government if they would give consideration, or if indeed they were giving any consideration, to one of the spin-off effects of integration and unification. I apologize to the committee for raising this matter a second time. It has been three weeks now since it was known that about 100 men would be dislocated because of a change in defence purchasing policies. I suspect these policies flowed directly from the Department of National Defence.

In any event, these policies are part of the defence purchasing policy and have led to the lay off of some 60 employees of Fairey Aircraft, an equal number from Cossor, an equal number from Sperry Gyroscope, and other companies might have one or two employees involved. We know that cutbacks have been made in the Neptune program, and there has been a reorientation of the Sikorsky helicopter work back to Montreal. All this has put these firms, particularly Fairey, in a position where they have no alternative but to lay off these men for an extended period. This means a loss of earnings for these men and, since we are talking about 100 men probably earning $5,000 each per year, the total amount might run to half a million dollars.

In addition, we were promised there would be no undue economic impact on any area because of unification. We have not even got unification yet, but we are already feeling the impact. I urge the government and the minister now to look very hard and very quickly for a method of overcoming this peculiar difficulty that is already rearing its ugly head.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question before he goes on to another part of his remarks. He was dealing with the disastrous economic situation that will result in Halifax, and may I ask him if he is aware that some time ago this same minister closed the Point Edward naval base in my area, resulting in the loss of 700 jobs and a payroll of over $3 million? We were assured also by the Prime Minister and by the minister from Nova Scotia that no undue effects would take place.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Many people are still without jobs.

Mr. Forrestall: My hon. friend raises a question with which I am very familiar indeed. It is for this reason I plead with the government to take some action immediately in order to avoid the economic hardships that we are suffering. I know the Sydney situation well which resulted from the closing of Point Edward. As I said the other night, this constant fear of telling the truth, of exposing their plans and letting people have a look at them so that retraining programs can be undertaken, is not good. The government will not do this; they say nothing is happening. However, you wake up one morning and find that the rug has been pulled out from under you. The maritime provinces cannot stand this economically.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): You will get phony promises from the minister that no one will suffer.

Mr. Forrestall: It seems to me this is not the way to approach this type of problem. This consolidation program is not a classified program. What is secret about it? What are we trying to hide? The program should be brought out into the open so we can talk about it so our provincial people can get together with the federal people and work out a scheme in co-operation. As I have said, when you close a major military establishment about 100 civilian jobs are lost. Shearwater is just a start, and this type of thing could go on. I believe there are some 5,700 or 5,800 civilian employees directly or indirectly connected with the Department of National Defence in the Halifax-Dartmouth area. We cannot afford to wait until the last minute to learn the ultimate fate of these employees.

• (3:30 p.m.)

I mention again the fact that for two days now I have asked the Prime Minister to indicate his reply to questions concerning a major situation in respect of the 700 or 800 members of local 743 of the Canadian Labour Congress at the Halifax dockyard. The situation is that the government is practising open discrimination against labour. These men are not classified under the ship repair group as labourers, board of transport people, riggers, brush hands and so on, and they find themselves in the position of receiving, among other things, one of four different rates of pay. Repeated pleas to the government by way of the associate minister and the President of the Treasury Board have produced no results whatever. A final plea has been made in the form of a night letter to the Prime Minister asking

him personally to intervene to correct this situation, or at least to recognize that there is a very serious problem here. I suggest to the minister that unless some action is taken these men will go on strike and will picket the yard, and we will then find our national defence structure in maritime command grinding to a very abrupt halt.

I close by leaving those two problems with the minister. I ask him to be kind enough to urge upon the Prime Minister and his colleagues in cabinet the necessity for finding some solution to the problem confronting the employees at Shearwater, and I ask the government to move quickly to overcome the disparity in labour wage rates among members of the general workers union at H.M.C. Dockyard.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to do something entirely foreign to my nature but which I feel must be done. I am going to submit a plea to the minister not to proceed with this measure at this time. It is within his power to delay further debate on this bill. If the minister will not listen to my plea I will direct it to the Prime Minister, yes, to the entire Liberal cabinet. I do so with the knowledge that the members of the official opposition are determined in their stand. We feel it is our duty to object to this measure in the interest of the defence of this country. We feel that this is what the people of Canada expect of us. We feel that if any other party were the official opposition it would do the same thing. My only regret is that by following the course we are determined to follow we will be labelled with words that have often been used before such as obstructive, disloyal, destructive, politically motivated, and without responsibility. But I can assure the minister that regardless of the words used to describe our action we are going to fight this measure because we do not agree with it in principle.

That is why I plead once more with the minister. I feel that he was perhaps initially misinformed about this measure. He has heard me speak on this point in the hearings before the defence committee. I referred him to a statement made by his present vice-chief, I believe it was, who suggested that there were only two courses open to the minister, although I think subsequent evidence has shown that there are more than two, in order to operate within a fixed budget and still maintain the effectiveness of our armed forces.

[Mr. Forrestall.]

When this point was raised in the committee we pointed out to the minister the action that France had taken in similar circumstances. They were faced with a similar proposition and had to maintain the effectiveness of their forces. What did they do? They immediately reduced their armed services by 50 per cent but obtained modern equipment so that their effective fire power remained the same and they stayed within their budget. This the minister could do.

There are possibly even more courses open to the minister, but I would ask him to pause at this time. Many of his former senior officers have also asked him to pause, to let the integration of the forces develop and see how it works. We have told the minister time and time again that we are not opposed to the implementation of integration.

However, Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some misunderstanding about what integration means. Certainly there is a lot of misunderstanding about the difference between the term "integration" and the term "unification". I was very surprised yesterday to hear the minister say that integration and unification are more or less part of the same cycle. I suggest that the minister is confusing not only the members on this side of the house but also his own members and the Canadian public when he makes such statements. This confusion has existed throughout the course of this debate. We are not unaware of the commitments of the government during this centennial year and it is not our desire to prolong this debate. Neither do I dislike the minister; in some ways I like him very much. But as I said, I think he has been misled, even though he will not admit it.

Mr. Régimbal: He is a willing victim.

Mr. McIntosh: Thank you; that is a good term. Yes, he is a willing victim. However, he should realize it now. If he does not, then the cabinet and the Prime Minister should. In any event, we are determined to pursue our course in regard to the implementation of unification.

• (3:40 p.m.)

I point out to the minister how some of the confusion arose. It was of his own making, as I think he will admit. First of all, when we asked him what unification meant we had just cause for asking. You will remember, Mr. Chairman, the number of senior officers who were discharged or had resigned because they did not know the definition of unification. In fact, it was evident in the committee that an embarrassment had been caused to the minis-

ter when he had to apologize to a certain admiral who had taken certain action.

The Canadian public do not know why that admiral took that action, but Admiral Landymore had been confronted by a number of subordinate officers under his command who had asked him what unification meant. The admiral told them truthfully that he did not know but that he would go to Ottawa to find out. His immediate superior, Air Chief Marshal Miller, also admitted freely to the committee that he did not know either and so he could not give Admiral Landymore an answer. As a result, Admiral Landymore went back to his subordinates and truthfully told them that he did not know what unification meant, that there was confusion. In addition, we also had the evidence of Lieutenant General Moncel on this point, to which I will refer in a few moments. I believe his evidence was referred to by the hon. member for Parkdale who I see is now in the chamber and I hope will remain.

Personally, Mr. Chairman, I have four reasons for pleading with the minister as I do, and I should like to put them on record. My first reason that we should delay this debate for six months, one year or even more—it does not matter—is that we want to examine the problems which have arisen from the evidence presented not only in the committee but also in this house. At the moment the definition of unification appears to be contradictory. I will come back to this point and explain why this is my first reason for delaying this measure.

My second reason is to assure ourselves that the identity of the three services within a single service concept will be maintained. There is some doubt in our minds that this will be the case.

My third reason is that we want to obtain further details of the cost and efficiency of present government defence plans, and the impact that these plans will have on the economy of the country. This point was made by the hon. member for Halifax. We want further concrete proof that the effectiveness of our troops will not deteriorate. We are more concerned about the deterioration of our combat troops than about tidy administration.

Time and again we have said that the minister has put the cart before the horse. We have no disagreement with the concept of implementating integration to tidy up the supply and administrative elements of our forces, but we do object to any tydying up, amalgamating, integrating or unifying that affects the combat effectiveness of our troops. The fighting part of our services must be kept uppermost in our minds. No matter how good the supply element is, no matter how tidy the administration, the combat element of our forces is the most important.

My fourth reason is that the positions with respect to NATO and NORAD are to be reviewed in 1968 and 1969. That brings up another point. Are we to go it alone, using an expression the minister may have used, in defending our country or should we be part of an interdependent group? It was agreed in committee that Canada can only be assured of a defence through a collective alliance. In this day and age no country can defend its own borders.

I now return to my first point in order to deal with the contradictory evidence we had before us. On page 502 of the committee proceedings Air Marshal Sharp, in talking about the differences between integration and unification, said:

> The dividing line—in the case of integration you must maintain three separate services, even though they are headless, because the present act does not permit you to unify into a single service. In the case of unification, which will be permitted by the amendment before you—

He is referring to Bill C-243.

> —you can create a single service and one does not need to maintain the three separate services.

I emphasize the last words:

> —one does not need to maintain the three separate services.

Previously he had said on page 501:

> —then people in it should be able to be employed anywhere and not keep them segregated as navy, army and air force—

These words directly contradict the minister who said on several occasions that there would be no change in the organization of forces units, that the system will not be changed by reason of unification, and that we shall certainly continue to have infantry regiments as well as the Royal Canadian Armoured Corps and the Royal Regiment of Canadian Artillery. The minister said:

> Although a unified personnel management system will be introduced, the separate units and elements of naval, field and air force will continue to exist.

That seems quite straightforward, though it contradicts what Air Marshal Sharp said, namely, that one need not maintain the three separate services. On the other hand, the minister says that we will continue to have the navy, army and air force but I point out that he ended his statement with these words:

Until the force structure within the unified force is developed.

We do not know what that means. Do those words mean that there is a time limitation to everything the minister has said? Do they mean that we will have the army, navy and air force for a limited time? We do not know how long that time will be. The minister has caused confusion. Members on the other side of the house are confused about what he is doing, though 80 officers resigned because they could not understand the term "unification". I freely admit, having attended 55 meetings of the committee over eight weeks, that I am as confused now as when I began about the term "unification". That is partly because time and again the minister has turned somersaults.

The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra said yesterday that unification only means a change of name and uniform. If we could believe that we as the official opposition would tell the government to go ahead with the bill. But we do not and cannot accept that because we remember the minister's words:

Until the force structure within the unified force is developed.

Obviously there will be some change, and it is a change we are afraid of. Having listened to the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra during approximately 55 meetings and knowing he has heard the evidence before the committee, I was surprised to hear him make that statement.

I was not surprised to hear the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River say that the minister had told him that unification and integration are one and the same thing. I know the minister does not believe that, but I do not think the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River was deliberately telling a falsehood. He was repeating something that had been told him. The official opposition is in a quandary which it would like to straighten out. It cannot be accused of not being sincere or concerned about the matter. We are concerned about the minister's remarks.

The hon. member for Parkdale, apart from saying how much he admired the Minister of National Defence for his forthrightness and courage, said that he was in favour of unification. He put up a fairly good argument and I read with interest passages in his speech where he referred to something I had said. I mention the hon. member's speech because, having read it and knowing him as I do, I believe he has deliberately distorted the facts.

[Mr. McIntosh.]

Perhaps he did not distort facts in that part of his speech dealing with the evidence of Air Chief Marshal Miller but he did distort them when dealing with Lieutenant General Moncel. The hon. member tries to make much of the fact that the former chief of defence staff seemed to contradict his former vice chief, Lieutenant General Moncel. The hon. member read a question asked by the hon. member for Vancouver East, as found on page 2299 of the committee proceedings:

Did you, as chief of staff, ever see the four plans on unification drafted by General Moncel?
Air Chief Marshal Miller: No.

That appears to be a contradiction. But on reading the evidence it appears that the four plans drafted by General Moncel were not submitted. All hon. members draft speeches time and again without submitting them. General Moncel did not say that he had submitted any of these plans.

I see hon. members on the government side shaking their heads. They know that when something new is proposed in the services, plans are drafted. General Moncel honestly tried to understand what the minister meant by unification. He thought he understood. It was as difficult for the general as for practically everybody else to understand what was meant.

• (3:50 p.m.)

How can we expect the Canadian public to form an opinion on issues of this kind? How can it be expected even of members of parliament who do not spend their lives in the services studying these matters? I do not know on what basis the minister has reached the conclusion that unification will work. The generals have advised him that it will not. We have tried to find out where he got the idea of unification. We have tried to find out what it really means. He has not been able to explain it even to his own supporters.

I continue to deal with the speech made by the hon. member for Parkdale in the course of which I was mentioned. I believe he distorted the views I expressed. One of the members of the committee, the hon. member for Hamilton West, questioned Air Chief Marshal Miller about the increased effectiveness of our combat troops. He asked whether there had been an increase since the last war, or since this government had taken over and, of course, the air marshal said there had been an increase.

The reason I asked my question was to show that Canada's increased effectiveness was not the result of anything achieved by

the minister. Every country in the world has proceeded in the same way. Combat effectiveness has increased. This is why I say the hon. member's speech in this house was distorted. I believe this was an intentional effort on his part, not that he is doing any service to his party, because he is confusing the members of this party and making it more difficult to understand this problem. And, as I said before, we sincerely wish to understand what is happening. The second point was:

To assure ourselves that the identity of the services within a single service concept will be maintained.

We do not think it will. And we have gone over the next point time and time again.

To obtain more detail with regard to the costs and efficiency of the present government's defence plans.

When we asked the minister and the chief of the defence staff what the estimated cost of their plan would be and what manpower would be required, we were surprised to learn that they had made no studies whatever along these lines. The same question was put to the former chief of staff who said he had made preliminary studies and that manpower would have to be increased by about one third; I think he said from 104,000 to 150,000. He also estimated that the cost to the people of Canada would roughly be double the amount of the military budget at the time the committee met. I think he said $2.6 billion. This was, of course, based on the assumption that we would continue our present commitments while creating a new, peace restoring force.

Members of the committee pointed out that even at the present time it is difficult to get sufficient personnel to fulfil our present commitments. In these circumstances we differ with the minister as to the advisability of setting up another force particularly when, as was pointed out by some hon. members yesterday, such a force would be of little use to the United Nations at the present time. An offer to provide one has been rejected.

It is all very well to make the offer, but why should we let our own defences down, thinking we have sole responsibility for peacekeeping throughout the world? I have stated before that the peace restoring role is altogether different from the peace keeping role and that it is a very dangerous one. I have pointed out that when the United States embarked on a peace restoring role in Viet Nam it did so with 24,000 men. Today there are over 400,000 Americans in the field there. Canada cannot afford to take on such a role.

What arrangements have been made to set up a combined force with those of other countries? There is no use in our going into a venture of this kind with a population of 20 million and limited financial resources if no other country is willing to become an ally in a like role. I urge the minister to shelve this bill for a time, bearing in mind that the NATO agreement is to be reviewed in 1968 and the NORAD agreement in 1969. The allies may decide at that time that NATO is no longer needed.

As a supporter of NATO I would say that NATO has prevented a third world war and that no matter how much it has cost Canada it has been well worth while. I am sure that any hon. member who is acquainted with the organization of NORAD can have little doubt about what it can do to protect the North American continent, and I would say that any contribution we have made in this respect has certainly been worth while.

I am sure I speak for every man in this house who has ever served in the armed forces when I say that our soldiers, sailors and airmen are the last who want to see war of any kind. Our senior officers have many times been called Colonel Blimps and brass hats, without justification. It has been said they would rather see action than anything else. This is not so. Any man who has seen action abhors war. These are reasons for pleading with the minister to shelve this bill at least for the present.

There is another organization which has been very interested in the actions of this committee and of the Minister of National Defence in bringing forward Bill C-243. I refer to the Tri-Service Identities Organization, or TRIO. They are opposed to the measure and they have spent a great deal of time opposing it and trying to understand it. I believe every member of the House of Commons has received a letter or memorandum from the president of that body. It reads as follows:

1. It is noteworthy that not one recently retired senior officer no longer having any attachment to the Department of Defence has supported the program which will be carried forward if Bill C-243 is enacted and everyone of any stature outside the services or government whose military opinion would command respect who has testified before the defence committee has expressed criticism or reservation on the proposed reorganization of the defence establishment.

2. Claims that other countries are following the Canadian example have not been substantiated. In fact government intentions as expressed in white papers on defence in the United Kingdom, France and New Zealand show no indication of emulating the Canadian plan which will be carried

forward if the bill is enacted. Informed persons in both the U.S.A. and the United Kingdom, as evidenced by recent articles and statements, have indicated concern or disenchantment with the Canadian experiment.

3. The effective strength of the forces is below 104,000 men or 20,000 under the strength at 31st March, 1963. The original objective was to reduce the forces by approximately 10,000 men. Included in this excessive loss are not only many senior officers well in advance of retirement but also many officers in the rank of lieutenant colonel and colonel or equivalent in all three services. In the normal course they would have been available to fill appointments of greater responsibility, yet their retirement must restrict the selection for future leaders. This can have serious repercussions for the future if something is not done to check this exodus.

4. There is evidence of concern over our capability to meet our military commitments as a result of the situation which has developed in the defence department in the last four years.

• (4:00 p.m.)

5. Expenditures on equipment for the five years ending the 31st March, 1968 will not match the spending for the five years ending the 31st March, 1963 despite claims that the reorganization is to make more money available for equipment.

6. It is admitted that the steps in the reorganization which will be possible under Bill C-243 will not lead to savings of any account.

Mr. Hellyer: Much of that was wasted. The Avro Arrow took up much of that five year period.

Mr. Ricard: What about the underwear you bought for 100 years?

Mr. Churchill: And the simulator.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Minister, that is one argument that should be settled or at least discussed before we proceed with this bill to unify the services. This is another statement which has caused confusion within the department. Therefore I again plead with the minister not to proceed with this measure at the present time. You provide arguments yourselves against going ahead with this measure, arguments which cause many of us to stand up here, like I am now doing, to oppose the principle of this bill because we do not understand it. I continue the quotation:

Thus if any savings are possible, it will be as a result of those steps taken since 1964 under the authority of Bill C-90.

A great deal could be said about Bill C-90 which was passed by the house. If, as members of the government have said, unification only means a change in name and uniform and unification and integration are one and the same thing, then certainly we do not need Bill C-243. However, I am inclined to agree with Air Marshal Sharp when he said we will not have the three services within a short time. Regardless of what the minister has said, Bill C-90 was sufficient to do everything put forward by government members so far in this debate.

Liberal members have made no argument why we should proceed with Bill C-243. At times the minister has attempted to do so, but the wisdom of proceeding with it at this time would, as TRIO states, "be questionable if economies are not to be effected and in face of the widespread criticism which the department's program is encountering." TRIO also states:

7. It has been admitted that morale should be improved.

The minister should take into consideration that the morale of the services was not improved after serving personnel found out about Bill C-243. It has already done a lot to bring down morale in the services. I continue the quotation:

Many service personnel are deeply disturbed by the uncertainty which now exists for a service career and are unwilling to accept the reorganization as they now see it. Nothing should be done to aggravate this situation . . .

9. Overwhelming support for the reorganization program does not exist amongst Canadians generally. Thus the latest Gallup poll showed less than 50 per cent of Canadians support it.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted for his speech has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

The Deputy Chairman: Is it the wish of the committee that the hon. member continue his speech?

Mr. Hellyer: Yes, briefly.

Mr. McIntosh: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I thank the committee for this unusual privilege.

Mr. Hellyer: You have been very nice this afternoon.

Mr. McIntosh: I hope you will reciprocate, Mr. Minister, and heed my plea because, as I said at the start, it is foreign to my nature to plead but this issue is much greater than any one member, including you, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Hellyer: Agreed.

Mr. McIntosh: It would be disastrous if it is not beneficial to Canada. That is why I make this plea, and I hope some of my colleagues will get up and make the same plea. If you, Mr. Minister, will not heed our pleas I hope

the Prime Minister and other members in the chamber will listen to us.

Mr. Churchill: The parliamentary secretaries might help out.

Mr. McIntosh: I continue the quotation:

> Observing that this poll was taken before the defence committee started its hearings, and before so much cogent evidence was presented by so many knowledgeable persons against the plans and policies as presently disclosed would certainly permit the conclusion that even fewer Canadians support the program now than six weeks ago.
>
> 10. The military merit of the proposed reorganization has not been established in the light of our declared military commitments at least to the satisfaction of experienced ex-senior officers who appeared before the committee.

I think there is justification and foundation for this plea, Mr. Minister, and I hope you will take note of it.

If I am not taking too much time of the committee I would like to refer the minister to an editorial in the Winnipeg *Free Press* of Tuesday, April 4, a newspaper which usually supports the Liberal party. It is headed "Destroying Defence." I regret that some of it is not complimentary to the minister but I think it should be put on record. I will not read it all. It says:

> This revolutionary gamble and experiment is being foisted on Canada in face of the strongest possible protest by nearly every experienced admiral, general and air marshal in the country.

I wish to remind the minister that these are people who have spent all their lives in the services, people who have been taught to serve and not to disobey, who have been taught to give advice to the best of their knowledge and ability and have done so even to the point of being dismissed.

> If this step could simply be classed as a further blunder by an accident prone government, and could be corrected when its faults became clearly apparent, the country could perhaps afford to go along for the ride.

But we are afraid, Mr. Minister, that we cannot go along for the ride.

> When it is realized, however, that Mr. Hellyer is playing with an annual investment of some $1.6 billion which vitally concerns the defence structure of the nation and involves our international obligations, the magnitude of this error becomes obvious.

In another portion the editorial says:

> This ill-advised step could, by a single act of parliament, sponsored by an inexperienced minister, tear down and destroy proven services which have been built with the sacrifice and efforts of Canadians in the past hundred years and more.

With reference to the services the editorial says:

> They have been carefully designed and organized to work in the closest possible harmony with our two major allies, Great Britain and the United States.

Today more than ever defence is interdependent. We must have a defence alliance. We must have the alliance of the different countries in NATO. We must depend on our neighbours to the south because, as I have said time and again in this chamber, they are going to defend the North American continent regardless of whether or not Canada wants to be defended. I say that if we can undertake one tenth of that defence, and I say one tenth because we are 20 million people compared with 200 million Americans, if we can do that one tenth of the job well, which I am sure our Canadian forces can do as they have done in the past, then we will retain our sovereignty and national pride which are so valuable to a great many of us.

Mr. Hellyer: Hear, hear.

Mr. McIntosh: The editorial also says that unification is "entirely foreign to both British and United States defence organizations." It is also entirely foreign to the set-up in NATO. Four brigade groups cannot fit into the NATO commander's plan. It is almost impossible. It will be an albatross around NATO command's neck.

Mr. Hellyer: Does it say who wrote the editorial?

Mr. McIntosh: No, it does not, but you can have it if you want it when I have finished. It also says:

> In the course of the next year, Canada will be reviewing and renegotiating her military commitments under NATO. Common sense, at least, should dictate delaying any major revision of our defence forces until these revised undertakings become known.

I could go on, Mr. Chairman. I have much more material, but I want to thank the committee for letting me finish this portion of what I have to say.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Haidasz: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek a question at this time?

Mr. McIntosh: Yes.

Mr. Haidasz: Was it the intention of the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek to convey the idea to the members of this committee that Lieutenant General Moncel was against unification of the Canadian armed forces?

Mr. McIntosh: Yes, absolutely. If you will read the entire minutes of proceedings and evidence in respect of this matter when he appeared before the national defence committee as a witness you will find that he said—I do not have the evidence here at the moment but I have it some place—that he did not know and still does not know what unification means. One can read certain portions of that evidence out of context, but if I could have the time to look up this evidence, I could show the hon. member that if one takes the evidence as a whole—and not too much of it—he will see that General Moncel was and still is against unification. In fact that is one of the reasons he left the department prior to his normal retirement date. I believe he had six or seven years more to serve.

Mr. Haidasz: I should like to refer the hon. member to minutes of proceedings and evidence No. 22 of the standing committee on national defence, page 1310, where General Moncel answered a question asked by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona concerning unification. General Moncel said:

> I was well aware of the fact that the white paper said that unification was the ultimate end. That was fine. There was nothing wrong with it as an aim. There was nothing wrong with it all; and it may be that had they been given the time it might not have taken five years: it ought to have taken three or four years in which a plot could have been evolved and the commitments altered to make unification fit like a glove without all this nonsense and trouble that we have had.

Does that not mean that General Moncel understood what the aims of the white paper were and that he went along with the aims expressed in the white paper and the ultimate aim which is unification of the Canadian armed services?

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out to the hon. member for Parkdale that the term unification was used once and once only in the white paper and certainly not in the sense of the interpretation we have of it at the present time. "Unification" meant "to unify", in the general sense. It certainly did not mean what the minister has said time and time again. This is one interpretation given by the minister:

> Unification is the end objective of a logical and evolutionary progression.

He later changed that and said that he wished he had used the words "the single service concept" instead of "unification". Had he done that in the first instance, I imagine that General Moncel and many other senior officers would still be in the department. It is because of this misunderstanding of the term "unification" that there has been disagreement between the government and the opposition and between the government and the members of the forces of our country. This is the reason we ask that this bill be held up and that the government proceed with the business they have in mind for the centennial year, because we are determined to keep discussing this bill until we obtain a definition of unification which all of us understand and which the officers and men who have to serve under it understand. It is our responsibility to see that the Canadian people understand what unification means, to see whether Canada can afford unification, and to see whether we can obtain the manpower to supply all these formations—NORAD, NATO, SACLANT, and so on—and still come up with a brigade group which can be used in the role of restoring peace as well as in the peace keeping role. The hon. member has introduced a statement which shows that there is an admission that we really do not know what we are talking about when we talk about unification.

Mr. Haidasz: Does the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek really believe—

The Deputy Chairman: I believe the hon. member for Parkdale has directed two questions to the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek and wishes to stress these points further. I would suggest that he do so at another time.

Mr. Bigg: Mr. Chairman, we have had a very fortuitous set of questions and answers as a prelude to the presentation I shall attempt to make at this time. What faces the nation today is the necessity for clarification in respect of the real meaning of the word "unification". The defence of Canada is the most important subject we could discuss on the floor of this House of Commons. Between wars we all earnestly hope that peace will remain indefinitely and old retired soldiers like myself hope that we will be able to sit back in an armchair and leave matters of defence to competent committees and able ministers. I only wish that this was the situation, but I do not have such confidence.

This is not a personal attack. I have the utmost regard for the character, integrity, kindliness and principled intent of the Minister of National Defence, but this is the worst thing I could say about him because wishful thinking and kindly thoughts are not enough to ensure that today and in the future Canada

will survive. When Mr. Chamberlain was prime minister of England I shuddered when I read the reports from Munich. We all wish for peace in our time. My young life was shattered by the results of wishful thinking. Had we had a different man in the defence department or in the prime minister's chair in England in the 1930's when Mussolini was on the rise and Hitler was still a bad name associated with a book he had written, we might have had peace in our time. War is something that faces every government whether that government is in Canada or somewhere else. Those of us who have lived between wars in the western world must be alert and be prepared to pay the price of freedom. I for one have not forgotten that the price can be too high for forgetting.

I think I am outnumbered in this house in respect of some of the very firm ideas I have on this matter. I would like to see a modified draft system in Canada so that every young Canadian, whether he wanted to or not, would be given an opportunity to become physically and morally fit and able to defend his country to his last drop of blood and to his last dollar. I realize that between wars this idea is just as unpalatable today as it was in the days when one lone voice in England, that of the late Sir Winston Churchill, spoke in this manner. I am not attempting to draw a parallel between my capabilities and his except in one narrow sense. My dedication is the same. My life and my talents are at the service of my country, whether in the army, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, in parliament or anywhere else. Nothing else is any good today if one wants to stand up and call himself a Canadian.

• (4:20 p.m.)

I want to know that the end result of this bill will mean the survival of Canada as a free nation with her own sovereignty. If the minister can give me an assurance in this regard, I will support the bill and use every influence at my command to get other hon. members and the people of Canada to support it. If this bill will worsen our position and sacrifice every tradition we have held as one of the lion's pups I will vote against it. Perhaps we do not want to be referred to as British because we have now grown too big. Perhaps we do not want the word "royal" attached to our regiments. That is not a dispute. We want our regiments to be Canadian, composed of men who will fight to the last to defend this loved land. I know that every man within the sound of my voice will agree with that idea.

Should we keep quiet until we know the answers to these questions? Should we stop talking until the minister tells us in clear, unequivocal language that the great traditions of our three services, on the land, on the air, and on the sea, will continue under this one, unified force? Must we wait to be assured that this free and noble Canada will survive and that every man will be willing and happy to do his part to defend this country in peace and in war?

We have all heard the lie, whether unintentional or not, that has been repeated in this country following the cancellation of production of the Arrow. This whole situation has been made a political football. I wish everybody in Canada knew the real truth. Production of the Arrow was cancelled because the government of the day decided it could not pay the bill for this type of weapon while at the same time overcoming transportation difficulties and the high cost of production with our small population.

Let me refer hon. members to volume 15 of the proceedings of the special committee on defence. On October 22, 1963, the ex-chief of staff, General Foulkes, made it abundantly clear that the production of the Arrow was cancelled because of political reasons. The government headed by the present Leader of the Opposition was left with the dirty job of cancelling its production. It was a job that had to be done at that time and this was known by every member of the armed forces of that day.

As an alternative we accepted the proposition that the Bomarc would be useful. *Hansard* is full of the present defence minister's comments regarding the Bomarc. He suggested that to accept the Bomarc armed with atomic weapons would be to make ourselves slaves subservient to the Pentagon. I will not bore the committee by referring to the remarks of the present Secretary of State who supported that view, because I do not expect the ladies of Canada to carry the burden of defence. The present minister of defence told us on numerous occasions that if we accepted the Bomarc under any circumstances we would become slaves of the Pentagon. Today we have the Bomarc equipped with atomic warheads. The minister knows that he has absolutely no control over the use of the Bomarc.

Fortunately I have had some legal training. Let me explain why no one in this country has any control over the use of the Bomarc. The United States McMahon Act spells out

that the President of the United States, and he alone, will determine if and when atomic weapons, whether on United States soil or elsewhere, are to be used. The members of the present administration have solemnly promised to accept that situation. Members of the present administration have said they had to accept this situation because of a previous commitment. I do not know whether the situation can be renegotiated but many of us would like to see the McMahon Act changed so that we would have what has been termed dual control of atomic weapons on Canadian soil or in the hands of Canada's armed forces.

I will accept the minister's assurance that unification will have no significant effect on Canadian armed strength, Canada's sovereignty, or her right to survive in a still hostile world. Will unification in fact denude Canada's armed forces? Many people have suggested that the present minister of defence is responsible for the strange relationship between the United States and Canada in respect of atomic weapons in Canada, but where does the Prime Minister fit into this picture? He was our expert in relations with the United States and he knows better than perhaps anyone else in this country our international legal rights. That right hon. gentleman has spent a lifetime studying this aspect of international relations, and I venture to suggest that perhaps no other man in Canada knows better than he whether the situation which exists as a result of the McMahon Act can be changed. I do not know the answer to this problem but it clearly exists as long as these armed aircraft are in the skies over northern Ontario and Quebec.

I do know something about soldiering and the morale and pride of a regiment. As a boy of eight I learned the semaphore method of signalling while in the Canadian militia, and as a boy at school I was a cadet. I served with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and no force in the world has a higher morale or greater tradition. If we did away with the red tunic we would have something less than the great traditions now enjoyed by that force. The red coat represents justice, fair play, humanity and a square deal.

Let me remind hon. members that the greatest contribution made by the mounted police force has been made by those at the grass roots level. The greatest contribution made by Canadians serving in the armed forces, whether at sea, in the air or on the land—I mention land last because I am a soldier—has been made by those in the ranks who slept without sheets in rough blankets. They won glory not only at Vimy Ridge and Passchendaele but also on the beach at Anzio, at the Sangro to the Sangro river and from Caen to Berlin. This Canadian glory has been enlarged upon by Canadians serving in units in Cyprus and in the Congo. I am immensely proud of them because they are serving in the same way Canadians served in two world wars. It is not necessary to put them into green uniforms in order to maintain the traditions of our services.

I believe in peacekeeping and I would hate to see Canada's military strength spread along a thin green line around the world without having some security at home. I put Canada first in my consideration although I long for equality in the Congo, peace between the Arabs and the Jews and among the Cypriots, be they Greeks or Turks.

• (4:30 p.m.)

I think first in terms of defending the little creek where I was born and then Canada and if I have any energy left I am quite willing to share it for the benefit of the rest of the world. But I do not think it is necessary to unify all our regiments. I suggest that the minister himself does not really believe it because the highland regiments say, "You are not going to take away our kilts," he dare not take away their kilts, and he knows it. So he has made an exception in their case.

An hon. Member: He tried to take away their bagpipes.

Mr. Bigg: The minister said, "We will not touch the highland regiments". He will not touch the Royal 22nd regiment, and I do not blame him, because the Royal 22nd regiment is one of the finest regiments of men who ever put on the Canadian uniform. I will not say it is the best because there are a great many others—the Princess Pats, the 48th Highlanders, the Royal Canadian Horse Artillery, the Service Corps, the nurses, the WAACS, the WAAFS, the Royal Edmontons. I could go on all afternoon; the list is endless.

I think the minister should ask for advice and when he does he should be man enough to accept it. I stood on the carpet many times before my commanding officers when they asked my opinion about this and that situation, and I gave it. I was never fired for it, I was promoted, because when they did not agree with me I stood behind my guns and said, "I have signed my name to this after giving my opinion to the best of my ability. If you want somebody else's opinion, take it, but let his signature be on it." Let the minister

sign a paper saying that he thinks unification is better than the three forces as we have known them. Let him show me that it is better if he can, and I hope he can, because I have no doubt this bill will become law.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Hear, hear.

Mr. Bigg: I am cheered by the Postmaster General. The noses have been counted. I am afraid the deal has been made. But do not criticize us for getting up and saying what we think about it because we are putting our signatures to this bill, for and against, when we stand and vote. If we did not stand and vote the very rocks of Canada would cry out. How many men still serving in the armed forces would like to say what they think about unification? I would like to see a great many more of them stand up and say it and get fired. There is room for them in this house—I would say about 128 seats.

An hon. Member: On which side?

Mr. Bigg: These men are not for unification. The men who serve in the Royal 22nd are not for unification. Those in the highland regiments are not for unification. Those in the navy certainly are not. And believe me, all the men who serve in the navy are not Wasps. A great many men who serve in the navy kneel to their God and serve their church in the way they wish because they live in a country that allows them to do this and always will. It is a sad day if they have to fear any minister of the crown.

Is unification an end in itself or is it a political tool? If unification leads to survival and to a better, safer Canada, if unification and men serving in one uniform will mean that more young men will be willing to step forward and wear the uniform of their country, I am all for it. I have not been sold on it. I read the names of those men who have given their opinions on unification. I served under one of them. He was major of our battery and is now the late—late in service but far from dead—Lieutenant General Guy Simonds, one of the finest soldiers who ever put on a uniform in or out of the Canadian forces. He does not like unification. General Foulkes does not like it, and he was honest enough to say in the parliamentary committee that the Avro airplane was not destroyed by the present Leader of the Opposition but because of the inability of the Canadian people to pay the enormous, snowballing costs of this rather oversized and—I believe these were the words of the minister himself—obsolete aircraft.

Tradition in the army depends to a great extent on the pride of the unit. I have been assured that the Black Watch regiment will keep its kilt. I hope they will and I think they should because members of my family on my father's mother's side wear the Johnstone tartan, which happens to be the Black Watch tartan. This means something to me. I speak personally in this regard and I make no apology for so doing because it is the only way one can speak when talking about things such as morale which are personal and depend on one's own personal loyalty and tradition. I would be horrified if any minister of the crown said that if I was disloyal to him and his ideas I was disloyal to Canada. In a rougher age we would have had to meet at dawn, but he would have had to be a good shot.

I again pose the question: What is the end result if we carry the unification program through to its logical conclusion? Are we going to maintain the necessary morale? Are we going to get the necessary recruits? Are we going to keep the traditions and loyalty of our regiments and our services? I come from a military family. My father's brother cut the submarine nets at the Dardanelles as a captain in the British navy. Incidentally, he was the youngest captain in the British navy. He would hate to be called colonel. Two of my brothers were in the air force and one in the navy. We are proud of our differences. We are proud of the fact that we joined of our own free will the armed service of our choice. In fun they laugh at me and call me "Silver" and in fun I call them "Jack Tar" or "birdy-bird" or something like that, making a joke about the other services. But I know we have unification in spirit, unification in dedication to our country. This is unification that means something. It is unification which does not worship a word but worships the principle behind the behaviour of all decent Canadians.

I have not been sold on this idea. I think unification means something else. The rear admirals, air marshals and generals who have expressed opinions about unification served most of the time in the ranks and their opinions cannot be swept aside just because we do not happen to agree with them. This is a matter about which the brass and the grass agree, and I think the minister should listen to their advice. If the minister really wants a cross-section of opinion, let every member of the armed forces sign with his own pen a short screed on what he thinks of unification. Then old fogeys like me can stand on one

side, and if the rising generation of young Canadians who wish to serve Canada want to do it in a green uniform and do not want to be called soldiers, sailors and airmen, that is all right with me. I do not know what we are going to call our serving men but it does not matter. I am not here to fight about words.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I am trying to find out the real principle behind this bill. I am trying to add my small voice to the voices of the long list of distinguished men, men who have made the grade, men who have been recognized as leaders in the military field and who have given a lifetime of dedicated service. I cannot believe that at the end of 30 years of this kind of service any man would be disloyal for 18 months or even 18 minutes. I cannot go along with the proposition that it is necessary to be disloyal to a country or to your principles to disagree with politicians. I feel with every ounce of feeling I have in my body that there are truly times when one has to stand up and risk being fired or even being shot, if that should be the result of sticking to one's principles and disagreeing with one's senior officers. This is a rare occurrence, and that is one of the reasons I know these men are honest and dedicated. I have spoken to them and I have worked with them. I have served with them. If my opinion means anything, I will say that if I had my service to do over again, particularly in the mounted police, I could not have done as good a job if I had not worn the red coat in the same distinguished way as my good father who belonged to the old North-west Mounted Police and who recently passed away.

These traditions are handed from father to son and from generation to generation. I do not believe we should brush them aside lightly. I believe we should have very cogent arguments indeed if we are going to interfere with the traditions of the British army, the British navy, the Canadian army or the Canadian navy. In many cases our service has been interchangeable. My deskmate fought the Battle of Britain in the Royal Air Force. This did not make any difference. He was fighting for Canada on every mission he flew. It was his own home in Canada that he was defending when he fought over the deserts of Africa, over the mountains of Asia and suffered for three or four years in a German prison camp. Are we going to take all of that away? I think we would be losing something very valuable if we did. I hope this does not sound like a purely emotional appeal.

[Mr. Bigg.]

There is a practical value in retaining morale. I would rather have 10 men who wish to retain the traditions and record of the regiment than 20 who do not care. I do not believe we are being ultra-conservative, with a small "c", by resisting unnecessary and unpleasant change. Polonius gave advice to his son and said, "be not the first by which a new thing's tried, nor yet the last to cast the old aside." I would not want to see us unify our forces in this manner merely to be able to say we did it first. If being first were the only thing, then Cain was a wonderful man because he was the first man who slew his brother. "A country without tradition," someone has said, "will not long remain a country." I believe we have to develop something more than a world peace keeping force in order to retain our freedom. I long for that day, and I am sure the minister does, but I would not like to see him blinded by wishful thinking. Let us not be too many thousand years ahead of our day. Let us not risk the whole of Canadian sovereignty by trying to get ourselves a great name at Flushing Meadows. As one of our members said this afternoon, the United Nations has it within its power to provide a peace keeping force when all the nations are ready to give up some of their sovereignty in the name of world peace.

This is the cause for which our own Prime Minister won the Nobel peace prize. As we all know, however, this idea was not unique in our country. Those of us who went through the unnecessary privations and risks of war never want to see war again. We are willing to go to any lengths to secure that objective except that we will not risk the security of our own land. I say again to the minister that if he can convince us that the result of unification is going to be greater security for Canada in the short pull as well as the long, that it will provide us with a more efficient, better trained force which will be more easily integrated with the armed forces of our allies, he will get a great deal more support than even he may have expected.

Many months ago, if my memory serves me right, when we asked for clarification of this bill the minister told us it would come in due time. He intimated clearly, at least to me, that by the time he clarified the meaning of unification the little green men would be running around and parliament would be involved in a useless debate. I believe that in his own words he said it would be a *fait accompli*. I see the minister shaking his head but that is certainly the impression he gave

me. This may not have been his intention but I believe that impression is widely shared.

Mr. Hellyer: I might have told my hon. friend by way of conversation that legislation is not required for new uniforms or rank designations. If one wishes to do that, it is provided for under the present law. I might have said that to him, but I am sure he would not want to give the impression I said we would be doing something for which the law does not provide.

Mr. Bigg: I was not referring to any private conversation which may have occurred between the minister and myself. I was referring to the statement he made in this house when he was asked to clarify the real meaning of the word "unification". I am well aware of the fact that orders in council can change the peak on a cap and that sort of thing. What I have been trying to put over this afternoon, and I hope I have made some progress, is that we are not just talking about the colour of a uniform or even the destruction of the names of regiments. This is not what I am worried about. I am really worried about the policy of the government and the projecting of this policy into the dim future. What do we really mean to do with regard to Canadian defence, Canadian sovereignty? I, for one, assure the minister that the change in the colour of a uniform or the changing of the names of the services would not make any difference to the attitude of many people toward defence. If the changing of the uniform is unnecessary and the taking away of regimental badges is unnecessary to achieve an end, that end being, I hope, the greater security of our country, then a lot of these minor difficulties might disappear. I think the minister will have to admit that, perhaps not intentionally—

• (4:50 p.m.)

The Chairman: Order. I must advise the hon. gentleman that the time allotted to him has expired. Does the hon. member wish to continue?

Mr. Bigg: If I may just finish, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Does the hon. member have unanimous consent to continue his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Bigg: I think that if some of these deep questions of policy were answered we would not worry about the shape of the cap or the colour of the uniform. I can assure the minister—I think I speak not only for myself but for the vast majority of the members of this house—that we would go a long way toward what the minister calls unification if that unification were based upon a principle.

Mr. Rynard: Mr. Chairman, I rise to say a few words on Bill No. C-243. I was not a member of the defence committee but there are a few matters I should like to raise.

I believe that across the country serious doubts exist about the wisdom of this bill. I believe that the average citizen feels that it is the duty of the opposition to oppose when it believes that legislation may be of doubtful value, may do irreparable harm or is wrong in principle. One of the ministers on the government benches was reported to have said in a speech the other night that the opposition was not doing enough probing, that it was not criticizing sufficiently to be as constructive as it should be in its role as the opposition. Well, let us not be accused of this.

I think one matter the house will regret is that this bill has been brought forward in our centennial year, a time when we are celebrating so much of our historical past, when in a sense we are paying homage to the people who made Canada as we know it today, possible, the people who pioneered this land. These people cut the forests, cleared the land, established homes and built the country that is seen today as the centennial train travels across Canada.

Our politicians had the sense to unite Canada and built it into a nation. This was not achieved by some process of integration and unification or requiring everybody to have the same culture, the same language, the same religion.

We must also remember that our soldiers, sailors and airmen have protected Canada in two great wars by fighting in foreign lands. During the first great war I was at high school and the flower of that school's pupils enlisted when they became old enough. Two thirds of them became lieutenants and only about one third of these men returned. Had they all come back, Mr. Chairman, I often think what a tremendous contribution they might have made. At that time, there were only eight million people in this country, but over 600,000 were under the colours fighting for Canada. We suffered well over 100,000 casualties and more than 50,000 men did not return.

Last Saturday I had both the honour and the privilege of speaking at a Vimy Ridge

banquet. Several of those present had been at Vimy Ridge. One man there had also been one of those in the retreat from Mons. And who can forget the "old contemptibles", one division which held off many German divisions and fought a rearguard action to Dunkirk? It was interesting to listen to the stories of these men as they recounted their experiences. One man in the "old contemptibles" was with a battalion of 850 men, only 45 of whom were still alive at Dunkirk.

Vimy Ridge was an impregnable fortress. One peculiarity of the terrain was that there was a great amount of a particular type of chalk or limestone through which the Germans were able to tunnel and bring forward their supplies to the ridge. Not only was the ridge dominated between 1914 and 1917 by the German forces but its fortifications were continually strengthened. It was attacked three times before the Canadians attacked. The French tried on two occasions and then the British tried. The French sustained at Vimy Ridge over 150,000 casualties.

The Canadians captured Vimy Ridge, this impregnable fortress, over the very bodies of the French and the British buried in the soil. I wonder whether this is something we sometimes forget. The experience I had last Saturday night listening to the reminiscences of the men who fought there and about their comrades who were left behind in France is one I shall remember for a long time.

Vimy Ridge was the first staggering blow that the German land forces received. It was the first punch under which they reeled back. This was in part due to the sentimentality and esprit de corps of the particular units under which many of the soldiers fought and unfortunately died. To the heroes of Vimy Ridge belong the honour and the glory of fighting together as a complete line, as a complete force. For the first time in the war the first, second, third and fourth divisions fought on the battlefront approximately six miles long. I suggest that this was really the first baptism of fire for Canadians as a group and was the consolidation of our Canadian spirit. It was here that we found our identity in the crucible of a war where men fought and died in the trenches and on the fields. This was the first trench warfare of any importance and it was fought often in mud and mire, stained by the blood of their fallen comrades.

The air force was there too. Can anybody forget Billy Bishop and Alcock? Yes, Mr. Chairman, we also had a navy. Perhaps it may be a little discomforting when we recall these events to realize how much we owe to these people. During the second world war the navy and air force also played an active part and covered themselves with glory.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Yes, we are concerned about the morale, the esprit de corps of the air force, the navy and the army just as we are concerned about that spirit in our schools, universities and colleges. Universities feel it necessary to keep their identities as separate entities. Families have a tradition of going to a certain university. Because on my mother's side my people were Scottish Presbyterians I went to Queens. No other university, to my people, was just like Queens though all universities tried to teach and did teach the same things. The Grants and Gordons of undying fame as principals were there. We also had Guy Curtis who made the football team a legend. Many a football game has been won by the inspiration of singing ballads to commemorate Guy Curtis. The memories of the Batstones, the Leadleys and the McKelvies are traditions at Queens.

One may ask, what has that to do with this bill? Simply this. When you unite the infantry, the air force and the navy you may find yourself with a force without tradition or loyalties. That might well mean the difference between defeat and victory in combat. Above all, what do you do with the young men and women of Canada who express a preference for the navy, the air force or the infantry? Canada is a big country, the second biggest country in the world. Will we in effect reduce our forces to the status of brush fire fighters?

Mr. Hellyer: I answered that question yesterday.

Mr. Rynard: The minister will have to keep on answering it. Do young Canadians want to join that type of league? Do we want a glorified police force or do we want an army, an air force and a navy proud of their traditions, proud of the heroes of Vimy Ridge, and proud of Bishop and Alcock? Do we not want to be proud of the navy that helped keep the sea lanes open in the last war? The nephew of a former prime minister of this country was a doctor in the navy and paid the supreme sacrifice in the Atlantic when his ship was torpedoed.

I do not believe that unification will lead to a force our people will be proud of. As a matter of act, unification will leave us confused. When some persons talk of a British mini-navy, mini-air force or mini-army, it is

not clear what is meant. Similarly, it is not clear what is meant by unification.

One ought to keep in mind that Canada is a maritime nation. That may sound strange, but a map will show that we are almost surrounded on four sides by water, having the Atlantic on the east, the Pacific on the west, the Arctic ocean to the north and the great lakes to the south. In view of that it is necessary to have the three separate forces and particularly to retain the navy. It must be remembered that every seagoing man is a fighter. Even if a man is a cook, at sea he will fight when the occasion arises.

Many of those to whom I have talked about unification have expressed grave doubts or have failed to understand what is meant by it. I do not think the officials of the department understand it. The Prime Minister said he was surprised by Air Chief Marshal Miller's testimony. I will not repeat his evidence except to say that the man who was chief of the defence staff for two years, the man closest to the minister and undoubtedly one of his advisers said as found on page 2300 of the committee testimony:

> We never had tentative unification plans submitted and agreed to.

The Prime Minister was surprised and the reporters felt that he would not go ahead with this measure and that it would be postponed. That did not happen.

I have known the minister for many years. We have been friends, we belong to the same church. I do not know whether that makes us any better but it should. I say to him in conclusion that there is enough sound criticism to justify him in withdrawing this bill. If he does so he will be a bigger man in the eyes of the people, in the eyes of this parliament and of the armed forces. If the minister retreats from a position that is unsafe and intolerable, so far as his political ambitions are concerned the Canadian people will laud him for it and he will live to fight again another day.

Mr. Hellyer: I wonder whether the hon. member would permit a question. Does he not agree that because some insisted in the early years of world wars I and II on proceeding with the established way of doing things, many lives were lost needlessly? Did the hon. member not hear one of his colleagues the other night, in commemorating the events at Vimy, describe how soldiers had fought uphill in kilts with mustard gas flowing up their legs? That veteran came down hard on the side of change, hard on the side of an intelligent application of the rules of today to the problems of today and tomorrow. We should do that rather than looking back to the way things were done in the years gone by. Would the hon. member, as a friend, really want me to withdraw or retreat from a position which I believe sincerely and with all my being to be right, to a position which I believe to be wrong? I am sure he would not want me to do that.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Mr. Rynard: I thank the minister very sincerely for what he has said regarding his conscience on this subject. I have advised him as my conscience has prompted me.

Regarding the minister's contention that many lives could have been saved, I agree. I think he will agree that hindsight is always better than foresight and I remind him that changes did take place. We began with trench warfare and then as the war progressed it became a scientific war. Winston Churchill, that great prime minister and war hero, was the man who introduced tanks in the first world war. It was simply a question of progress. Because we did not have any better we could not do other than we did.

Mr. Hellyer: But he did that against tremendous resistance by the military conservatives of the time.

Mr. Rynard: Mr. Churchill was a Conservative.

Some hon. Members: Oh, no.

Mr. Rynard: I would say we would be very foolish if we did not adopt scientific equipment as it came along. I also feel that the public does not understand the unification bill enough and I do not believe—I say this in all sincerity to the minister, holding him in the respect I do—that he or his staff have the answers for the people.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Chairman, my intervention in this debate is made partly to continue some remarks I had not finished the other day. But to begin with I have an apology to make and I hope the committee will bear with me if it is in lighter vein than the serious and important discussion which has just been going on.

When I last spoke I said I believed there were more economic ways in which the minister could be spectacular than by deciding to scrap the navy, obliterate the air force and do away with the army. I made a couple of suggestions as to how he could get headlines. Since then I have been subjected to a good

deal of good-natured criticism by some of my associates, chiefly veterans of the air force, because I limited my suggestions to land and sea and made none as to how the minister could get some headlines in the air environment. This was especially unfortunate, they said, since the minister of defence of Rhodesia had only recently gotten himself worldwide notice by making a parachute jump at the age of 56. It has been reported that he was interviewed by the press afterwards. They asked him what it was like. He is reported to have said, "It was perfectly simple. I just counted 16, pulled the ripcord and floated down." Someone who had been in the air force asked him why he had counted 16, adding "When I was in the air force we were told to count to 10 before pulling the ripcord." The minister replied: "Well, I thought I would just be different and count to 16 because that is the latitude of Salisbury."

All this opens up tremendous possibilities for the Minister of National Defence because in this country he has a choice of latitudes to use as numbers to count from about 43 to 90. Taking his pick from any number in that range I am sure he would make headlines one way or the other. In addition, he would have the advantage of being different, of getting away from what is customary and old-fashioned in the air forces of the world.

Now I wish to turn to a more serious matter. A great deal of publicity—"propaganda" would perhaps be a better word—has been given to the myth that if we pass the bill before us we shall have the most modern concept of defence anywhere in the world. If whether or not a thing is modern is judged by how new it is, I can made a suggestion to the minister. He could be even more modern, and could have an even more modern defence policy by withdrawing Bill C-243 and taking the advice which has been almost unanimously given him by the men who are most knowledgeable on the subject of defence.

But the word "modern" has a deeper meaning. It does not mean just what happened last. In its best sense it means a concept which has developed as a result of maximum use of the accumulated knowledge of a field up to the present. In my judgment the actions of the minister do not accord with this definition. He has rejected out of hand advice given by conscientious, loyal Canadians who believe sincerely that the road on which we are embarked will not be the best for this country. That is putting it mildly. Most people think that if we continue on this course it will be disastrous for the military security of Canada.

[Mr. MacLean (Queens).]

The minister dismisses this sort of thing. For example, he said the other day that at one time, when integration was in process, Britain was ahead of us but that now we were ahead of Britain.

This is a myth. We are not ahead of anybody if nobody is following in the direction we are taking. This proposal for unification has been rejected by every country in the world which has examined it. In this connection, for some weeks Lord Mountbatten was quoted with approval by the supporters of unification. Mountbatten is recognized almost throughout the world as being the high priest of combined operations. He was in charge of combined operations in the second world war, in command of a special force made up of units of the army, the air force and the navy to carry out special tasks.

I should like to quote from what he has said. I know this has been quoted in part already during this debate but I believe it is worthy of repetition. He is speaking of the system of defence in Great Britain.

> In the operational commands, such as the Far East, the three separate service commanders-in-chief of four-star rank have been replaced by fleet, army and air force commanders of three-star rank under a unified commander-in-chief of four-star rank.

● (5:20 p.m.)

> He is in complete operational command but his administrative responsibilities are still very limited. We have had an admiral, then an air chief marshal and now a general filling this post.
>
> Few people still oppose the integration of arrangements for pay, food, clothing, furniture, equipment, etc., since this must be a more economical way of providing them.

I may interject that I commend the minister for what he has done on integration and I agree almost entirely with that program, but I do not agree with unification. Lord Mountbatten goes on:

> In fact I believe the British reorganization, although much disliked and opposed by many senior officers at the beginning is now accepted as reasonable and more efficient and economical.
>
> In the British reorganization care has been taken to preserve esprit de corps and morale and those traditions which help to maintain this in the services and fighting units.
>
> It has been accepted that to achieve this the three services must retain their uniforms and ranks with an identifiable professional head of their service. The idea of a single uniform and rank structure was also rejected as undesirable and unnecessary.
>
> There was some talk of taking the uniform and ranks of one service and imposing this on the others, but the idea of a man in say army uniform with an army title arriving at a foreign port in command of a warship was generally felt to be so ludicrous that it was not pursued.

The general cut and colour of naval uniforms are internationally so well known that a sailor from any one country can readily be recognized as a sailor in any other country.

Sailors the world over take great pride in this and so in their own services do soldiers and airmen. No compensating advantage could be seen in attempting to impose so unpopular a change.

At this point I would like to interject that the question goes deeper than just the cut of a uniform when a young man decides to join one of the services, whether in peace or wartime. In the part of the world from which I come there is a long, deep tradition of the sea, and men from that area who want to serve in the armed forces frequently join the navy, if they have this tradition of the sea in their families. They will not want to join a unified force if they do not know where they are going to end up.

It has been said that we have a jet age Minister of National Defence. That opinion was widespread a few months ago, but now the Canadian people are coming to realize we have a Minister of National Defence who is following a philosophy that went out of style over 100 years ago. The attitude of the minister so far as technically capable advisers are concerned, men who have given their whole lives to the study of military problems, is that their great wealth of knowledge is useless and no longer applicable to the present day. I disagree wholeheartedly with that point of view.

The minister's philosophy of the role of senior military officers is that theirs is not to reason why, theirs is but to do and die, that what is to be done will be imposed from the top without any valid consideration given to the experience of our senior officers in the military field, or to the experience of our allies, and of all other countries.

The minister has said, and rightly so, that there should be civilian control of the military. With this I agree wholeheartedly. I have yet to know of anyone who would question that proposition, either in or out of the services. I think that every responsible officer in our armed services has always known that in this country civilian control is not only essential but that it has always been recognized. However, that is not to say that we should embark on a course which will do irreparable damage to our defences and to our national security, just to show who is boss.

Certainly we can have civilian control. We have always had civilian control and I trust we always will; but this does not preclude the necessity of having technical military advice as to what policy should be with regard to our defence problems. But the minister has this magnificent obsession that he is going to make sure that the military are controlled by civilians, and appears to take the attitude that one should discard all military advice that does not coincide with one's own thinking.

This sort of thinking reminds me of the fellow who had an obsession about being superstitious. He wanted to impress everybody with the fact that he was not superstitious and ended up jumping out of a 13th storey window to prove he was not superstitious.

Mr. Hellyer: Explain the moral of that story?

Mr. MacLean (Queens): We are in the situation where we are cutting off our noses to spite our faces. We are going to take our navy out of blue because other countries, chiefly Britain and France from which most of our heritage stems, dress their sailors in blue. I cannot understand this sort of thinking. I think we are becoming a fairly mature nation—at least we should be on this our hundredth anniversary—and I think if we claim to be taking our place in the world as a mature nation, we should act like a mature nation and not discard some of our most worth-while traditions, customs and technical procedures because someone else thought of them first, or because we have inherited them from somewhere else.

Much of what we stand for has a long history. We are the beneficiaries chiefly of European culture, European language, European developments, and European education. We should not be ashamed of that fact. We should not embark on this narrow-minded or ingrown kind of nationalism upon which we seem to be proceeding now.

It is said that we have got to have a unified force so that none of our armed services will look like the armed services of any other country. I think that would be not only unnecessary but a great disadvantage. We are proceeding on a course which is contrary to the general trend in the world today. We are in a world which recognizes more and more that internationalism will be the means for us and our culture to survive, if we are to survive. If our western civilization is to survive there must be co-operation among all the various nations in that civilization in defence and security matters, as well as in many other fields. Yet, it seems to be our intention to put ourselves, as it were, in a ghetto so

that we will not be contaminated by contact with the customs or methods that are imported from other countries.

• (5:30 p.m.)

I believe this is an unreasonable and juvenile attitude. I do not think, in order to be good Canadians, it is necessary to deny our past or deny what we have inherited from other cultures. I believe this is a time when our armed forces should be organized in such a manner that they are compatible with the armed services of our closest friends and allies, so that they can work smoothly together in the various alliances in which we are a member. I believe, as many of our senior military advisers have said, that only in that way can we benefit to the greatest extent from the experiences of our friends, and only in that way can we work most closely with them.

This is a poor time for us to take the narrow minded ingrown view that to be a good Canadian we must do everything different from everybody else.

Mr. Hellyer: Or vice-versa.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): I consider myself to be a loyal Canadian. To my mind that does not preclude my recognition of my heritage; it does not make me feel ashamed that Canadian sailors may look like French sailors or United States sailors because they are dressed in navy blue. If we were to pursue this kind of narrow minded thinking to its logical conclusion, then all of us would have to change our names to something which could not be identifiable with an origin in some other country. That would be the result if one were to bring this kind of thinking to its absurd conclusion.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is a very important matter. It is a technical one, it is true, and one which perhaps does not fire the imagination of many Canadians because they do not feel they are technically qualified to form a judgment on the matter. As I said before, however, I think the question of national defence and national security, to which we as taxpayers have contributed roughly $1½ billion per year for many years, now is too big a question to be settled without the most serious consideration because, as time progresses and as more evidence is gathered, we find that more and more people feel sincerely and strongly that we are embarking on, and are locked into, a disastrous course.

I implore the minister to reconsider this matter. I ask him to rise to the occasion and show that he is a man, if he is. I suggest to him that he should take seriously some of the advice which has been given to him. If he would do this, we would have some confidence in this government and I am sure the Canadian people would regret less their having elected it. I am sure also that the government would have a better prospect of being a government again if its members would realize their responsibility and accept the fact that the minority position they hold which allows them to be the administrators of the trust of government for all Canadians for a very brief period does not give them the right to be dictators and to ignore completely what is the will of the majority.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, last night I was cut off in the full flood of my remarks because time ran out on me. I do not know whether you were in the chair at that time, but I am sure, had you been, that you must have been disappointed, because I was about to deal with the speech made last Wednesday by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Of course, in the opinion of that minister there is nothing more important than a speech which he makes. I wish to pay my tribute to the exalted position he occupies. As I said, his speech dealt with the subject of external affairs. Unless we are very clear on that subject our defence policy will not make sense. Our understanding all along has been that foreign policy is declared and that our defence policy then is designed to meet that foreign policy, or is tailored to fit it.

Last Wednesday I was hoping that the Secretary of State for External Affairs would give us a very clear statement with regard to Canada's position concerning our external relations, and where we stand in the field of foreign affairs. The minister thought he had done that; but when one reads his speech he finds that there are some question marks. In the course of the speech the minister dealt with the subject of the proposed reorganization of our defence forces. He gave us no evidence in this regard, but he did give us what he considered to be a weighty opinion. After all, the speech that was given to us was that of none other than the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Normally one bows when his name is mentioned. He may have thought he was speaking to his friends in the ambassadorial circles around town instead of to those persons who know him well in this House of Commons.

I was not as interested as some persons might have been by this apparently weighty

opinion expressed by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. He did not tell us that he had examined the evidence of the committee. Heretofore he has not exhibited any great interest in defence matters; yet apparently he felt competent to tell us what should be done.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs attempted to clear up the situation with regard to our alliances, yet he left a great escape route—a loophole. I should like to read these words of the minister which appear at page 14565 of *Hansard*:

> I do not exclude the possibility that in the future it may become feasible, and indeed I hope it will, to withdraw our forces from Europe and to make our entire contribution from bases in Canada.

This is diplomatic language. Every word is very carefully selected, because it will be read and interpreted around the word. Here we have the Secretary of State for External Affairs hoping that we will be able to withdraw our forces from Europe and make our entire contribution from bases in Canada.

• (5:40 p.m.)

At a meeting of the external affairs committee last spring I asked him whether it would be a feasible proposition to use our transport airplanes to rotate our troops in Europe more frequently, rather than leave them there for a year. I asked him whether or not it would be feasible to rotate the troops much more frequently, rather than at considerable expense leaving them over there with their dependants for a year. I suggested they could be rotated at intervals of perhaps three or six months. I do not remember his exact words but he indicated his assent to that proposition. He then received phone calls and communications from countries in Europe, and other countries with whom we are in alliance in this situation, and he became greatly disturbed because he thought I had trapped him into giving an answer. Actually I was just looking for information.

Periodically when I find that not enough attention is being paid to the minister for external affairs in the house I ask him a question on orders of the day. Frequently he does not answer my questions and we are deprived of information. Nevertheless I like to draw attention to him so his name gets in the papers, because I know he loves the publicity.

The minister has now enunciated his doctrine of withdrawing our forces from Europe and making our entire contribution from bases in Canada. He then went on to say this:

> But such a course of action is neither feasible nor desirable at this moment—

He had to have an escape hatch. What does he have in mind as to when this may take place?—next week, next month, later on this year or next year? The minister for external affairs failed in this regard to give the house the exact circumstances relating to our foreign policy. Why did he not make a statement which would not be subject to misinterpretation? He could have told us that we were going to maintain our forces in Europe under our alliances in NATO throughout 1967, 1968 and 1969 unless the NATO allies together in conference decided there should be a change. He did not do that. He left everything in mid-air. I suggest the statement indicates that there is nothing certain about the maintenance of our forces in Europe. In fact the minister hopes that they may be withdrawn.

Later on in the same paragraph he created another escape hatch which he would use if one queried him about this during orders of the day, when he said:

> Until we can be sure that we can make an appropriate and effective military contribution entirely from Canada, or until a Canadian contribution is no longer considered necessary, we should continue contributing forces in Europe as part of a collective defence.

He says we should continue, but he does not say that we are actually going to continue. He leaves the Canadian public in a state of uncertainty as to whether or not we are really going to maintain our NATO alliance and our contributions in Europe, or at what strength. He said nothing about our responsibility in antisubmarine warfare. We have a commitment to NATO to maintain an effective and large antisubmarine force. We heard evidence before the committee on defence that the antisubmarine force no longer is as large as it was, and that ships now available are undermanned, with some of them tied up for want of personnel.

The minister said nothing about NORAD; yet the whole purpose of getting him into this debate was to obtain from him a clear and definitive statement on foreign affairs. I was very disappointed in the minister, as I am almost every week, because in the course of my remarks I complimented him and referred to his lengthy career in the house. I outlined the highlights of that career and the many good things he has accomplished. I did not mention any of his failures. I was very complimentary to him. But when he rose to speak he did not return the compliment, in fact he

was inclined to ridicule me. I was rather hurt because I had tried to be friendly and help the minister, under whose direction Canada's prestige abroad has fallen to an all time low. I tried to help him, so his spirits would be revived. Not only did he brush me aside but he misinterpreted what I had said. Perhaps he did so unconsciously or inadvertently, but he did refer to what I had said about peace restoring as peacekeeping.

The expression peace restoring has been used on many occasions by the Minister of National Defence and others. There is a vast difference between peace keeping and peace restoring. Let me read what the minister of defence said on December 7, 1966 as reported at page 10832 of *Hansard*:

> Even the success or failure of peace restoring or peace keeping operations can well depend on the speed with which decisions are reached and the force and its equipment delivered to the trouble zone.

The phrase peace restoring was used during the committee study of this bill. I had hoped that the minister for external affairs would tell us something about peace restoring. He did not do that, but rather referred to peacekeeping.

There are two distinct methods of operating, one is peace keeping, which we are doing at the present time in Cyprus and in the Gaza strip as well as other places where we have observers. Peace restoring involves sending a punitive expedition to a place where trouble has broken out. That force must be prepared to engage in warfare and put out the so-called brushfire or trouble that has occurred.

At page 10835 of *Hansard* for December 7 last year the minister is recorded as having said:

> It can be said with assurance that Canada's influence in the years ahead and its capacity to act in favour and settlement of disputes that endanger peace will grow with its own development.

Note that the minister referred to the settlement in disputes. There is a dispute taking place now in Aden. People are firing rifles at each other and throwing bombs. Last week there was a dispute between Israel and Syria when aircraft were attacking each other. Our Canadian forces, in order to perform in that capacity—settling disputes or restoring peace—must be prepared to enter into warfare to enforce peace. Let us have a statement from the minister for external affairs in this regard. He did not give us such a statement, but dodged the issue. He is very skilful at dodging issues. So when I hoped that he would talk about peace restoring, he talked about peace keeping.

• (5:50 p.m.)

My proposal for peacekeeping was that it should be separate and apart from our armed forces. The Secretary of State for External Affairs had to admit that what we are carrying on in Cyprus and the Gaza strip is a police operation. We do not require heavy tanks, close support aeroplanes or artillery for that job. Those things are not there with our people; they have light arms for self-protection. That is the way in which we are performing in our missions abroad. It is a police operation. I was suggesting that we continue that type of operation, within the limits of reasonable expense and with the co-operation of others in the United Nations, but that we do it, not by using our navy, army and air force, the forces that are equipped for war, but by using a special, elite force which is a peace keeping force.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs rejected the idea and thought we should continue to do what we are now doing. The weakness of the minister's position is just this: At the external affairs committee yesterday—and I am not reporting the committee hearings; I am reporting what appeared in the newspapers and on television last night—the minister made a lengthy statement with regard to Viet Nam and outlined a four-pronged program to be put into effect immediately, if possible, when that war comes to an end. This was his contribution to the situation in Viet Nam and part of the continuing process of keeping in the limelight with regard to matters concerning peace. The minister periodically has a press conference, an exposure on television, or makes a speech somewhere, and if all those things fail he can call together the committee on external affairs and get his publicity that way. In the course of that exercise he suggested that if and when peace does come in Viet Nam, Canada is prepared to make a contribution with regard to the maintenance of that peace, which means another peace keeping force when the war comes to an end.

How many people would be involved in that peace keeping force? Speculation in the press is that we might require as many as 30,000 men for that purpose. I do not know whether that figure is inflated. But if Canada participates, it cannot be just on a small scale; it would surely have to be on a battalion scale, two battalions, or something like that. You might find that you were providing for activities in Viet Nam 1,000 people from our armed forces over and above the 800 that are in Cyprus, as well as the others that are

in the Gaza strip and elsewhere. We have about 2,000 people abroad right now on peace keeping missions.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs has offered another group for another peace keeping mission. Where is he going to get the men? Our national defence figures indicate a serious depletion in the strength of our forces. They used to number about 120,000 or 125,000; now they are down to 104,000. All the 13 infantry battalions are, on the average, under strength and have been for some months. There is a deficiency of 4,000 infantrymen in those battalions. There is a deficiency of 4,000 men to man the ships in our antisubmarine role.

Where is the Secretary of State for External Affairs going to get these men? Is he going to reduce our commitments to NATO? I submit that we are not meeting our commitments to NATO at this very moment, because we have reduced the effectiveness of our air division overseas. The two infantry brigades in Canada that are earmarked under NATO for an emergency are not up to strength. The antisubmarine force which is earmarked for NATO purposes is under strength. So where is the Secretary of State for External Affairs going to get another 600 or 1,000 men for a peace keeping operation in Viet Nam, if peace is declared in that country? This shows the extent of the confusion in the government ranks with regard to these matters.

If the minister is going to make an offer—he has publicly made the offer now, and if peace is declared this summer Canada would be obligated to do something about it—we would have to provide a force, if parliament consented, reduce our commitments to NATO, and reduce our commitments for home defence. So it is quite clear that we have not had given to us by the Secretary of State for External Affairs a clear exposition of our obligations in foreign affairs and to our allies.

Why did he not tell us last Wednesday, when he was making his speech, what his proposition was with regard to Viet Nam? He did not disclose it in the House of Commons, and exposed his hand at the committee hearings on Tuesday, and to the press and the Canadian public over television. So we now have another commitment just around the corner, and we are already short of men in the forces and are failing to meet our present commitments. That, sir, constitutes part of what I intended to say last night with regard to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I have not quite finished, but I think there will be another opportunity to deal with him and I hope he will be present to hear me.

I call it six o'clock.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will carry on with this debate. If we should conclude it during the course of the day we will take the bill standing in the name of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, and following that such other business as appears on the order paper.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, April 13, 1967

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. DIEFENBAKER—OMISSION OF REFERENCE TO SASKATCHEWAN IN TRAVEL BUREAU DOCUMENT

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege affecting almost a million people in this country, specifically in the province of Saskatchewan. I have before me a document entitled "Special Centennial Events" issued by the Canadian Government Travel Bureau, Ottawa, under the authority of the Department of Trade and Commerce. On the second page the following appears:

Abbreviations of Provinces and Territories
Alberta—Alta.
British Columbia—B.C.

The Northwest Territories is the last listed. Saskatchewan is entirely omitted.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Saskatchewan is entirely omitted in the portion dealing with abbreviations. We know that in that province we may be in the bad books of the present government; we might indeed be described as canines, but I ask the Department of Trade and Commerce to rectify this very serious omission.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps I ought to deal with such an important question, and reassure the right hon. gentleman that I shall take the matter up at once with the premier of Saskatchewan to see if he cannot explain this omission.

Mr. Diefenbaker: This involves the Department of Trade and Commerce, not the premier.

MR. JUSTICE LANDREVILLE

Third and final report of special joint committee respecting Mr. Justice Landreville—Mr. Laflamme.

23033—939½

HOUSE OF COMMONS

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ISSUING OF WRITS FOR BY-ELECTIONS

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform the house that by order in council PC 1967-737 of April 13, 1967, writs have been issued today for by-elections to be held on Monday, May 29, 1967, in the five federal electoral districts of Sudbury, in Ontario, and Hull, Outremont, Papineau and Richelieu-Vercheres in Quebec.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REFERENCE TO BUSINESS COMMITTEE OF TIME ALLOCATION RESPECTING DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I propose that the question of allocation of time on the committee of the whole stage and all remaining stages of procedure on Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof, as amended, being government order No. 107 on today's order paper, be referred to the business committee under the terms of standing order 15-A.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The old guillotine.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to provisional standing order 15A the question stands referred to the business committee.

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP

REPORTED SPEECH BY STATE SECRETARY RESPECTING METHOD OF OBTAINING

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I asked the Prime Minister the other day whether the government had given consideration to the suggestion put forward by the Secretary of State, as reported in the press, that native born Canadians should in future be required to apply for and qualify for citizenship papers.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I have received the text of what the Secretary of State did say on that occasion, and the text indicates that the report was entirely inaccurate.

Inquires of the Ministry

Mr. Diefenbaker: I asked whether the government was giving any consideration to this outrageous proposal.

Mr. Pearson: There has been no such proposal, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

POSSIBLE MARCH ON OTTAWA BY DAIRY PRODUCERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture. The minister is doubtless aware that the Ontario and Quebec dairy producers are organizing a march on Ottawa. Does the minister intend to apply a preventive policy by increasing immediately to $5.10 per hundredweight the price of manufacturing milk, with a view to sparing the farmers the expense of coming to Ottawa?

[*English*]

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): The government's policy has been announced in the proper fashion in this house. Should there be any change in that policy, something which is not contemplated at the present time, it will be announced in the proper way in this house.

CANADIAN CENTENNIAL

INQUIRY AS TO FREE DISTRIBUTION OF DISPLAY MATERIAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. F. Kennedy (Colchester-Hants): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State. In view of the heavy demand by organizations and institutions for centennial display material, especially flags, what is the policy regarding provision of such material on a complimentary basis?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Well, Mr. Speaker, I have used up all I had for distribution to members of the house on a complimentary basis. Unless and until there is a further supply for the House of Commons and the Senate it is unlikely that there will be a further supply made available to hon. members.

WATER RESOURCES

ONTARIO—FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO UPPER THAMES VALLEY CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Mines, Energy and Resources, of which I have given him notice. Has the minister or any of his officials informed the government of the province of Ontario or the upper Thames river conservation authority that the federal government will no longer contribute its agreed share of 37½ per cent of the cost of conservation and recreational facilities being or to be constructed for the upper Thames river conservation authority, and in particular with respect to such facilities at the Gordon Pittock dam and reservoir at Woodstock, Ontario?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that this type of question should be placed on the order paper.

Mr. Nesbitt: With great respect may I draw to Your Honour's attention that in the spring of the year, because of flooding and other things, this is a very urgent matter. If Your Honour insists I will have to put the question on the order paper, but I would hope Your Honour would accept the question as appropriate.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, things are not as stated by the hon. member. I might point out that the law says contributions by Canada are:

—for the conservation and control of water resources in that province.

They are not for recreational purposes. However, it is often very difficult to assess what is for recreation and what is for conservation, and we have had difficulties with respect to projects in Ontario. A provincial-federal task force has just been created which will inquire into the difficulties, and decisions will be made on the basis of its recommendations.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—FORMULA FOR FINANCING POSSIBLE UN PEACE FORCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): I direct my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the announced readiness of Canada to contribute to the United Nations peace force in Viet Nam if and when an appropriate occasion arises, can the Secretary of State for External Affairs advise the house whether any progress has been made in establishing an adequate and acceptable formula for financing such an operation?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): As far as the United Nations is concerned this matter is under consideration. One would have to await the outcome of the discussions in the committee before one could give a satisfactory answer.

CONSIDERATION OF FRIENDSHIP AND PEACE AGREEMENT WITH RUSSIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Having in mind the British government's decision to take up with the U.S.S.R. a proposal for a friendship and peace agreement, would the minister be willing to give consideration to the wisdom of Canada following a similar approach?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take notice of this question.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

BELL ISLAND, NFLD.—ASSISTANCE FOR UNEMPLOYED MINERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Prime Minister based on newspaper reports from Newfoundland and on correspondence I have received concerning the pitiful and appalling conditions on Bell Island arising from the closing of the mine there. I want to ask the Prime Minister whether any negotiations are in progress between the government of Canada and the government of Newfoundland for a joint federal-provincial program to alleviate conditions on the island and do something about the unemployed miners and their families in that area.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): There have been discussions going on. I would be glad to take the question as notice and give a more complete answer tomorrow.

Mr. Douglas: Can the Prime Minister tell us what departments of the federal government are involved?

Mr. Pearson: More than one department, Mr. Speaker.

INQUIRY AS TO STEPS TO MEET UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister of Labour. I would ask him whether his attention has been drawn to the press release issued by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics under the authority of the Department of Manpower and Immigration, showing that as of March 18 unemployment in Canada had risen to 400,000 or some 59,000 higher than it was in March of last year. In view of this situation is the minister in a position to advise us what measures, other than the usual flamboyant and optimistic statements, the government intends to take to meet a problem which each month is recurring, as it has in the last several months?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Regardless of what may be said about flamboyant statements I would draw attention to the fact that more people were actually working in March of this year than last year. It may be that there was a slight increase in March, a regrettable increase, in unemployment, but it is a fact that there are certain adjustments that usually take place in the months of December to March, and that unemployment is at the peak in the month of March. I would think the improvement will set in, as is expected, in the present month of April.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I ask the minister to explain why it is that in March this year unemployment is 59,000 higher than at the same time last year.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. These supplementaries are argumentative.

[*Translation*]

[*Later:*]

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

In order to check unemployment, is it the minister's intention to recommend to his colleague the Minister of Labour (Mr. Nicholson) the implementation of the Chevrier-Martin program that was in operation between 1959-1962?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

QUEBEC—INTEGRATION OF FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL MANPOWER CENTRES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. René Tremblay (Matapédia-Matane): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Inquiries of the Ministry

According to a report in a Montreal newspaper this morning, the federal manpower centres in Quebec are about to be integrated with the provincial employment offices.

Could the minister tell us whether he has any knowledge of this plan and whether he had anything to do with it?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that plan. On the contrary, we have increased and are still increasing our staff in manpower centres. So, I have not taken part in the development of this plan, to such extent as it may exist.

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

COMPLAINTS RESPECTING DIFFICULTIES IN HIRING TRANSIENT LABOUR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. On Tuesday of this week I directed a question to the Minister of Agriculture asking if he would look into the excessive amount of bookkeeping and red tape which farmers have to go through when hiring transient or part time help. The minister said the matter was being referred to the commission, I presume the Unemployment Insurance Commission. I would now ask the Minister of Labour has it been referred to the commission, has the commission reported to him, and could the minister report to the house?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture did discuss the matter with me pursuant to the assurance he gave. Yesterday I met with the officials of the Unemployment Insurance Commission and was assured that the program had been in force for some 12 or 13 days only and that they had had no prior representations. However, in the light of what was said by my colleague the Minister of Agriculture they are studying the matter and have promised a report early next week.

TELEVISION

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT RESPECTING FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State. In view of the minister's speech in Sherbrooke in which she said the C.B.C. is not the most appropriate agency to carry out the role envisaged for the federal educational television agency, will she take an early opportunity on motions to tell this parliament what the government has in mind concerning educational television?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I have been anxiously awaiting the opportunity to make that statement, but not on motions because it would be too long. I would hope to make the statement when the supplementary item is called.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the minister whether she has given due consideration to the propriety of asking this house to vote supply in the amount set out under supplementary estimate item F in respect of—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that this question is not in order.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, on the question of order, may I say that I am simply asking the minister for information concerning her views about proceeding with an application of this kind 14 days after the year has expired in respect of which the estimate is to be spent.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is asking a very interesting question, but I suggest it should not be asked at this time.

Mr. David MacDonald (Prince): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question also is directed to the minister. In view of the fact that in its last report the broadcasting committee suggested an early reference on this question so it could give wide consideration to it, and in view of the meeting currently being held in Toronto, will the minister assure the house that very shortly this matter will come before the broadcasting committee for full consideration?

Miss LaMarsh: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated before, the supplementary item is on the agenda. Presumably it will be one of the early items called at the conclusion of the business which is now before the house. I did say earlier, and on a number of occasions have said publicly, that notwithstanding the fact that it is unusual to use this means of introducing legislation it is neither illegal nor unheard of. In an attempt to meet the request of the provinces to get on with educational

television, because of the fact that otherwise it could not be dealt with in the house until late in the centennial session and perhaps not even within the centennial year, the government has taken the position that the item will be called and a statement of purpose given. Only if there appears to be agreement in the chamber will the item be proceeded with. If there should be an apparent and consistent refusal by the house to go on with it, the item would be withdrawn and we would simply have to advise the provinces that the house would not accede to that idea of priority.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister whether representations in respect of this matter were received by the government from the C.B.C., and whether those representations have been considered.

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether this is a proper question, but there have been no representations with regard to that item received by me from the C.B.C.

Mr. Knowles: Were they received with respect to the policy of turning this matter over to another corporation?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond.

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): My question is supplementary, Mr. Speaker, and is on the same subject. I wonder whether the minister has asked the officials of her department whether, pending the hearings of the broadcasting committee on educational television, this problem could be solved simply by having the C.B.C. construct the facilities in the province of Alberta for this year pending a final decision concerning who is to have this authority.

Miss LaMarsh: Well, someone must obtain approval from parliament for the money. The C.B.C. does not have approval from anyone to spend funds on that particular service.

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

OTTAWA—INQUIRY AS TO CONTRACTS FOR DEMOLITION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Justice or to the Solicitor General of Canada.

In view of the fact that so many people in the area are taking an interest in the wrecking of the Roxborough apartment building and the old printing bureau, does the government intend to set up a commission of inquiry to get to the bottom of that matter and find out if there was anything improper in the way contracts were awarded to the people who wrecked those buildings?

Mr. Speaker: I do not think that the question is urgent and should be answered immediately, and the hon. member might want to put it on the order paper. If he disagrees with my ruling, he could raise the matter on the adjournment motion.

Mr. Caouette: At ten o'clock tonight, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO SUPPLY OF BUFFALO MEAT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. D. McLelland (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Will the minister inform the house whether there is still a considerable amount of buffalo meat available at the present price of 42 cents per pound, which can be obtained for special events for centennial year? If that is so, does this mean the meat is in storage or that the animals will be slaughtered at a later date?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. While there seems to be some urgency to the matter raised by the hon. member, I doubt that this type of question should be asked at this time.

HOUSING

INQUIRY AS TO POSSIBILITY OF MEETING ECONOMIC COUNCIL TARGET

On the orders of the day:

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Labour in his capacity as the minister responsible for housing. Have his officials made an estimate as to how close we will come this year to meeting the target of 170,000 homes which the economic council has suggested will be required for this year?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, it has been estimated that housing starts will reach the production level of 170,000 per annum during the current year.

In view of the relatively few starts during the first three months of this year, it may be that we may not reach that level during 1967, but that annual level or rate of starts should be reached within a matter of months.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Does the minister have any figure as to the number of completions estimated for 1967?

Mr. Nicholson: I should perhaps take that question as notice, but if I recall correctly the estimated level is between 150,000 and 155,000.

AIR CANADA

REPORTED DELAY IN OBTAINING REPLACEMENT ENGINES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. N. Ormiston (Melville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport, but in his absence I shall address it to the Prime Minister. In view of the statement by the sales manager of Air Canada in Timmins, Ontario, that several DC-8's and DC-9's cannot be put into service because it is impossible to obtain the necessary engines which are normally acquired from the United States, would it be possible to renegotiate this contract in order to obtain engines from the British Rolls Royce Company and in this way put these aircraft into service during centennial year?

Mr. Speaker: Order. That question should be placed on the order paper.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

NOVA SCOTIA—REPORTED PROTESTS RESPECTING TRADES TRAINING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Has the minister received a letter from the Sydney unemployed workers' association expressing dissatisfaction with the manpower office methods of selecting applicants for trades training? If so, what reply has he made?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I do not remember receiving such a letter, but I will make inquiries and give an answer tomorrow.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether in his reply he will indicate whether adequate publicity will be given to the trades training program in order that the public may be well-informed. At the same time, since there is some confusion as a result of the transfer of this program from the federal government to the provincial government, will he elaborate on this program?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, I must be a little bit prudent in this regard because as yet this proposed measure has only been given first reading. As soon as it is passed I will be in a position to give it sufficient publicity.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I have a supplementary question. Will the minister indicate why the files have been transferred to the Canadian manpower offices, since the legislation is not as yet in existence?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That question is argumentative.

RETRAINING OF WORKERS LAID OFF BECAUSE OF AUTOMOBILE AGREEMENT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer a question asked last Tuesday by the hon. member for Ontario. He asked me whether my department had been in touch with the government of Ontario for the purpose of providing additional facilities for the training of laid off workers in Oshawa. I should like to inform the hon. member that the officials of my department are reviewing the training situation in Oshawa just about every day with the provincial and local training authorities. As a result the training facilities in Oshawa enroll some 850 workers as of today, which is more than four times as many as a year ago.

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. In view of the fact that only about 800 are now receiving training while many hundreds are not being trained because of the lack of facilities, will the minister consider providing additional facilities?

Mr. Marchand: The facts I have on hand are as follows. As of yesterday there were in the Oshawa manpower centre 180 candidates registered for training. It is expected that most of these candidates will be in our training courses within two weeks. Only 17 of them are laid off auto workers. I would like

to add that only a relatively small proportion of the laid off auto workers show any interest in training.

Mr. Starr: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact they have been told there are no facilities in which to receive training, many of them have been discouraged from applying for training.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): You want to encourage them by your speeches.

[*Translation*]

EXPO '67

INQUIRY AS TO C.B.C. BROADCAST OF OPENING CEREMONIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Secretary of State.

Following the protests of the big American and European television networks against their inability to rebroadcast the special program of the World Fair formal opening next April 27, due to its overly restricted character, would the minister consider getting in touch with C.B.C. authorities and the General Commissioner, Mr. Dupuy, so as to give that formal opening all the pomp and prestige of a spectacular show and to advertise more widely our World Fair throughout Canada?

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

POTATOES—REQUEST FOR IMPROVEMENT IN SURPLUS DIVERSION PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Hugh John Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Has the minister any information to give the house concerning the negotiations, if that is the right word, being carried on at the present time with the government of New Brunswick with regard to surplus potatoes? I ask this question in light of the discussion which took place yesterday in the New Brunswick legislature.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with our program announced some time ago, provincial programs in the provinces of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island have now been agreed upon which I think are satisfactory to the governments and officials of those provinces.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

HALIFAX—REQUEST OF DOCKYARD COUNCIL RESPECTING PAY RATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. I wonder whether he has had an opportunity to review the telegram from the 700 or 800 members of local 273 of the Canadian Labour Congress. Perhaps I may redirect my question to the President of the Treasury Board.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue and President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, the telegram has been answered very briefly. A longer answer in letter form is being prepared at the present time and will probably be mailed this afternoon or tomorrow morning.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the President of the Treasury Board whether at least the most important request in that telegram will be met, that is whether some interim consideration will be given these employees?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is now submitting a representation.

C.F.B. SHEARWATER—ASSISTANCE TO CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES LAID OFF

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I directed a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, although in his absence the Minister of Labour took it as notice. I wonder whether the minister has the answer to that question, and if in considering this matter he will also discuss it with his colleague the Minister of Industry to see whether any change could be made in the policy so these lay-offs at Halifax will not be necessary?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I take it that this question concerns the workers at Shearwater.

Mr. Knowles: Yes.

Mr. Marchand: I would like first to make it clear that these workers were not on the payroll of the Department of National Defence but were employees of Fairey (Canada) Limited, a private firm engaged in repair and overhaul of aircraft. The officials of the Canada manpower centre in Halifax are at

this very moment at the naval base interviewing them in order to assess their needs and the kind of assistance which would be most effective. We have already received a request for some 20 workers from a firm in western Canada.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. May I ask the minister, as I suggested earlier, if he will discuss with the Minister of Defence Production the possibility of reconsidering the policy pertaining to this work in the hope that the workers in Halifax will be kept at work there.

Mr. Marchand: I am ready to discuss this matter with the Minister of National Defence.

Mr. Knowles: You mean the Minister of Defence Production.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

VIMY RIDGE SERVICE—INVITATION TO PRESIDENT DE GAULLE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether he has read the observations made by the ambassador of the Republic of France regarding the absence of General de Gaulle from the Vimy service, and whether any communication has been received from France explaining the reason for the absence of the president and a guard of honour.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, preparations for this year's special fiftieth anniversary ceremony at Vimy Ridge were undertaken by the Department of Veterans Affairs, as has been the case for the annual ceremony in previous years.

The French authorities were informed through diplomatic channels of the Canadian government's wish to hold this special ceremony, of the proposed program and of the intended representation on the Canadian side. The concurrence and assistance of the French authorities for this special Canadian ceremony were sought and obtained. There were continuing consultations on the arrangements, and the French authorities extended all the material assistance and facilities required. The fullest French participation was also sought, and the possibility of inviting General de Gaulle was discussed through diplomatic channels. Had it been possible for him to attend we would have been honoured and delighted.

The French government appointed official representatives both for the ceremony and for the reception of His Royal Highness Prince Philip on his arrival. The level of this representation and the fact that no French troops participated were reflections of the view taken by the French government that this was an essentially Canadian occasion, and should not be interpreted as indicating any lack of French recognition or co-operation. In fact the French authorities have themselves assured us of this.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Now I ask the minister the question that was asked yesterday. Was an invitation extended to President de Gaulle; because my reading of what the ambassador said was that no such invitation was extended at any time.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I saw the French ambassador in Ottawa yesterday. I know of no basis for this observation by the right hon. gentleman, which I suspect is the result of his own intuitive and original thinking. The French ambassador in London yesterday reportedly explained that the status of the head of state in France was not comparable to that of His Royal Highness Prince Philip, the prince consort. I have made it clear, as the Prime Minister did yesterday, that an invitation was discussed through diplomatic channels, which is the only way in which it could have been discussed.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Was it extended?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): In my opinion nothing would have been a greater effrontery, if the head of state did not propose to attend, than nevertheless to force an invitation. Nothing would have been greater evidence of lack of courtesy to a friendly country.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Certainly my powers of intuition have been proven correct. Is it a fact, then, that it was made clear by President de Gaulle or his representatives that he would not attend because the representation of Prince Philip was not on a co-equal basis with him?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend knows that there is no basis in fact for that supposition.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is what you just said.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question. When the minister says "through diplomatic channels", was that through our ambassador to France, and is the atmosphere between General de Gaulle and our ambassador to France rather chilly at the present time?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Naturally "through diplomatic channels" in the case of France means it would be undertaken by the Canadian ambassador, Mr. Jules Leger, one of Canada's outstanding ambassadors who enjoys the highest reputation in France.

COAL

BRITISH COLUMBIA—REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE FOR VICTIMS OF MINE DISASTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, over a week ago the Prime Minister said the government was giving consideration to making a contribution to a fund for the families of the miners at Natal, B.C. who had been killed in the unfortunate mine disaster. I wonder whether any conclusion has been reached with respect to that matter.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker.

CANADIAN CENTENNIAL

INQUIRY AS TO CANCELLATION OF PARLIAMENT HILL PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. Will a program be substituted for the "Son et Lumière" program which has been recently cancelled on parliament hill, and if so will it involve the young people who were originally scheduled to participate?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the "Son et Lumière" program has not been cancelled. It is to be run from Nepean Point and will go ahead exactly as scheduled. The program which was cancelled was called "Spectacle on Parliament Hill" which was to have taken place for some two weeks during August only.

Mr. Dinsdale: Can the minister inform the house whether the young people involved will be employed in the "Son et Lumière" program?

Miss LaMarsh: No, what will be involved is only one official language, that of sound and light.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

INQUIRY AS TO CONTROL OVER HOCKEY BROADCASTS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, may I answer a question asked yesterday by the hon. member for Saskatoon with respect to the control of the Stanley Cup hockey telecasts by the C.B.C. As I suggested yesterday, and as has been subsequently confirmed, television rights to the Stanley Cup hockey games are not owned by the C.B.C. but are owned by the MacLaren advertising agency in Toronto. The C.B.C. only sells time to the agency for the broadcast and telecasts. MacLaren Advertising is the owner and has the responsibility for determining which games are to be shown on which networks. We are not in a position to do more than lease the time and the facilities to the agency, and nothing could be done if the MacLaren firm decided to buy the necessary time on CTV only and not use the C.B.C. at all.

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the Prime Minister?

I would like to know from the Prime Minister, now that by-elections have been announced in Canada, and more particularly in the province of Quebec, whether he will allow the Minister of Forestry and Rural Development (Mr. Sauvé) to run as Liberal candidate in Outremont?

Mr. Speaker: The question is out of order.

• (3:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

AMALGAMATION OF NAVY, ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The house resumed, from Wednesday, April 12, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof—Mr. Hellyer—Mr. Batten in the chair.

The Chairman: Order. When the committee rose last evening clause 2 was under consideration.

National Defence Act Amendment

On clause 2—*Canadian forces, Canadian armed forces.*

Mr. Flemming: Mr. Chairman, it had not been my purpose to take part in this discussion, but in spite of the fact that I do not pretend to be a defence expert, and as a matter of fact have little experience with regard to matters connected with the defence department, I am impelled to take part in the discussion because I believe the emphasis in this debate as outlined by the Minister of National Defence, by his cabinet colleagues and by his supporters has not been constructive but rather destructive. All these gentlemen appear determined to pursue a course which I am convinced is in most respects detrimental to the defence of Canada in present day conditions, either when carried out in co-operation with our allies or by ourselves, and in the fulfilment of our world wide commitments.

First of all I should like to remind the house of the importance of what we are doing here. The fact that we have before us a bill which drastically amends the National Defence Act seems to me to justify very careful examination of this point. Before we even contemplate such a drastic change should we not satisfy ourselves that it is needed?

Before we consider whether the bill before us constitutes an improvement I think we should look over the record of the last half century. We will find, of course, that from a defence point of view we have participated in two world wars. It is my opinion, it has always been my opinion and I believe it will continue to be my opinion, that the world wide prestige of Canada and the glorious reputation which our country has earned for itself is mostly due to our participation in two world wars and to the fact that our servicemen have risen to every occasion and have covered themselves and Canada with glory. Surely I do not need to remind the house that within the last few days our Associate Minister of National Defence made a pilgrimage to the scene of the battle at Vimy, where history was made and a glorious tradition established for us, for our country and for our children to view with pride, a tradition which has gone down in the annuals of our nation.

This is part of the record I am asking members of the house to examine. I ask also that the price paid be remembered. Many Canadian lives were lost, many Canadian bodies were broken and many Canadians were crippled for life. So let us not tamper lightly

[The Chairman.]

with the National Defence Act under which these men fought our country's battles.

I will proceed to an examination of the record. Now I come to world war II. I remind the house of the six year period during which the Canadian forces were engaged in many areas of conflict. I remind them of the battle of Britain, of the campaigns in Italy and North Africa, the Dieppe raid and the invasion of France. I pay full tribute to the many people within sound of my voice this afternoon who fought in these battles. Men from all sides and all quarters of this house participated.

It seems to me that before any drastic change—and I emphasize "drastic change" once more—is made in the act this house should carefully examine the record and preserve all that has stood the test of time for more than half a century, during which two world wars were fought and the freedom of the world was at stake. I ask the house, is it not sensible and logical to preserve everything in the present act which has stood the test not only of time but of wartime? Then, Mr. Chairman, having done this, we can strengthen the act in the light of the changed conditions of today.

I agree that we must keep our National Defence Act up to date in the light of the changed conditions of 1967 compared with those of 20 years ago. Having examined the record and decided that we need to reassess and improve the act, let us see what the minister and the government are recommending to the representatives of the people, who after all have the final decision to make. At this point let us keep in mind one fact, and I ask the minister to particularly take note of it. Changes should be made only in the best interest of the defence of Canada and the people of Canada.

Mr. Hellyer: That will be done.

Mr. Flemming: I for one am not satisfied that every clause in this bill presently under discussion does fall within that qualification. Let us examine the title of this act, Mr. Chairman. Bill No. C-243 is an act to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof. The short title is the Canadian Forces Reorganization Act. Sections 15 to 18 of the National Defence Act are repealed, and I should like at this point to

refer to what section 15 of the old act says. It reads as follows:

> The Canadian forces are the naval, army and air forces of Her Majesty raised by Canada and consist of three services, namely, the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force.

The new act substitutes the following:

> The Canadian forces are the armed forces of Her Majesty raised by Canada and consist of one service called the Canadian Armed Forces.

What does this new provision do, Mr. Chairman? Chiefly it drops the word "royal." I would ask why that word is dropped? Does dropping the word improve the forces or the ability of the forces to defend Canada? This is one point on which I should like the minister to make a statement and explain that omission.

I should like the members of the committee to examine the meaning of the word "royal." Webster's dictionary states that it means magnificent, majestic, excellent. It also says it pertains to a king. In simple language, Mr. Chairman, it implies that this is the superlative of excellence. Why do we drop the word if it denotes the superlative of excellence? If I had my way I would leave it in. If the government's supporters would vote for it I would propose an amendment that the new force be called the "royal Canadian armed forces."

In addition to changing the name, Mr. Chairman, what does the bill presently under consideration contemplate? As I recall the minister's speech, he advanced the idea that when he assumed his responsibilities as minister of defence some four years ago he decided that three things had to be undertaken. The first was to bring the past up to the present, by which he meant we should acquire nuclear warheads for the weapons systems. The second task was to review the equipment programs outstanding; the third was to determine a long range defence policy for Canada.

This was all in progress long before he became minister; there is no question of that. In the result, Mr. Chairman, we acquired nuclear weapons. The minister stated that it was the unanimous opinion of the chiefs of staff and the staff members—and I hope and pray, as I am sure we all do, that this assumption is correct—that a nuclear war was the least likely. The minister has informed us that we are protected, to the extent that we can be protected, against a surprise nuclear attack. Therefore this disposes of that particular requirement.

The minister mentioned the need for flexibility and mobility. As a layman I find no fault with this. I suggest this would mean we should acquire more planes and ships. We are all faced with the need for more flexibility in our respective businesses.

The minister also mentioned the absence of an over-all strategic plan applied to the three services. He deplored lack of co-ordination of equipment programs for the determination of priorities from a national point of view. I do not believe there is very much difference of opinion on this question. The question of national priorities is pretty well understood and agreed with, I suggest. The minister then stressed the need for co-operation to fulfil objectives. There seems nothing wrong with this. He emphasized the need for equipment purchase priorities with national defence in mind.

The conclusion to all these proposals, Mr. Chairman, was of course integration and integrated action; and the minister has outlined the steps which were taken. I emphasize here that there has been little if any objection to the broad principle of integration, though I am sure all of us in this house will agree that it is quite a gigantic task to undertake.

The minister has mentioned the formation of one intelligence agency to replace five. He has mentioned a 30 per cent reduction in personnel in this branch, which he suggests means a financial saving. He has referred to construction engineering and to the advantage of applying common knowledge and experience, again suggesting there will be a saving. There is no objection to this; it is one facet of integration. The minister has also given some information relative to recruitment, and there is no objection to this. He also mentioned information services which have reduced expenditures.

The minister made specific reference to NORAD and air defence command. He forecast a saving of 30 per cent. He mentioned communications, and stated that a long line system for the Canadian armed forces will result in a saving of 18 per cent. The minister stated that the new system is working very satisfactorily. Most of all, he said, it is enabling the defence department to have studies made.

The minister referred to the new combined cataloguing system and the saving in personnel which would result in a 26 per cent financial saving. The minister suggested that all

these savings will mean great financial advantage so far as defence spending is concerned.

Adding all these percentages together, Mr. Chairman, it would appear that the minister expects large savings in defence expenditures. Now, Mr. Chairman, what are the facts? The facts simply are these, that in the estimates tabled in this house a few weeks ago the sums allocated to defence have increased over last year by $115 million, and this after the minister has told us of percentage savings on this item, that item and the other item.

The minister's remarks relative to equipment are to be remembered, Mr. Chairman. I do not propose to repeat them, but he did bring together integration and unification in this regard, and this is what I take objection to. I cannot agree with the unification principle, the doing away with branches of the armed forces and with famous regiments. Integration has been under way for some years and generally speaking it is not unacceptable, but I suggest to the minister unification is an altogether different question.

• (3:30 p.m.)

It is for the minister to show that the bill we are presently studying will improve the ability of the people of Canada to provide for their own defence. I suggest that the minister has not done so. This is not only my opinion but the opinion of many senior officials in his own department, or at least they were members of his department. The minister glibly implies that they are fuddy-duddies who do not care to lose their privileges. I prefer to take the opinion of the career people who have served the country in war and in peace with great distinction rather than the opinion of the minister who seems to wish to disregard his closest and most able advisers if their advice conflicts with the preconceived notions he has acquired through his limited experience in the performance of his duties.

The question on which we are to vote is: Are the suggested changes good for Canada? Will they effect an improvement in the light of modern advancement? I submit the answer is no and I propose to prove that.

Before the minister concluded his remarks on Monday, April 3, he said he would deal with some of the myths which had been raised. This is where he and I part company so far as agreement is concerned. He delves into the world of the theoretical in his reference to so-called myths. He goes up into the clouds. He says the uniforms of the servicemen make little difference, and that the question has been effectively answered. I say, I do not know when, or by whom. He says that uniforms are not unimportant. I say they are very important.

I now digress for a moment. I wish to make my position perfectly clear. The minister simply has not proven his case for unification. That is what he should do. It is not our responsibility to prove he is wrong; it is his responsibility to prove he is right.

No minister of any government should tamper with the defence of the country and make forays into the unknown, all in one big jump. Governments should be satisfied to make necessary changes step by step, one at a time, creeping before they walk, experimenting slowly and bewaring of blundering. We cannot afford to blunder when the defence of our country is at stake. This government has an unenviable record for blundering.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Flemming: That is the question for the Prime Minister to answer. Will the suggested changes improve the ability of our defence department to defend the people of Canada properly? The judgment of many senior officers, generals, admirals, air vice-marshals, distinguished in war and peace is no, they will not. The Minister of National Defence, with practically no experience, says yes, they will. The Prime Minister must decide. I appeal to him to make the good, the well-being of the people of Canada the paramount consideration and to let nothing else matter because the good of Canada should override every other consideration.

I return to my comments regarding Bill No. C-243. The members of this committee have a solemn responsibility when they vote. They must be satisfied that what they vote for is in the best interest of Canada and the defence of Canada. Defence has been referred to by Webster as meaning "resistance to and protection from attack". I repeat those words, "resistance to and protection from attack".

The question we all ask ourselves is whether the changes contemplated will strengthen the ability of our defence forces to resist and protect the country from attack. Many opinions have been expressed. Let us submit them to critical examination and then record our opinion by voting. The government have submitted Bill C-243 which does not stand up under critical examination on the basis that it will effect an improvement over the existing

act. It appears to me that they are again guilty of a tampering which will prove to be blundering. I do not believe that the armed forces can be organized for unification in a hurry. I believe it is possible to effect the improvements of integration and still retain the distinguishing and distinguished units, of which there are many, in which many hon. members within sound of my voice have served.

While we acknowledge that equipment and machines play an ever-increasing part in defence, I do not think we can ignore the individual and the part he plays in defence operations. Those advocating changes in the National Defence Act should have in mind the general desirability of appealing to the young men of our country to make a career of the defence of our country. To appeal to young people and to keep recruiting and enlistment on a proper basis it is necessary that young men be able to select the service of their choice and wear a uniform indicating the particular service in which they choose to serve. It is an elementary part of freedom that people select their vocations in life. In the free world we emphasize the right of young men and women to select their lifetime occupations. The record of productivity in the United States and Canada illustrates the wisdom of this feature of our social and economic life.

Where the uniforms of sailors, airmen and soldiers are of the same colour, material and design it is difficult to distinguish one branch of the forces from another, and this will discourage recruiting. Some young men will lose interest in joining. Most young people have natural aptitudes and work best at what they like to do. This bill makes little appeal to our young people to use their talents in the service of their choice and may prevent them from making the maximum contribution toward their own happiness. The bill should make a career in the armed services attractive and it does not do so. It should provide for the saving of money on certain things and it has not done so. It has been said that a certain percentage of money will be saved but according to documents tabled expenditures on defence show an increase of over $100 million over last year's figure.

This bill ought to be so drafted that it will improve the efficiency of the defence forces. The minister says it will do that but many senior officials say it will not. Many senior officers appeared before the standing committee during its 50-odd meetings. Many, with long experience and knowledge respecting military matters, said that this measure will not increase efficiency and will not effect an improvement. That was the opinion of distinguished soldiers, sailors and airmen who fought in the war, who have served their country in peace and war. They deserve better than to have reflections cast on them by anyone. I have more confidence in the judgment of these experienced senior officers than I have in that of the minister at the present time.

• (3:40 p.m.)

To summarize, I have made the point I wished to make. I have said I do not feel that the National Defence Act should be tampered with unless an improvement will result. This bill will not have that effect. Remember, we in this committee are tampering with the defence of Canada, something which does not deserve to be treated lightly. I submit that many portions of the bill are premature, ill-conceived and ill-considered. The measure should not be supported in its entirety. It will not improve the ability of the defence department to perform its proper function, the defence of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hopkins: Mr. Chairman, new ideas are not easily come by nor do they develop overnight. New ideas are not put into practice easily because invariably they conflict with traditions and with customs. In the circumstances surrounding the issue before us there is ample opportunity to discuss the theory of change, social and political conflict, and the moulding of new practice.

For some time now we have been in the thick of this debate on the unification of the armed forces of Canada. It is gratifying to me to travel around my riding and hear people express their opinions on the unification issue. There is a great desire to see us get on with the passage of the bill because, as many people have stated to me, there has been enough discussion, enough repetition. It is now time for a final decision to be made and for consequent action to follow.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hopkins: I do not profess to be a military expert, nor do I pretend to be a pessimist about change. As I am not a military expert it is not my intention to discuss all the technicalities that are more familiar to military minds. I feel, however, that there are many

things beyond and surrounding this issue which should be brought out at this time.

First, I want to say something concerning the young people of Canada. In his speech in the house last Monday the hon. member for Kamloops indicated that we should get on with the job of building the kind of forces which, when it is necessary to call upon them, will repeat, with the same morale, the same splendid tradition, feats such as those at Vimy Ridge to which we have just paid tribute. Regardless of the way in which the hon. member for Kamloops intended these remarks, I would like to say that we of my generation and those of the younger generation following us, regard the veterans of Vimy Ridge and all veterans of both world wars with pride and with the greatest respect. Many of the young people of Canada today are the sons, daughters or grandchildren of those world war veterans who served with distinction in Canada's armed forces.

There is a point here which must be made and must be clearly understood if we are to be fair to those young people of our country who were under age and were not able to serve in the second world war. I know I can say without reservation that if the young people of Canada were today called upon in an emergency to defend their country, to defend their freedom and the freedom of others, they would rise to the challenge in the same manner as did their predecessors in the second world war and in the first world war. They would do so without hesitation because they have pride in their country and because they would be anxious to uphold the outstanding record of the servicemen who are serving Canada today and the veterans who have served Canada at some time in the past.

A very broad look should be taken at the bill as a whole in the light of many other military decisions which have been taken at the political level. A case in point close to home was the great debate which occurred as a result of the Laurier government's introduction and subsequent passage of the naval bill in 1909 and 1910. As we are all aware, it was Laurier's intention to construct a Canadian navy for the protection of Canadian coastal waters. This would have released ships of the British navy for full time service in that navy, and in the event of a large scale war the Canadian navy could have been placed under the command of the British navy.

Premier Roblin of Manitoba called the proposed Canadian navy a "tin-pot navy". The Conservative opposition took up this cry

[Mr. Hopkins.]

in many areas of Canada. The naval issue, combined with the reciprocity issue and the controversy surrounding them, resulted in Laurier going down to defeat in 1911. The Borden government decided not to proceed with the building of a Canada navy but instead, to make an outright $35 million donation to Britain for the purpose of building dreadnoughts. The bill for that purpose was passed by this house but was defeated in the Senate by the Liberal senators who still favoured the building of a Canadian navy. Possibly the one really gratifying aspect of this debate is that hon. members opposite are standing up in this house and recognizing the Canadian navy which was really the brainchild of Sir Wilfrid Laurier shortly after the turn of this century.

The passing of certain traditions is a difficult thing for some people to face. It is not my intention to rub salt in any wounds. I am, however, going to point out that many great decisions have been made in the past and that society is still in operation in spite of all the controversy and the gloomy predictions which have surrounded issues, such as the one before us at this time. Time changes many things. The hon. member for Chicoutimi cited some very good examples in his speech the other day. The predecessors of members opposite spoke against a Canadian navy 50 years ago. Today we hear statements from members opposite defending the status quo in respect of the navy. At the same time, several members opposite are determined to defeat this bill dealing with unification of Canada's armed forces just as their predecessors were determined to defeat the naval bill. I submit that at some time in the future this house may well hear some of their successors speak favourably in regard to the legislation now before us providing for the unification of the armed forces of Canada just as hon. members opposite are now supporting the status quo in the Canadian navy to which their predecessors in the Conservative party refused to give birth some 50 years ago.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I would like to submit some other examples to show how difficult it has been to overcome opposition to military change in the past. All of us are quite aware of the mud, mire and wire conditions of the battlefields in France in world war I. In 1916 top military personnel were demanding more men to throw into the slaughter. Many others recognized that only some new technique of combat could break the stalemate of trench warfare. A small

group in Britain was promoting the idea of a new weapon called the tank. In order to make the construction of tanks possible Churchill allocated naval funds to the project. In this connection I would like to quote the following from page 748 of the Encyclopedia Britannica:

> In July 1917 despite Tory protests Lloyd George appointed Churchill minister of munitions. In that post he was able to stimulate production of the tank, the decisive weapon of world war I, the development of which he had largely inspired at the Admiralty.

Churchill's success in getting the tank into operation on the battlefields of France saved the lives of thousands of soldiers and was instrumental in bringing the war to a close at a much earlier date. Yet he had to overcome vehement personal criticism and strong opposition.

As I said at the beginning of my speech, new ideas are not easy to come by nor do they develop overnight. If we take a look at France between the two world wars we find that in 1926 de Gaulle was given the task of re-examining the whole military position along France's northeastern frontiers over which had flowed in past centuries so many tides of invasion.

I quote from a book written by Duncan Grinnell-Milne, "The Triumph Of Integrity":

> Throughout 1926, applying his now profound knowledge of military history and science—

The author is speaking of de Gaulle.

> —he studied to devise a fortified line that should not only protect France, but would also provide, should ever the eastern enemy attack again, suitable bases for a spearhead thrust into Germany. By French military authorities the first part of the plan was readily accepted. A "line of fortifications" —did it not embody the lessons of recent war?

His seniors were convinced that the fortified line must be built but they were also convinced that suitable bases for a spearhead thrust should not be built because they failed to recognize the importance of it. In vain de Gaulle protested subsequently that this was only half the plan, that to the shield must be added a sword. The defence minister, one named Maginot, saw to it that de Gaulle was overruled.

Throughout the years 1932 and 1933, even though trouble was brewing in Germany, France's prestige and prosperity were riding high and the military chiefs were complacent because of their pride in their army which consisted of a possible five million men. To exemplify the attitude of leading French military men of the time, I quote an appropriate paragraph from the same book, "The Triumph Of Integrity":

> It was not that they slept, those military chiefs, at least not then. Dazzled by too much sunshine, they might blink myopically at progress, but they were wide awake to the supposed requirements of their beloved army. Against it Germany could do nothing. Everything was ready. Fifteen years after the war they had absorbed all its lessons, so that now they were well prepared to achieve victory in the pattern of 1914, as in 1914 they had been ready to achieve it in the pattern of 1870. No one could teach them anything new; adulation had made them dangerously over-confident. Looking proudly to their defences, they forgot to look to the future.

There are a couple of other paragraphs I would like to refer to showing that among the first with de Gaulle who had this concept were General Fuller and Captain Liddell Hart in England. As the book says, they were among the first:

> —to grasp the idea of using a large force of tanks (and other arms) independently of the infantry which hitherto they had been employed only to support; a force of armour to be regarded not so much as cavalry, but rather as it might be a squadron of warships with auxiliaries, compact, self-supporting, under its own commander. He—

Meaning de Gaulle.

> —was certainly the first in France to develop the idea in detail, to lay down the composition of the unit, the "armoured division", to describe its organization, and then to examine its purpose and vast strategic possibilities in modern war. In this examination, and in the logical conclusions he drew from it, he led the world.

At that time de Gaulle wrote a book recommending the formation of six mobile divisions to go along with the Maginot line as the sword. He was turned down by his superiors. He wrote an excellent book outlining his whole program, but so great was the confidence in the senior military personnel of France in that day in the establishment, in military circles, that the book sold only 750 copies. But three of those copies found their way into Germany and into the hands of a very intelligent German colonel. Receiving this information first hand and studying de Gaulle's plans this German colonel, after receiving consent from his superiors, went ahead and organized the very Panzer division that was the first one to set foot on French soil in 1940. Yet de Gaulle was not listened to because his ideas were new and strange.

This is why I rise today to speak of these things that have happened in military history in the past because sometimes we get tied up in the middle of these debates. We become highstrung. We make insinuations and remarks that are anything but kind, but when

we are in the middle of dealing with a piece of legislation like this we must look at it with a sense of perspective. Who is to say today what is going to happen 20, 30 or 40 years from now?

Mr. Churchill: Paul Hellyer.

Mr. Hopkins: We cannot, but on the basis of what we know in the present and the things that point to trends in the future surely this is where our judgment must lie. I want to make the point very clear that in bringing in a new piece of legislation like this it is very easy for certain individuals to insinuate that those who are in favour of the legislation do not look with favour on those who fought for their country in the past. I should like to say that such insinuations are absolute nonsense and should not enter into this debate. I do not think there is a member in this House of Commons who does not have the greatest respect and regard for anyone who has ever fought for this country or for world freedom in general.

• (4:00 p.m.)

An hon. Member: It did not sound like that in the committee.

Mr. Hopkins: Certain remarks are being made across the way which are typical. They do not bother me.

Mr. Danforth: They are factual.

Mr. Hopkins: I should like to refer to the speech I delivered in the house a few weeks ago in which I paid tribute to the veterans in this House of Commons with whom I deem it an honour to sit as a member. When the second world war ended I was 15 years old. During the hearings of the defence committee reference was made to members of the committee who did not have any military service. This is the type of remark which I think is uncalled for.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hopkins: I might ask at this stage whether anyone who would make a statement of that kind is insinuating that there should have been another world war since the last one so that those of us who were too young for the last war could have had an opportunity to have military service. We must remember that there are a large number of young people across this country today who have never had military service. But that does not mean to say that they do not have the opportunity to run for parliament and take part in the proceedings of any committee of this house as they choose. Surely this is what our Canadian veterans fought for, so that the young people of Canada could have that privilege.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hopkins: Great issues in the history of any nation have been debated in the past on the merits of the proposals. When we are in the middle of debate a great many doubts are stated. On the other hand, many statements are made in defence of proposals. There is one thing we must remember when we are so engaged. Time heals, but the passing of time does not produce progress unless there is planning for the future. This bill plans for the future on the basis of what we know today. Members of this house in the future will have to bring about changes on the basis of their experience in the house. This bill does not throw disdain on anyone who has walked the military paths before.

I should like to leave these thoughts with the committee. We must look at this bill in perspective. Out of this debate must come a sense of mutual respect for the views of various members of the house. I do not think there is very much ground for some of the personal attacks we have heard on the floor of the house. I hope that as we continue with the debate on this bill all hon. members will address their remarks to the merits of the bill as a whole or to the clauses in the clause by clause discussion. The Canadian people today are saying; Get on with the business of the House of Commons.

An hon. Member: This is the business.

Mr. Hopkins: Let us discuss the matter—

An hon. Member: You have not been home lately.

Another hon. Member: Thank you, teacher.

Mr. Hopkins: Let us discuss the matter, keep personal conflict out of it, and consider the merits. Someone on the other side just made the remark, "Thank you, teacher". I hope I have taught my lesson well, Mr. Chairman.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Chairman, I believe all of us were interested to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Renfrew North when he said that it is the view of those on the government side that we should get on with the business

of the house and that the people of this country are saying: Get on with the business of the house. I happened to be a member of this house 11 years ago when another famous debate, the pipe line debate, took place. At that time the matter being debated was not whether or not Canada should build a pipe line. Every member of the house agreed that it should be built and that it should be a Canadian pipe line. The question under discussion at that time was whether or not the government had the right to deny essential information to the representatives of the people. That was the issue and the only issue.

At that time Mr. Howe and all hon. members on the Liberal side of the house kept telling opposition members that it was their duty to stop the debate, back down, and agree with what the Liberal government was trying to cram down the throats of opposition members. They said we should get on with the business of the house. It turned out that they had completely misread the feelings of the people of Canada. As was demonstrated in the election of 1957, the people deeply resented the fact that the then government would not provide information which the opposition had a right to require it to give. For that reason that government was thrown out of office unceremoniously.

Now we hear the same old Liberal call—get on with the business of the house; do not interfere with what we want to do. We know what is best for you; we know what is best for the armed services. Do not interfere with us. We have all the answers, and if anybody in the armed services dares to disagree with us and tell you anything different from what we say, they will get their marching orders very quickly indeed.

Three years ago when the minister presented his white paper we were told that this measure of unification would give us a more effective and more efficient defence at less cost. Let us take a look at the results that are becoming apparent today because of the proposed or actual introduction of this measure in respect of the armed services. In this regard it is impossible for us to obtain any answers from the minister, the government or the minister's officials. I have made a point of speaking to a great many members of the armed services. I did not speak to them on the parade ground or anywhere where they could be overheard by agents of the minister and his officials. I spoke to officers, non-commissioned officers and men of our armed services in very large numbers in their own homes where they could talk, say what they think about this whole measure and state whether they think it is good or bad. I have had an almost unanimous expression of opinion by a great number of these men in all ranks in the various services along the following lines.

• (4:10 p.m.)

First of all, Mr. Chairman, they do not like losing their identity as a service. They join a particular branch of the services because they like its history and traditions. These are proud men and they want to continue to serve in that branch with its ranks and uniform. Some of these men have served for many years and they do not like the way the unification program is being put into effect. This is a very sore point so far as members of the armed forces are concerned. They cannot find anyone of any rank who can tell them what will happen to their particular branch of the service in the future. Very often when they make inquiries they are told that no one knows the answers and if they do not like the situation they should get out on civvy street and look for something else. Very often they make these inquiries of politicians and are told the same thing.

Because I have an admiration for the men in our armed services and feel that they must be protected I advise them to carry on and remain in the services while we try to convince this stupid and perverse cabinet to change its mind. I have told these people that I cannot believe the government could persist in this kind of stupidity. Surely in some way we can push some sense into the heads of those stubborn government members who, for reasons known only to themselves, are trying to shove a measure through which obviously cannot and will not work. It is nothing more than an exercise in futility.

When the minister presented his white paper in 1964 he said that as a result of his program we would have a more efficient and effective force at less cost. It is apparent today that the cost of maintaining our armed forces has increased by $161 million per year. I suggest that this is only the beginning of the increase in the cost of maintaining our armed forces. What will happen when the minister has really had a chance to implement his program? I suggest that the cost will soar and that our forces will become less efficient and effective.

The minister, as I said, suggested that his program would result in a more effective and efficient service at less cost. Let me ask the minister, who considers he is among the

world's greatest military thinkers, why all of the great powers of the world who have considered the idea of unification have turned it down as cold as a mackerel. I suggest these great powers are aware of two things. They know that unification will not work and will not increase the efficiency and effectiveness of an armed service. They realize that a uniform and an identity have great meaning to fighting men.

If we persist in unifying our three services, there could be only one possible advantage. That would be that it we are a few thousand men short in the navy we could bring in replacements from the army or the air force. Obviously that is the only advantage which unification could bring. The minister has not referred to any other advantage and no one else claims there is another advantage. Obviously this idea of easy transfer of personnel is not practical.

In this day and age each member of the armed forces, regardless of the branch to which he belongs, has been trained in a specialty. The tasks performed by our service personnel are complex and specialized. If we move a man or woman who has been trained in one specialty in one branch of our services to another branch we will lose the advantage gained by that specialized training as well as the many thousands of dollars required to retrain that individual. The day of the man-at-arms is past.

It must be obvious to the members of the government that one sure result of unification will be the loss of morale, which in turn will lessen the effectiveness and efficiency of our armed forces. Morale is built up as a result of historical tradition and uniform identification. These things mean a great deal to people who have been in combat, although perhaps little to those who have not.

Let me elaborate on that point. Any man who has been in combat, whether in the navy, army or air force, knows fear. No matter how many times a man has been under fire he knows fear, and anyone who suggest differently does not know the facts. It would be unnatural for a member of our armed services to go into battle without knowing fear. It would be unnatural for anyone to charge out of a trench, fly a bomber through burning flak or man a ship during a bombardment without some degree of fear. In order for our service personnel to serve efficiently they must have high morale, made up of a love for family, for their country, and for the tradition of their units. These men need a lot going for them in order to be efficient during a combat.

The minister can well afford to sit there and laugh because he does not and cannot know about these things. Let me assure him that these things are true. He can doubt my word about other matters but in this regard what I am saying is accurate. The minister laughs because he does not think our fighting forces need morale in order to carry out their functions efficiently and obtain their objectives. He laughs because he does not think those men who were wounded and those who died in battles required these things. He thinks these things are unnecessary and that our forces can be effective even though we put them all in Coca-Cola uniforms and make them as alike as peas in a pod. How does the minister know? Of course it makes a lot of difference.

• (4:20 p.m.)

If we ever get into another combat the men under the minister's command will have to have a great deal going for them. They will have to have pride of self, pride of country, pride of unit and pride of service in order to push themselves forward. If you take away some of these things, as the minister is proposing, you take away their ability to perform well. If you take these things away from our armed forces personnel you will destroy the armed forces' objectives and their whole ability to do the job. We as Canadians, like everybody else in the free world, are in favour of preserving peace. There is only one good, sure way to preserve peace and that is to make it known to possible aggressors that we and our allies are so strong, have so much will to resist, so much power to resist, that our services are so well trained and their morale is so high, that if they try to gain their objectives through force we can hurt them far more than they can hurt us.

Everybody knows why there is not an atomic war today and will not be an atomic war. It is not that people have no desire to drop atomic bombs; it is simply because those who might be tempted to do so know perfectly well that they will be hit many times harder than they could possibly hit us. Logic tells them not to start an atomic war. That is why germ warfare, which we were told would be the deciding factor in the last world war, was never started. Both sides knew they would be hurt at least as much as they could hurt the enemy. If those who started the first two world wars had realized the will, power and ability to resist of the allied forces in

1914 and 1939 we would not have had those world wars. That is why those of us who have had something to do with the services seriously urge the minister, not for political motives but because we as Canadians want our armed forces to be as efficient as possible, not to weaken the ability of the services. We should show possible aggressors that we are a strong, able link in the allied chain. Possible aggressors should never be tempted to try to go through a weak spot. They must realize that we have the morale, the weapons and the men to stop them and that we will fulfil our task as we have so ably in two world wars.

The people in our armed services today are the finest you will find anywhere. They want to be able to resist an aggressor and do just as good a job as their brothers, fathers and grandfathers did in the first two world wars. The reducing of their morale, which is what the minister is doing with this proposal, is greatly resented by them. They resent the fact that their future ability will be weakened, because if they ever have to do this terrible job again they want to do it well.

If morale in our forces is not what it should be we might be considered a weak enough link that a potential aggressor might take a chance and start a war, as was done in 1914 and 1939 when, I am told, 16 million members of the allied forces were killed. These are the serious matters we put before the minister. We put them before him seriously because we love our country. Those of us who have had some connection with the armed forces know that they want to continue to do the job that should be done. We do not appreciate it when the minister sits over there so smugly and smiles and laughs when we tell him what we must do to ensure that our forces are able to do their job well. The minister sits back when we tell him these things and snickers and laughs because he does not care. The fact is that he does not know, he does not understand and he tries to cover it up by laughing, smirking and smiling. The minister is insulting the men in his armed services who want to do a job for Canada.

An hon. Member: Don't go too far, gorgeous.

Mr. Hees: I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that those of us who have served in the armed forces, who have members of the forces as constituents and have talked to them in their own homes and know them well, know that these people are as fine Canadians as one can find. We know that the men in the forces want to make a real career of the service. They want to stay in the armed services to do the job. If they join the navy they want to be in the navy, if they join the air force they want to be in the air force, if they join the army they want to be in the army.

These men want to know that there is a future for them in the services. If they ask a sergeant, lieutenant, flight lieutenant or naval lieutenant, "what is the future for me in our service, where are we going", I tell you, Mr. Minister, that their officers are not able to tell them because they do not know. It has not come down from the top. Nobody seems to know where the armed services are headed. They want to know. They do not want to waste their time in a career that is going to collapse. They want to know where their particular service is going. The minister has not told them because I do not think he knows.

I would like the minister to answer this question before the debate ends. Lieutenant General Moncel said when giving testimony before the defence committee that if we continue our present commitments in NATO, NORAD and the United Nations we will require an additional force of some 50,000 men and an additional expenditure of $500 million a year. I do not know anybody in this country better able to give these facts than General Moncel, a brilliant soldier, an honest soldier and a man who I say is telling the truth. If he is not telling the truth, I want the minister to say in what way he is not telling the truth. If the minister says General Moncel is wrong, I want him to tell us whether he is completely wrong and that the figure is 10,000 men, 15,000, or whatever it is. If General Moncel is wrong about the additional expenditure that he says will be required, I want the minister to show us just how wrong he is. I believe that General Moncel is right, because I know him and can state that he is one of the most brilliant soldiers this country has had. I think the minister would agree with that. General Moncel would not make such a statement if he did not mean it.

I ask the minister: Where are we going in this area? Are we going to fulfil our present commitments, as the Secretary of State for External Affairs said we were in his speech the other day? If we are going to do our job in NATO, NORAD and the United Nations, are we going to do it on the same scale as in the past or are we going to do it in a smaller way? Do we intend to let the United States

come in and take over on Canadian soil? Do we intend to fulfil the commitments that we undertook in the NORAD operation? The Canadian people want answers to these questions. They want to know whether this government intends to humiliate them by having nationals of another country come in here and giving them the right to operate on our soil and do our defence job for us. I want to hear from the minister whether there is any inclination to do this. Are we going to continue our operations in NATO, NORAD and the United Nations on the same scale and not withdraw from these organizations in any way, shape or form? The public have a right to know these things. These are the things that this minister, like Mr. C. D. Howe exactly 11 years ago today, refuses to tell the Canadian people.

The minister sits and smirks, laughs and smiles. Mr. C. D. Howe used to do quite a bit of the same thing. I had a great respect and liking for Mr. C. D. Howe. He made only one mistake. He believed he had the right to run parliament and tell parliament what it should do, ignoring the wishes of the Canadian people. That was his mistake and it was the reason for his personal defeat exactly one year later. It defeated his government one year later. I tell this minister that if he persists in this kind of thing he and his party will suffer a great defeat when we go to the country. This is what happened one year later in the case of Mr. C. D. Howe.

• (4:30 p.m.)

The pipe line issue did not come before the electorate in 1956 but in 1957, and the minister knows very well what happened at that time because it happened to him personally and to a great many of his colleagues. I can tell him that if he is going to continue to kick the armed services around as if they were his own private football because he believes that this is the thing to do, it will not be long before his government will receive exactly the same treatment as did the great St. Laurent government in 1957 when on the night of June 10 they suddenly found themselves ousted.

I suggest to the minister and the government that they should now give an answer to the questions which have been put by me, by all of my colleagues in the house, and by the people of Canada. This is nothing new. We have demanded answers on behalf of the people of Canada and of the service personnel. We ask the government to give us the answers. The sooner it gives them the better. If they

[Mr. Hees.]

are not satisfactory answers, if the government cannot produce proof of a good purpose in upsetting the whole armed service personnel, if it cannot prove that it will improve our armed service operations, and thereby bring about savings, as the minister said, then there is only one honourable course and that is to withdraw the bill immediately.

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, it had not been my intention to take part in this debate until I heard the Minister of National Defence make the following remark the other night just before the closing of the house at ten o'clock; "Tomorrow we will carry on with this fascinating debate". I decided then and there that I should take part in this fascinating debate. May I also remind hon. members of what was said by the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) when he concluded his remarks on Tuesday, April 11, as recorded at page 14778 of *Hansard*. He said:

> The opposition undoubtedly has a duty to perform and as everyone knows I have never questioned that. But I am questioning it now. There is considerable, though as I have said perhaps unintentional, danger if we persist with this debate much longer. I think it can rightly be claimed that the opposition has played the game and has put up a fair fight with tangible and valuable results.

I believe that this debate has been worth while. I think that all the members of parliament who have been elected to the House of Commons feel very deeply about the unification bill, and I am sure that hon. members on our side of the house have opposed this issue in a most sincere and dedicated way. The members of the defence committee sat through 55 meetings of that committee over the course of the past two months. I am sure our members participated in those meetings in a very dedicated and sincere manner because they felt they were fighting in defence of a good cause.

I believe that the members of the armed services who were called before the defence committee were outstanding witnesses. I want to make it quite clear at the outset that I was not a member of the defence committee nor have I been a member of the armed services, apart from a short period of time. Owing to circumstances beyond my control I did not stay in the services. However, I wish to point out that if I had taken part in world war II, like all other members of the services, I would have wanted to join a particular group. By this I mean that I would have wanted to serve in the army, the navy or the air force. I believe the hon. member for Northumberland who has just finished speaking described the

differences among the three services in a most striking way. I intend to refer to this a little later. I believe this is one of the basic reasons for opposing unification.

I should like to refer to an article which I came across in the last day or two. It is an editorial which appeared in the Winnipeg *Free Press* of Wednesday, April 4, 1967. I will not read all of it but I wish to quote one paragraph. It is entitled, "Destroying Defence". It sets out one of the main reasons I am taking part in this debate. Another reason is that I will have to stand up and be counted in the House of Commons when the vote on this issue is taken. The paragraph reads as follows:

> As members of parliament cast their votes in support or rejection of Mr. Hellyer's bill, they must surely recognize the grave responsibility they bear individually. It is a question that far transcends both politicking and party. Canadians will not lightly forgive or forget if our defence structure is thoughtlessly dismembered. This ill-advised step could, by a single act of parliament, sponsored by an inexperienced minister, tear down and destroy proven services which have been built with the sacrifice and efforts of Canadians in the past hundred years and more. The reputation, character, efficiency and traditions of Canada's regular and militia units have been won and tested in action in battlefields in Europe, Asia and Africa, in the sea lanes of the North Atlantic and in the bombing and fighter missions in the air. They have been carefully designed and organized to work in the closest possible harmony with our two major allies, Great Britain and the United States.

I think that this is the decision we as members have to take. We will have to make a decision on the change which will be brought about in regard to the service personnel on whom we have relied over the years to volunteer to fight for our country.

I believe that very few people, if any, oppose integration with regard to arrangements for the paying of personnel and the provision of food supplies, clothing and equipment. I am not in favour of a common uniform and I have very definite opinions about this. There is no argument that integration of the services would bring about greater economy in the provision of these essential services for the different sections of our armed forces.

As I said, I was not a member of the defence committee although I sat in on some of the meetings and I have read some of the evidence with great interest. I realize that many members of the house on both sides have served with distinction in different branches of the services. Many members on this side of the house who have served in the forces with distinction have put forward outstanding arguments for opposing unification. It is my belief that not too many people oppose the idea of integration in purchasing the essential products used by all branches of the services. I think this is only good, common sense.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I should like to refer to the history and background of one of the witnesses called by the defence committee to illustrate that the witnesses were dedicated men from the time they first joined the forces having gone through the officers' training school. I refer in particular to the evidence of Lieutenant General Fleury, to be found at page 1489 of minutes of proceedings and evidence No. 24. He said:

> Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, I took my first faltering step in the military service when I joined the Canadian Officers Training Corps in 1929. I stayed with the C.O.T.C. for some five years; then I returned to it a couple of years later, early 1937, and I was still an officer in C.O.T.C. when war broke out. At this point I held the rank of captain. I was adjutant of a training centre at Farnham, Quebec. I went overseas in 1941 where I took up the appointment of adjutant in a reinforcements unit. The following year I was posted to the Canadian military headquarters in London, where I stayed on the staff until November 1943, then I went on staff to Italy in the rank of major. I was returned to London as the military secretary of C.M.H.Q. in the spring of 1944. I returned from overseas after V.E. day in 1945 with the rank of colonel.

That discloses Lieutenant General Fleury's record and the positions he held during the last war. He continued:

> Since the war I have been director of personnel, director of organization and vice-quartermaster general at army headquarters Ottawa for various periods. I was also the chief of staff, prairie command, Winnipeg; commander Canadian military mission Far East, 1950-51; commander Eastern Quebec area 1951-56; general officer commanding Quebec command 1961-65.

As a result of his vast experience he was ordered to Ottawa, promoted to lieutenant general and appointed comptroller general of the newly integrated Canadian forces headquarters. He concluded:

> I retired a few months ago and my legal status at the moment is that of an officer on leave pending retirement.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the background of one of the witnesses and explains why he was finally promoted to the position of comptroller general of the defence forces in Ottawa.

Another point is that we should ask ourselves some of the basic questions of concern to the people of Canada, especially those on whom we rely to constitute our armed forces.

As I have already said, I do not think integration is a great issue but, as the hon. member for Northumberland said a few minutes ago, I believe there is one basic problem with integration. I have talked to many service personnel across Canada during the last year or two and I have come to the conclusion that these men are dedicated to the service of their country. They want to serve in the armed forces of Canada but they want to be free to make their choice. Many men are army-oriented. They love the army, want to serve in it and join that branch of the armed forces for that reason. On the other hand, there are many young men, particularly in this day and age, who have a flair for flying, just as was the case between 1914 and 1918 when the old R.F.C. was formed. There were many young men during the last war who wanted to fly and that was the basic reason they joined the air force. They desired to be in the air when they took part in the defence of their country. Personally I had two brothers who served in the air force.

I suggest, that the minute we take away from the men who volunteer to serve in this country's defence forces the privilege of joining the particular service they desire to serve, we destroy a basic principle. I believe that such action would lead to conscription sooner than any of us realize.

There has been a lot of publicity during the last few months given to young Americans who arrive in Toronto from the United States. I happen to know personally one man who came from the United States for no other reason than to avoid being conscripted into the American army. I suggest that this could very well happen in Canada; I think there is no argument about it. For example, some men have a genuine desire to serve on ships. But today, if this bill passes, they will join "Canada's armed services"—period.

As I say, some of our young men want to be pilots. Personally, if I had to join the services and I thought I would end up serving on water you would never get me into the services. I am sure this feeling is typical among young men today. If this bill goes through I am satisfied, as I said before, that we will destroy the fundamental freedom of choice on the part of the volunteers who join the services.

I confess I do not know the difference between integration and unification, though I have had it explained to me many times. I have talked with a military friend of mine from the west who said he really did not understand it either. I freely admit that I do not understand it. One hon. member said in this chamber the other night that integration and unification are like conception and childbirth, but I do not think that integration is nearly as simple as that.

• (4:50 p.m.)

I shall now put on record some of the reasons for the resignation of Lieutenant General Fleury a man of 52 who retired three years prematurely. As found on page 1490 of the proceedings of the committee, the hon. member for Vancouver East was questioning and in reply Lieutenant General Fleury said:

> I myself held an integrated position in headquarters for just under a year, from the fall of 1965 to the summer of 1966. There had been over the years a good deal of consideration—possibly more consideration than action—toward integration. I had always felt that the armed forces would benefit by a much greater degree of integration than was the situation in 1964. I think it would not be unfair to say that I was a supporter, maybe even an enthusiastic supporter, of the principle of integration. I have noticed, particularly in recent months, that the terms "integration" and "unification" seem to get confused and indeed, sometimes—have been treated as synonyms, which of course they are not, in my lexicon. Does that answer your question?
>
> Mr. Winch: It is a nice start, sir. To your latest knowledge, has integration been successful, with its faults, and should it be pursued per se?

Lieutenant General Fleury answered:

> I can speak from personal and more or less official knowledge only up until the 15th day of July last, when I relinquished my appointment as quartermaster general.

Farther on he said:

> I meant to say comptroller general. Up to a point shortly before the 15th of July, I thought we were on the right road. I thought that the integration of the three services headquarters in Ottawa was a good thing because it would increase the efficiency of the armed forces, because it should save money, and because it would bring the three services closer together.
>
> I began to have considerable misgivings about the direction and speed of integration some weeks at least, if not months ... I came to realize, or I thought I came to realize, that things were being done under the cloak of integration which really were not part of the integration process at all. I discovered to my surprise, because this was not my first tour in Ottawa—it was my fourth—that communications were very bad within the headquarters, and between the headquarters and the commanders in the field. I found that the tried and true channels of communication which had been the warp and woof of navy, army and air force procedures in chain of command for decades had largely been discarded. I found that officers working for me knew more, or said they knew more, or thought they knew more, about what was in the mind of the minister than I did. I found that security information as I knew it, was practically non-existent. The whole headquarters reminded me of a giant sieve. I saw evidence of disloyalty,

and near disloyalty, in some people to the point literally that on one, two or three occasions a week, I would sit at my desk and feel like vomiting. I decided after all these years that this was an atmosphere, that these were conditions under which I could no longer conscientiously serve, and I asked for my retirement.

This sort of thing takes place not only at the top of the service rank structure but all through that structure. People become fed up, decide to leave and they go. We will have problems in securing the personnel for our forces.

The end result of this measure can only be more disunity, more confusion, than we have today. This bill will not bring about savings within the Department of National Defence. It has been said today that the money spent in that department has increased in amount year by year. I am sure that expenditures will continue to rise. It is interesting to note that the Minister of National Defence sent a gilt-edged book, which cost $5,398 to produce, to leading people in this country in an attempt to convey his message. The minister in so many words said: I believe this bill will do wonderful things. I do not share his view and I feel that I have no alternative except to vote against the principle of unification.

To return to a point I tried to make previously, young men join our forces voluntarily. When they join they join a particular branch of the services. They like to be known by their uniform. We see a similar attitude reflected among people joining service clubs. There must be some reason for people prefering to wear different blazers, pins and emblems to distinguish them from the members of other clubs. Similarly, personnel of the forces like to wear uniforms which distinguish them from others in the forces. If that privilege is taken from them they may not want to join.

I say we are going in the wrong direction. I urge the minister to delay this measure to see if we cannot arrive at an equitable solution acceptable to the men, to our people, to members of parliament and to all those Canadians who will have to carry this program through.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Howe (Wellington-Huron): Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few comments on this important piece of legislation which creates an about-turn in an important department, for many years one of the prestige departments in the government of Canada. I had not intended to take part in this debate because I felt that after all the days of discussion, after all the committee meetings, after all the information obtained from representatives of the armed services, members of this house and others, the government would reconsider this legislation and withdraw it or amend it so as to make it more acceptable to the armed services and to the people of Canada.

I enter the debate today, however, for a couple of reasons. First, I feel that this legislation is similar in many ways to a great deal of the legislative program on which the government is priding itself these days. So much of it has a certain degree of finality attached to it. In other words, once this legislation is passed and the machinery is set in motion that will destroy the traditions, the insignia and the unity within each branch of the services which have made for the greatest effectiveness in the past, the process will become an accomplished fact. It is almost forever. Those things which have created such effective, friendly rivalry in the past will then have disappeared and our armed services, as one hon. member has said, will become just a grey mass of uninterested and uninteresting individuals.

Perhaps this is the ultimate goal in the eyes of the minister. Perhaps he hopes that nobody anywhere will raise objection to the things he is doing. He would like to see an army of puppets or robots who could be moved by remote control from one place to another. I believe this is what the minister would appreciate. Indeed, it would appear that this is their present role in view of the lack of respect he has paid to the opinions of distinguished officers who have come forward to offer their counsel on this legislation.

I referred earlier to legislative measures passed by the house in the last few years which have had a measure of finality attached to them, measures which have had a tremendous effect on the economy and on the social welfare of this nation. One of them is the Canada Pension Plan which also had a difficult time in the House of Commons. It was brought in and withdrawn time and time again through every phase of its consideration, and it made necessary the passing of two other important pieces of legislation, the Canada Assistance Act and the guaranteed income bill.

This was legislation which put a great strain on the economy. Indeed, the bill to supply a guaranteed income resulted in an increase in the sales tax. So we have every reason to be sceptical about the legislation now before us. One might mention the medicare legislation which had to be amended to

take effect in 1968 instead of 1967 so that the economy would not be overheated. Not only have such measures as these overheated the economy but they have burdened the bookkeeping facilities of the small businessman, the farmer and the pensioner to the point of exasperation. The reason I mention these particular pieces of legislation in connection with the bill before us is that there has definitely grown up around the legislative program on which this government prides itself a great deal of public cynicism. In this connection I could refer to the fanfare which preceded the legislation creating the Canadian Dairy Commission, a commission which in the first year of its operation, whether on its own or by government direction, produced a dairy policy entirely unacceptable to all facets of the dairy industry.

I mention these things because much has been made in this house about the need to think in terms of constant dollars and the contention that in 1961 there was less money spent on defence than there was in the past year in terms of purchasing power. That may be true. But I am critical of the reluctance of the government to do anything to control the decline in value of our dollar. We have watched its purchasing power fall day by day until the people of Canada are wondering how to meet their bills and other commitments.

I speak in this debate in the knowledge that much of what I say will be repetitive. However, having listened to many of the contributions made so far I realize I will not be the first offender. I must say also that I was not a member of the defence committee, nor did I have the honour and privilege of being associated with any part of the armed services, though I do honour to all those in this house and outside who have given distinguished service in this field and to whom so many impassioned and important tributes have been paid in this chamber.

I had hoped that before long the minister would have realized that the opposition, not simply in this house but outside it, by those closely associated with the defence of this nation and even on the part of the general public, was serious in its intent, and that the minister would have taken a second look at this legislation with a view to removing the areas of controversy. Like the hon. member for Northumberland who spoke earlier this afternoon, I am reminded of a debate which took place some years ago in this house and in which I took part. I cannot say the same for the Minister of National Defence. I refer to the defence production debate in 1955.

This, we must recall, was in the era of the trained seals who were kept in subjection by a ministry which had been in power for so long that it did not believe it was necessary to consider the rights or opinions of the people of Canada. In fact things became so bad at one time that the late Hon. James Gardiner, then minister of agriculture, made the statement that as long as the Hon. C. D. Howe and the prime minister of the day, Mr. St. Laurent, remained, we would have exceedingly good government in Canada.

As I say, those were the days of the trained seals when, in practice, three men were acting as the executive. All the others followed along. Events then had a great similarity to those surrounding the present debate. Here we have a minister who in spite of all the criticism and advice given him by knowledgeable individuals and in spite of all the indifference and criticism which is apparent within his own party—most of the Liberal members who have taken part in this debate have done so through the medium of carefully drafted texts—continues stubbornly upon the course he has set himself.

• (5:10 p.m.)

I would say that today we have a new, modern type of trained seals who are allowed to speak in debates of this kind but not freely or openly as they would like. We have a minister who has decided that this bill must be passed in its entirety in spite of any opposition. There were times, Mr. Chairman, when members of the Liberal party spoke out against their own party and ministers, times when they considered they were not being fair or just in their treatment of the House of Commons and the nation. In this connection I refer to a statement made by the late Hon. P. J. A. Cardin, former Liberal minister, on February 9, 1943, after he had broken all ties with his party. I quote from page 282 of *Hansard* for that date:

> We are fighting for liberty, we are fighting for democracy and parliamentary institutions. Yet most of our activities are in the hands of little potentates, men of no experience, dictators in the field that has been given to them for administration.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe that history is repeating itself in this debate. I might also refer to a statement made in the House of Commons by a very distinguished former member who is continuing to distinguish himself in the Senate and who was not afraid to speak out against legislation introduced by his own party. I refer to Hon. Charles Power

who on March 21, 1946, had this to say as recorded at page 172 of *Hansard* for that date:

> We have fought a victorious war after four years. We have talked glibly of the new order which was to follow it, and it almost appears to me as though we the victors had taken on the manners and customs of the vanquished... If this is to be the funeral of Liberalism I do not desire to be even an honorary pall-bearer at the funeral—

These were men of dignity and integrity who were not afraid to speak out against their party when they felt in their own minds that the particular legislation before the house would not be in the interests of the particular area affected or of the nation at large. I am hoping, Mr. Chairman, that the character of the debates of that day will be duplicated.

Perhaps I should remind those who were in the house at that time, and those who were not, of the events that took place. After many days of debate in the house, gradually the press of that day began to realize that the Conservative party was in deadly earnest and that the cause for which it was fighting was a just one in that wartime emergency powers should not be continued forever. Because of these facts public opinion began to be felt and pressures were exerted that brought the prime minister into the act.

The press of that day did not always accuse the opposition of using delaying tactics, of opposing for purely political purposes, as part of it has been doing now. Instead, just as part of the press is doing today it gave us credit for acting as an opposition should act by examining and discussing all legislation with a view to its improvement or better acceptability to the public and, in cases such as this, by preventing the passage of unjust legislation.

I am hoping that the Prime Minister, who I am sure is deeply concerned about this legislation, will take some action. I feel that he has three choices in the action he may decide to take. I hope he will not be swayed by the antics of other ministers and of the Minister of National Defence who threatened to resign because of differences of opinion. There are times when such juvenile actions would place the participants in the class of cry-babies.

The first choice which the Prime Minister has is to amend this legislation and remove the clauses dealing with unification. I suggest that the same procedure could be followed as was followed in 1955 when the minister involved was conveniently sent on a special mission and during his absence the required amendments were approved and the legislation passed.

The second choice the Prime Minister could follow would be to have a free vote in the house. He could take the whips off in order that all members in all parts of the house would be free to express their opinions. Such a move would indicate a truly democratic action on the part of the government and remove the possibility of the overthrow of the government if the measure was defeated.

The final choice is closure. Today we had an indication that this course may be followed. I am sure that every member abhors it as it has the effect of interfering with the truly democratic rights and privileges of this institution.

Mr. Roxburgh: May I ask the hon. member a question? For closure to take place I think he will agree a government has to have a majority. This happens to be a minority government. Therefore how can closure take place with a minority government?

Mr. Howe (Wellington-Huron): I think the hon. member has answered his own question. It can happen in the same way that most legislation is passed by this parliament. It is passed by reason of the fact that the minority government is joined by other groups in the house.

Mr. Roxburgh: Which means a majority of opinion.

Mr. Howe (Wellington-Huron): Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote from the words of a very distinguished individual who was a member of the cabinet for many years. I refer to the late Right Hon. Mackenzie King. This quotation is from a time when he was in opposition in 1920, and it is to be found on page 4540 of *Hansard*:

> The government must be by parliament and through parliament. It must not be carried on by cabinet ministers in their secret chambers. The aim of Liberalism is to seek a wider freedom for the masses in social, political, religious and industrial life, to restore the control of the people over parliament and to restore the control of parliament over the executive.

As the hon. member for Northumberland indicated a few minutes ago, we have a government that wants to push things through the house, a government which went down to defeat in 1957 for that very same reason. We have a minister of the crown who, in spite of all the arguments advanced by the opposition and by interested and knowledgeable individuals outside this chamber, will not budge

one iota or admit that this legislation has been conceived with too much haste. The government should take the sensible course of amending or withdrawing this legislation.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Chairman, Her Majesty's loyal opposition welcomes the present debate. It is the first real opportunity that has been afforded members of parliament to discuss external affairs since the government assumed office almost four years ago. All of us here and people all over Canada know that the government has shunned opportunity after opportunity to provide for a full discussion of Canada's external affairs policy and its demands on defence policy. Its reluctance has been the notable characteristic of the present administration.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs has earned a reputation for evasiveness, a reputation for restriction of discussion, and this attitude has destroyed the unanimity that once characterized Canada's external affairs policy.

• (5:20 p.m.)

The Secretary of State for External Affairs has tried to wrap the function of democracy in a cloak of secrecy so selective that only the government, and perhaps not all government members, could be taken into his confidence. He has made a mockery of the democratic process. He has been able to do this because of the carelessness of the splinter groups within this parliament which place tenure of office above a careful assessment of the situation based on a knowledge of the facts. This minister has harmed and damaged the image of our nation abroad and in the councils of the world wherever they meet.

I believe, sir, that history will record the results as the most glaring shortcoming of the present administration. The failure has been the result of the deliberate decisions taken by a most experienced minister, the Secretary of State for External Affairs. That is the atmosphere in which Canadians and members of parliament have been compelled to resort to speculation concerning the nature and posture of Canada in respect of external affairs and the demands of that policy on Canadian defence policy.

The desire of Canadians for peace and for the solution of international disputes within the rule of law remains unchanged. Our belief in and our dependence on co-operative action by the community of nations as an instrument to preserve peace remains unchanged. Any

Canadian government, even the careless government opposite, can rest assured that parliament will never fail in its responsibility in that regard. Nor would any of us deny our support and prayers for the ideals embodied in the resolution presented at the United Nations which sought the establishment of an international force to implement the observance of the rule of law in respect of international disputes. However, it would be more than charity for any of us to commend the minister for his failure to discern and assess world opinion and his failure to rally that opinion to the objective which all of us applaud.

The failure to attract that support for the government's resolution draws into question the minister's judgment. It draws into question the government's judgment in respect of the matter of timing. I say to you, sir, there are serious students of world affairs who believe that the precipitous haste exhibited by Canada has set back the clock in that regard and even endangered the ultimate achievement of an objective with which Canadians and many other people throughout the world have little quarrel. There are those who have admired the evasiveness of the Secretary of State for External Affairs over the past many months. The minister himself almost appeared to be delighted with his own performance in the house. Parliament has been denied the knowledge upon which a good understanding and a spirit of good will could sprout and flourish. Thus we have before us this measure apparently predicated on the assumption of acceptance of Canada's resolution at the United Nations last fall. Parliament is being asked to commit the Canadian defence effort to a concept which failed to secure endorsation last fall at the United Nations.

The Minister of National Defence had some harsh words for the Leader of the Opposition indicating that he had not pointed out the avenues of information even though they were not readily available from the government opposite. What we attempted to do, without putting it too bluntly or too forthrightly, was to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Minister of National Defence to spell out the basis and premise upon which the government now believes that the resolution it brought forward last fall at the United Nations now stands to gain favour in the councils of the world.

Why this pall of secrecy? Why this reluctance to confide in the Canadian people?

Mr. Macaluso: Did you lose your place?

Mr. Nasserden: Well, I can tell the hon. gentleman opposite that I did not have to have hired help in the gallery to write anything I have to say in this debate today. Why is there this reluctance by the government opposite to provide information to the Canadian people and to parliament? The only logical conclusion certainly is not a pleasant one for Canadians to contemplate. It is not pleasant to think that the decision to proceed with the resolution at the United Nations last fall was ill-fashioned and ill-timed. I ask you, sir, under the circumstances which now prevail and which prevailed at that time, is there any other conclusion that can be reached other than that the government and the minister opposite bungled the whole matter?

The government has placed before us a measure that will bring to an end the character of the Canadian armed forces as it has been known in the past. The government proposes a new concept. This is how it has been described by the Minister of National Defence. Yet the new demands envisioned by the resolution at the United Nations were defeated. That concept was set back by the precipitous haste of this government acting in the name of Canada. Now the parliament of Canada, without a definitive statement from the Prime Minister or from any other minister, is being asked to embark upon what appears to be an equally precipitous course, thereby establishing a new concept within which we will have to live in a world as we find it.

The carelessness for which this government has been famous at home seems to be the same kind of carelessness it has practised abroad. Time after time the government has displayed a lack of foresight and there has always followed a reluctance to take Canadians and parliament into its confidence. The Secretary of State for External Affairs just cannot admit that he could ever be wrong. Indeed, his attitude reminds one of a pyramid of pomposity. From that ineptness we are invited to accept another measure which is now before us. This measure is nothing more than a brazen attempt on the part of the government to bluff their way along, carelessly hoping that the future will take care of their problems.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Reference was made by the Minister of National Defence to the decision to scrap the Arrow aircraft. The minister tried to compare that loss to the losses sustained by Canada because of the respective elements of the defence effort under his proposed legislation. The significant fact of that argument is the admission by the minister that there has been a loss arising from his proposed legislation.

How can this government opposite, in its wildest, most desperate and degenerate dreams, imagine that the foremost bastion and fortress of democracy and freedom would be willing or ready to rest, in the custody of a nation ten times its junior in population, the supremacy of its air power? Does this nation think that it could at this time meet that challenge which must be faced, by the nation upon whom the mantle of final responsibility falls? Canadians are not that ignorant or that ungrateful. The minister brought in a red herring. But the carelessness remains, the carelessness of a minister and a government ready to throw away the heritage, the tradition and the sacrifice of its people in their most challenging hours when life itself was laid down for kin and country.

I cannot speak for those who have fought or died. Nor can I put into words the thoughts and vision that carried them on to victory. I have read some military history and it seems to me that the substance and history of victories throughout the ages has been elusive indeed. A lock of hair caught in a helmet, a patch of colour stitched to a sleeve, a snatch of verse from out of the past, a bar of music or a banner proudly clutched—throughout history the intangible something has been the difference between victory and defeat.

No one will quarrel with the idea of a unified command. That has been and is one of the requirements of modern military science. No one will quarrel with elimination of duplication of supply. Indeed, the standardization of numbers in supply between the services is a worth-while objective and one that should provide some small economies. But the greater benefit would be the elimination of one of the oldest frustrations that must have troubled men in all ranks in all services.

I suppose it is old-fashioned but I like to see the distinctiveness of the various services as indicated by their uniforms—the style and colour and decorations. I do not consider myself a military person but I must confess that recognition of the various units affords me a thrill when I see them. I believe it does something for the enlisted man as well. Why do they choose one service over another? I believe it is the spirit of the service that attracts men and women. It is a delicate quality. I do not think it can be coerced. I believe it may

be cultivated, nourished, cherished, held close beyond the scrutiny of anyone outside that service, and in the final, desperate clinch it will remain an inspiration and command when that is all that makes the difference. That quality of Canadians should not be destroyed or lost or lessened. I do not know whether the minister understands this but it seems to me his duty cannot allow that to happen.

The government made certain presumptions which may have appeared valid at the time but with the passage of time they have proven to be unattainable. Moreover, this measure involves more than the physical substance and form of the armed forces. I would think that the minister has some greatness within him and that he recognizes these facts. Many of us see some desirable aspects in this bill but as its stands we are compelled, with regret, to oppose it and vote against it. I believe it destroys a great deal that is good in our military lore and tradition. I believe it destroys some of our nation's spirit and in its own way it denies some of the sacrifice that was dearly given. I am left cold by the claim of savings to be made with dye for uniforms. I believe that our airmen are distinctive. They have a role in our services not fully known by any other service. The role at sea cannot be compared with that of the other services, and it is a continuing one. When all others have completed their tasks, whom can you substitute for an infantryman? The minister can show his greatness in this matter or he can indicate his arrogance and add to the pinnacle of arrogance with which he has become associated.

Mr. Brand: Mr. Chairman, originally, like many others, I had no intention of entering the debate on Bill C-243. I felt justifiably that the members of the defence committee, at least those on this side of the house, were infinitely more qualified than I to discuss the intricacies of the evidence on this most important matter. I believe my confidence in my colleagues has been confirmed and strengthened by the excellent speeches they have made. As I perused the monumental work of the defence committee I was proud of the exemplary way in which they discharged their duties as Her Majesty's loyal opposition.

What has dismayed me, however, is the epidemic of intransigence that has afflicted the government side. Incidentally, I make no apology for medical references. Indeed, they seem to have become an integral part of this debate. I recall hearing some reference to obstetrical measures by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra who referred to cutting the umbilical cord after a baby is born. This is astounding because presumably the baby would still be in utero. The epidemic seems to have been spread by the minister to almost every member on the government side. One might well ask what the symptoms of this affliction are. I shall delineate them, but first may I hazard a guess that the epidemic started from a germ of an idea which was somehow fully incubated in the laboratory of perhaps an executive assistant. I think it started in that way and has been spread by the minister.

The symptoms of this affliction are, as will become obvious, all mental, and the first is confusion. In this regard one has only to read the words of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra to understand how confusion has become one of the symptoms. The second is vertigo, a medical term which perhaps I had better explain. It means dizziness, going around in circles. We can all recognize immediately that this has been epitomized by the words of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. The third is incoherence. Who else but the Minister of Transport? Fourth, and above all, is intransigence.

• (5:40 p.m.)

What I simply cannot understand is how the government can be so uncompromising in face of the clarity and cogency of the arguments presented by the opposition. Why does the minister have to be contumacious instead of conciliatory? Why is he not sage instead of so stubborn? Surely the words of the military experts before the defence committee have meant something. Surely their years of experience count to a certain degree. Can we simply dismiss their views in a cavalier manner as being hopelessly out of date or are they just out of step with the minister, 'out of step with our Charlie?'

How in heaven's name can the expertise which has been exhibited by so many of the best brains of the armed forces of our country be completely ignored and tossed aside as completely unimportant? Yes, we have heard the evidence. On looking over the evidence one finds that there seems to be a preponderance in favour of delaying the bill, until integration is complete and working well, which from the evidence apparently it is not, until we have a chance to reassess what unification really means, and until we have a chance to plan a proper foreign policy and a proper utilization of the Canadian armed forces in

the framework of such a proper foreign policy. It is inconceivable to me that the words of Canada's foremost experts can be dealt with so cavalierly. I believe their words bear repetition.

But first, what are the real issues before the house and the country today? Surely one of the issues is morale. Another is the savings that may be effected by the proposed unification. Increased efficiency is another. Another is the matter of conscription. Another is, exactly what do we mean by unification? Another is incompatibility with foreign armed services and, most important of all, our ability to meet our commitments with a unified force.

If we turn to the evidence we find that the question of morale was dealt with by the experts who appeared before the committee. I have heard many comments from hon. members on the other side of the house that morale in the forces is fine. As one reads the speeches one finds the minister saying that morale is at an all-time high. The minister is shaking his head. I happen to agree with that shake of the head. Then we listen to hon. members on this side of the house and hear that morale is seriously affected. But when it is discovered that morale is not as good as it was, hon. members on the other side of the house blame us and say we are responsible for it because we are doing our job as a loyal opposition in the House of Commons.

Air Marshal Annis made a comment on morale which is to be found on page 1435 of the proceedings of the committee on national defence. I will not read it all but in part it reads as follows:

> Therefore it is the worry about the morale and the difficulty of acquiring into the services and retaining the hard core people that I worry about. Unification, in my opinion, would have a very difficult psychological impact on them.

He goes on to say that we should have more time, which is a point that has been raised many times in the house. If I may paraphrase his remarks, he points out that unless we have time to see what this program is going to do and to plan properly, the detrimental effect on morale may be incalculable. The last part of his statement in this regard reads this way:

> It might even happen that the time would come when we could safely say, "We are going to unify", and a gasp of dismay through these trades would just not occur.

It might, but we must have time to look carefully at this matter and try to understand what the minister is proposing. General Foulkes, as found on page 1216 of the committee proceedings, said:

> Another issue which has come in for a lot of criticism has been the lack of authentic information. Information was replaced by rumour and conjecture, which no doubt disturbed the morale of the forces.

I will leave out a few sentences. Then he said:

> This, Mr. Chairman, in my view, is the surest way of breaking down the morale of any force.

In other words, lack of information. All that we on this side of the house have been trying to get is information from the minister. But he has built around himself an ivory tower in which he is unassailable and unavailable so far as clarification is concerned. The minister makes a great many comments. I have heard most of them. He made quite a speech the other day about what was going on in the United States. What this had to do with unification I did not quite understand.

General Foulkes in his testimony quoted General Montgomery, Monty, as he was known. At page 1217 of the committee proceedings, referring to Monty's memoirs he said:

> He can think, he can appreciate, and he is definitely prepared to criticize.

He was talking about the fighting soldier. The passage continues:

> He wants to know what is going on, and what you want him to do, and why and when. He wants to know, in doing it, that his best interests will be absolutely secure in your hands.

General Foulkes went on to say:

> Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge that those responsible for implementing unification ponder over these remarks, especially over the last sentence—

Then he repeats it:

> He want to know, in doing it, that his best interests will be absolutely secure in your hands.

Unless he has the information and knows what is going to happen the inevitable result, as is already happening and as we have seen from the minister's acquiescence, is that morale will decline. Morale is beginning to suffer. General Moncel also commented on morale. At page 1308 of the minutes of the proceedings of the committee the hon. member for York-Sunbury asked this question:

> How much value, General Moncel, do you put on morale and esprit de corps in private units and private service in the matter of ability and willingness to do a job in this disturbed world?
>
> Mr. Moncel: It obviously is a very, very real factor. In a voluntary force such as ours it is of very real importance.

So there is no question that morale has suffered. There is no question either, if we had proceeded with integration with which we all agree and this red herring had not been brought in, this idea that was conceived for what purpose no one knows, although there have been many suggestions, to unify our forces and put them all into one basket, what would have happened to morale. Surely not what has happened. The minister has talked about the tremendous savings that unifying the forces will mean for the Canadian taxpayer. The hon. member for Northumberland has already pointed out that these "savings" have already amounted to an additional expense of $161 million to the Canadian taxpayer. If these are savings I would very much hate to see what would happen when we tried to increase expenses.

• (5:50 p.m.)

I go now to page 1452 of the proceedings and evidence of the committee where the following question and answer appear:

Mr. Harkness: Do you see any advantage in doing away with our present three forces and putting them into one force called just a defence force?

Mr. Hendrick: Not the slightest bit; it baffles me completely. I think the economies could be achieved by much more simple means and I do not understand the advantages of this proposal at all.

Again, at page 1476, in answer to a question put to him by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, Mr. Hendrick said:

No, I cannot. From the details, as they appear to me, now outside the service, I cannot see anything that would cause a saving. As I said earlier, I do not even believe the savings are substantial in eliminating waste. I believe the only way you can save money in substantial amount is to cut the manpower. That really is the only basic way you can save money in substantial quantities.

That was the answer given by an expert. The minister has done even better than that. He has cut the manpower and raised the expenses. I wonder what some economists would have to say about this new approach to saving?

On the matter of economies General Moncel pointed out at page 1335 of the committee evidence that it would cost much more money to operate with a unified force in conjunction with our allies. I quote the following excerpt from that page:

Mr. Harkness: In effect, in order to produce any reasonable defence effort commensurate with our population, our manufacturing ability and our general economic situation, we have to operate with allies.

Mr. Moncel: Yes, unless you want to spend a great deal more money.

[Mr. Brand.]

Yet the minister says we are going to save money. At page 1330 of the committee proceedings, when General Moncel said there was no economy in unification the following exchange took place:

Mr. Harkness: And I say it does not matter whether you call them by those names or not, in effect, you still have to have those three services.

Mr. Moncel: This is right, and there is no payoff for calling them anything else.

What about efficiency? We have heard how efficient the unified services are going to be. Let us say we unified parliament into one group under a prime minister. Would it not be tremendous? The government, which would be composed of everyone in the house, would bring in bills and they would be passed. The rights of the people of course and of those directly involved would be trampled upon. I ask hon. members to look at some of those countries where this has happened. It would be a very efficient parliament. We could even get home for very long summer vacations. We could get home for long Christmas and Easter vacations if we were still observing our religious traditions.

Let us turn now to page 1428 where Air Marshal Annis was giving evidence. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre asked the following question:

Mr. Churchill: Do you see an increase in the fighting efficiency of the armed forces through unification?

Air Marshal Annis answered:

No, I do not, sir.

How definite can one be? Then he went on to say:

I do not see a great deal provided one is successful with integrating fully the supporting services and the top command structure.

Earlier I mentioned conscription. Surely that is what unification is. Members who are now in the armed services may or may not want to go into the unified service proposed by the minister but they are in effect being conscripted into the new force. I do not understand how the splinter parties at the far end on this side of the house can support conscription when they have opposed it in the House of Commons for so many years. The government is conscripting these men into the new force against their will.

What is unification? The minister's definition of unification is a dandy one. He says that unification is the end objective of a logical and evolutionary progression. One could

almost apply that to the evolution of the species. It would look pretty silly if every one of us looked like the Minister of National Defence.

Mr. Forrestall: And what if we thought like him?

Mr. Brand: I do not even want to think of going that far. It is much more than my mind could possibly stand at this late hour.

I wonder whether the experts who appeared before the committee really understood unification. At page 1233 of the committee proceedings the following exchange took place:

Mr. McIntosh: Could you give us your definition or understanding of what you think unification means?

Mr. Foulkes: It is completely beyond me.

Yet I have heard suggestions from hon. members on the other side of the house, including the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, that we on this side also lacked understanding. He thought unification was very simple: it was just a matter of changing the uniform and changing the name. He said that is all this bill means. This shows how clear his understanding is of what is going on. It is very nice when one can make decisions without regard to what the experts say.

At page 1396 of the committee proceedings the same hon. member, the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek, asked Air Marshal Annis the same question. Air Marshal Annis did not really know what unification means. There does not seem to be great agreement on what unification actually is. That is certainly true of the expert witnesses who appeared before the committee. Mr. Chairman, may I call it six o'clock?

The Chairman: It being six o'clock, in order that the house may proceed to the consideration of private member's business I do now leave the chair.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at ten o'clock this day are as follows: the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge), Immigration—reported presence in Canada of German war criminals; the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis), Health and Welfare—protection of nutrition standards following milk price increase; the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Béchard), Postal Service—delay in the delivery of mail in the counties of Bonaventure and Gaspé, P.Q.

• (6:00 p.m.)

PRIVATE BILLS

QUEBEC NORTH SHORE AND LABRADOR RAILWAY COMPANY

The house in committee on Bill No. S-31, respecting Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway Company—Mr. Blouin—Mr. Batten in the chair.

On clause 1—*Extension of time for completion of line.*

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I was present in the standing committee when this bill was discussed and I am surprised to find that the evidence taken before the committee is not yet available to us. Therefore there is some reluctance in discussing the bill at this time. The discussions in which I participated led me to believe that the extension of time for the completion of this railway is not necessarily in the interest of the community it will serve in view of the fact that the company has failed to live up to its original obligation.

Originally the Labrador Mining Company, which was owned and operated mainly by Hollinger Gold Mines, was granted a charter to build a railway line to bring out iron ore from the area in which it intended to operate. Many people have been inclined to wonder why the company sought a federal rather than a provincial charter, but a perusal of the map which has been supplied indicates that the line crosses the boundary between Quebec and Labrador at least once. I believe there are other spurs which cross the border, and for this reason a federal charter was sought.

In granting a charter to a company engaged mainly in mining one must bear in mind two major considerations. One is the advantage which will flow to the country in general by the opening up of a particular mining development. The second consideration is the service which will be provided to the people who will move into the area and become permanent residents. Obviously colonization takes place when a primary industry is developed in a given area and a community is built around that industry.

This company originally thought it would be able to use one of the ports in the northern extremity of the province of Quebec, namely,

Ungava Bay, as a terminal and loading point. I have been quite closely connected with the mining industry and I remember the discussions that took place about the deep sea transportation which would be available when this railway line was built to Ungava.

It seems to me that since May 14, 1947, when the charter was first granted, the situation has changed substantially. I think that the development contemplated at that time has been brought to pass. The communities of Schefferville, Labrador City, Wabush and other small settlements in the area have established themselves and mining activities have spread to the extent that several mining companies are now in operation. Throughout the whole area extensive developments are taking place and an immense number of strikes involving various minerals have been recorded. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion it is now doubtful that this company should be operating a railway at all as a directly and totally owned subsidiary. I wonder whether the time has now come when the major railway companies of Canada should establish connections to this area and provide the transportation facilities required.

Several years ago this company experienced considerable difficulty with Wabash iron mines. The company wished to start developing its own mine but found itself what the members of the transportation committee would call a captive shipper of the line in that it would have to meet the rates set by the line. As I say, a great deal of difficulty arose in providing the extension necessary to tap the ore bodies of the area. For this reason there was considerable consternation in the area which resulted in a number of hearings before the Board of Transport Commissioners. Eventually a second subsidiary railway not connected with the first was built, and this line is now tied into that development.

In the original act passed in 1947 section 19 reads as follows:

> The Company may, within five years after the passing of this Act, commence to construct the line of railway, and may within ten years after the passing of this Act complete the said line of railway, and if within the said periods respectively the said line of railway is not commenced or is not completed and put in operation, the power of construction conferred upon the Company by the Parliament of Canada shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the said line of railway as then remains uncompleted.

In my opinion this is what should have happened, and it would have happened but for the extension granted by parliament in 1956 of an additional ten years, extending the charter to 1967. The company is now returning to parliament, having done no further work on the line and given no further consideration to the problem, and asking for another extension of ten years to construct the line which has already been approved by parliament. The plans for the construction of the line have been submitted to agencies of the government and have met with the approval of parliament. Yet the line is no closer to completion than it was ten years ago. In their evidence before the committee officials of the company indicated, I suggest, that they had no intention whatever in the foreseeable future of extending the line to its final destination at Ungava Bay.

For this reason, I think this company is being both unfair and unreasonable in expecting parliament to extend its charter, which also gives it the right to limit the activity of other companies. The Board of Transport Commissioners would have to examine, of course, any additional request for railway facilities in the area, whether for the purpose of transporting ore from the mine or for the general conveyance of passengers. The board would have to consider the fact that a charter covering this area had already been granted.

It seems to me that the Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway Company has been given a grave responsibility by parliament. In turn it has received a very large concession. It has been given the benefits of the Railway Act which allow it to conduct the business of railway transportation in all its forms —passenger service, baggage, movement of iron ore and minerals and other goods. It has been given the right to build hotels, telegraph and telephone lines, to operate pipe lines, to engage in shipping and in the development of all facilities made possible under Canadian railway legislation. In the minds of members of parliament when granting the original charter was the idea that in return for benefits the company would incur liabilities or obligations.

• (6:10 p.m.)

The people living in the Ungava, Labrador and northern Quebec areas have the right to expect the railway company we are considering to provide a service so that agricultural, forest and other products may be shipped and the mining communities, as well as persons engaging in exploration, may have the benefit of rail transportation. It seems evident, however, that this company does not intend to continue the development desired. It asks

permission to extend its line for another 60 miles to join another line servicing another property. Though this company has come to parliament asking for an extension of time there is no legitimate reason for parliament to give a blank cheque, a charter to develop something that the company has no intention of developing. It seems that the company will do only a small portion of what it originally committed itself to do. I should like to see the railway extended to Ungava Bay and the Atlantic ocean. I should like to see railway lines extended in the northern areas of James Bay and Hudson Bay. We have many resources there. Enough iron ore exists in the Belcher Islands area to justify a railway being built on the east shore of Hudson Bay to provide service for a big steel plant which could be erected there.

Living in the north I am aware of the resources there. Communities will spring up around these resources and in time the entire area will be developed. I say that the Canadian National should have been entrusted with building a line to this northern area in Quebec. It was foolish to entrust a private company with the building of a railway to transport an important part of our natural resources. What has happened disturbs me.

The Labrador Iron Company can transport what it needs to transport much more easily than others who have no ownership in this railway. Parliament gave this company an important asset to help it develop its properties in the north. Some development has taken place and transportation needs for the area will continue to grow. Quite obviously, however, difficulties will arise should this line be extended to the Ungava area. Those difficulties were originally mentioned when the charter was first sought.

The management of Hollinger Mines has never been completely stupid. It was aware that Hudson strait freezes over, and that Ungava Bay is closed for many months of the year. It was aware of the difficulties of building a line into that area. Nevertheless the management did agree when seeking a charter to undertake development beyond its needs at that time. In fact, 150 to 200 miles north of where the line was to end large bodies of ore were blocked out.

I repeat that much development will take place in these northern areas. The hon. member representing the area in question is optimistic about its future. Having connections with diamond drilling companies working in that area, I am familiar with the fact that there is a tremendous potential for mining minerals there. It is estimated that there are hundreds of millions of tons of various kinds of ore there. I maintain that companies wishing to develop that region will have to depend for another ten years, should this charter be granted, on a company that may not build the railway that is needed.

Is it the intention of parliament to let this entire northern area be at the mercy of a company that may not build a needed railway? Do we in this house not wish to provide transportation facilities for the northern mining areas? Do we not wish to see transportation needs and rates determined by the Board of Transport Commissioners rather than by a private company? The board could set rates based on the cost of operating that railway. I point out that this private company would not be responsible to the board. Users of the railway would not have the board's protection.

I represent an area serviced by a provincial railway which operates in a manner different from that of other railways. It is interesting to note, for instance, that the Ontario Northland Railway employs licensed engineers, though other similar companies do not insist on their engineers having licences. Department of Transport examinations are the only criteria required.

It is also interesting to note that iron pellets are transported to Pittsburgh via five lines at a cost of less than $100 per car. I am told that the clay necessary for making these pellets comes from Manitoba over two lines at a cost of $285 per car. As can be seen, there is a great difference if goods are coming into the area or are being taken from it. I cite this example to show that the people in northern Labrador will find themselves in a similar situation.

• (6:20 p.m.)

There is a great disparity between the needs of the people and those of industry in that area. You subsidize one and you soak the other and there are always more people getting soaked than there are people receiving benefits.

The Deputy Chairman: I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, realizing that Bill S-31 was to come before the house during this hour I looked for the evidence before the standing committee and, like my hon. friend from Timiskaming, I was unable to find it.

Apparently it is not in print yet. My hon. friend did have the opportunity of attending the hearing before the committee but I was not able to do so and I am therefore somewhat at a loss in considering the merits of the bill now before us in committee of the whole house.

However, as I examined the title of the bill I discovered it to be "An Act respecting the Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway Company". This rang a bell in my mind and I recalled that I had been a member of the old committee of the house on railways, canals and telegraph lines some ten years ago when a similar measure was under consideration. So I looked at the statutes of 1956 and examined chapter 68 entitled "An Act respecting the Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway Company". I found there were some interesting similarities between that bill and the bill now before us. Both bills contain only one clause, the clause now before us, and I believe the differences and similarities between them may be of interest to hon. members who were not present when chapter 68 was enacted in 1956.

Clause 1 of the bill now before us reads:

> Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway Company, hereinafter called "the Company", may within a period of ten years from the 14th day of May, 1967, complete that portion of its line of railway authorized by chapter 80 of the statutes of 1947 which is not now completed, namely, from the town of Schefferville, in the province of Quebec, to Ungava Bay, and, if within the said period the said line of railway is not completed and put in operation, the powers of construction conferred upon the Company by the Parliament of Canada shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the said line of railway as then remains uncompleted.

This is what is set out in chapter 68 of the statutes of 1956:

> Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway Company, hereinafter called "the Company", may within a period of ten years from the 14th day of May, 1957, complete that portion of its line of railway authorized by chapter 80 of the statutes of 1947 which is not now completed, namely, from the town of Schefferville, in the province of Quebec, to Ungava Bay, and, if within the said period the said line of railway is not completed and put in operation, the powers of construction conferred upon the Company by the Parliament of Canada shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the said line of railway as then remains uncompleted.

It will be obvious to hon. members that save for the fact that the date is changed from May 14, 1957 to May 14, 1967 the bill now before us is identical in its terms with that which was before us ten years ago. This leads me to wonder whether this is likely to be a hardy decennial bill which will come before parliament every ten years from now until we celebrate our second centenary. In view of the fact that ten years after its earlier application the company is apparently in the same position with respect to the extension of this railway as it was in 1956, one wonders whether there is really much point in renewing this charter in respect of the portion of the line which still remains to be constructed.

If my understanding is correct as to what was said before the committee by a spokesman for the railway company, the company has indicated that it has no present intention of completing the line of railway to Ungava Bay within the next ten years. This is what I have been told. It seems to me that when the company comes before parliament with a request of this kind it should have serious intentions because undoubtedly the terms of this bill do confer rights and privileges and its passage may have an impact on other concerns and interests and what they may wish to do or be able to do within this large area of Canada. Having renewed the company's privileges for one period of ten years during which they apparently were not exercised, it seems to me the house should do nothing more now than extend the company's rights in respect of projects it has every intention of fulfilling.

When I realized that this bill was in terms almost identical with the one introduced ten years ago, I took the trouble to refresh my mind as to what had gone on in the committee when the earlier application was under consideration. In the proceedings of the house committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines in 1956 we find that Mr. Hugh E. O'Donnell, Q.C., solicitor for the Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway Company, appeared as a witness. He had this to say, as reported at page 10 of the committee evidence:

> • (6:30 p.m.)
>
> Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this is a very simple bill.

I do not know why it is that all these bills that come in as private bills are always described as being very simple bills. Whether this is because they consider that members of the House of Commons are a bit simple minded and can only cope with simple bills, I have never been able to decide. Mr. O'Donnell continued:

> It is merely asking for authority to extend the franchise for a further ten years. The railway was incorporated, as hon. members know, in 1947 and its purpose was to permit the construction of a railway from a point on the St. Lawrence River to Ungava Bay.

Then he went on to describe the route of the railway, which was shown on a map placed in a position where members of the committee could see it. He pointed out that—

—it runs from Seven Islands to Schefferville which is 375 miles; 138 miles roughly from the river to the southern boundary of Labrador and then for a distance of 212 miles across Labrador and back into Quebec at Schefferville which is approximately 25 miles beyond; there is approximately 300 miles from Schefferville to Ungava Bay, and at the present time there is no requirement for transportation in that area.

Then a little later on we had before us Mr. W. H. Durrell, the vice president and general manager of the Iron Ore Company of Canada. The then hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, now Hon. Howard Green, was a member of the committee and he questioned Mr. Durrell as follows, at page 14 of the evidence:

By Mr. Green:

Q. Your company built this railway in order to get out your own iron ore deposits in the vicinity of Schefferville?—A. That is right.

Q. That is the real and only reason that you constructed the railway?—A. We had sufficient tonnage to justify the building of the railway.

Q. Have you any rights north of Schefferville towards Ungava Bay?—A. Yes. Our company and our subsidiaries are doing a lot of work in that region. When you say 'rights', you mean ground?

Q. Yes?—A. We have a subsidiary company called Orlando mines which spent several million dollars in the last few years to justify the extension of the railway.

Q. Would you please point out on the map where you have these deposits and rights north of Schefferville?—A. On this ground we staked the same as any other prospector.

He went on to point out that at Fort McKenzie they have a small copper showing. Mr. Green then asked:

Q. What other companies or groups have rights, or are working in that area between Schefferville and Ungava Bay?—A. I could not name them all, but there are a number, such as Long Lake gold mines which is in the same general vicinity. They are about here on the map at this point, south of the Koksoak River, and Fentimore iron is in there. They will be doing considerable work with their base metal concessions. The Labrador trough is about 50 miles west, and in this 35 miles of the western section is where they find iron. Due east of this brown area, there is a belt about 15 miles in width.

Q. That little strip from Schefferville to Ungava Bay is a very promising area?—A. Yes, it is very promising.

Discussion proceeded on the basis of inquiry by Mr. Green and other members of the committee into the mineral potential of the area as it was then known. At page 19 of the evidence there appeared this question by Mr. Carrick:

Q. Have you in mind any estimate of the time likely to be needed for this construction?—A. My understanding is that it would take at least six years.

Q. Would you feel justified in commencing the construction of the railway right away? I understood you to say earlier that the date of beginning construction depended upon exploration to be carried out in the northern territory.—A. There is nothing at the moment to justify the construction of a railway. Surveys show areas which may be suitable for mining development, but so far, as I said, we know of nothing which would justify beginning construction.

Q. So in addition to the six years you think it would take to complete the project you would need to have a period of time in which to consider whether it would be justified to begin construction?—A. It would take at least three years to locate sufficient tonnage.

Then Mr. Hamilton, who was then the member for York West, went into some questioning about what they had in mind when they got their franchise, and as the evidence proceeds it is clear that in the minds of at least some members of the committee the proposal to grant this franchise for a further ten years from May 14, 1956, was conferring pretty firm monopoly rights upon this particular concern, at least for practical purposes in the future exploitation of the mining resources of that whole area.

At page 26 of the evidence Mr. Green, who was one of the principal spokesmen for the then Conservative opposition in the house on matters dealing with transportation, said this:

On clause 1, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move an amendment in line 9, to substitute the word "five" for "ten". The result of that would be that the extended time within which this company could complete the extension to Ungava Bay would be five years from the 14th May 1957 instead of ten years. In other words, they would have until the 14th May 1962.

In support of this amendment I point out the nature of this railway changes from Schefferville to the north. The company built this line from Seven Islands to Schefferville for the purpose of getting out this company's own ore, the parent company's own iron ore. But once it goes beyond Schefferville then the company has no specific interest, and the line will then become a railway for the use of other Canadians who are interested in that particular area. There is quite a different background, then, for the construction from Seven Islands to Schefferville.

Based on the evidence that had been given to the committee, Mr. Green added:

I would point out also that the area is developing rapidly. Mr. Durrell admitted that himself...

It is all right to give this company a concession, but there is no rhyme or reason why this company should have a strangle hold on the country in question for ten years. They can sit down and

do absolutely nothing for ten years, and in fact nobody else can move into that area.

That was said in 1956. Now, in 1967, we have this company coming before us with an identical proposal for a further ten year extension which, if one accepts Mr. Green's view as stated in 1956, gives them a "strangle hold on the country in question for ten years," and "nobody else can move into the area". I suggest that Mr. Green's words have proven to be quite prophetic.

• (6:40 p.m.)

The bill which we have before us today shows that in fact Mr. Green was quite correct when, before the standing committee of 1956, he suggested that parliament was then creating a situation in which this company could sit on this franchise for 10 years and do nothing about it. Now the company comes before us again to ask for a further 10 year extension. From the understanding I have of the evidence they gave before the committee, they have no intention to build this railway line to Ungava Bay within the period of the next 10 years. I would suggest with all seriousness that this sort of approach to parliament is one which should give rise in the minds of hon. members to some very serious questions.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, but the time allotted for his speech has expired.

Mr. Barnett: I am sorry I did not get around to quoting my own remarks.

Mr. Martin (Timmins): Mr. Chairman, I am wondering whether we might hear a few remarks from the sponsor of this bill. If he is prepared to speak to it, I would be glad to yield the floor to him.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Blouin: Mr. Chairman, I feel everything has been said which could be said about Bill No. S-31, entitled an Act respecting Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway Company. Still, I noticed what the hon. members for Timiskaming and Comox-Alberni (Messrs. Peters and Barnett) had to say.

I do not think that the company concerned, or the other companies, because there are others operating in that area—

[*English*]

I should like to say to my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni, in respect of his statement that for the past 10 years, or at the time when Mr. Green gave evidence before the committee in 1956, everything was frozen, that there has been a great deal of movement in that part of the country in question. As you know, this was started by one company, the Iron Ore Company of Canada. Three very large companies are operating up in that area now.

From Schefferville to Ungava Bay there are 282 miles of country in which at the present time there is absolutely nothing. I do not believe this company should be forced to build a railway 282 miles in length for the caribou. With the development which is going on in that area, we have no assurance that some other company will not ask for a charter to build a railroad in that part of the Ungava and Labrador area. I do not see anything in this bill which suggests that with this 10 year extension this area will be frozen.

The proof of this is that we have seen the Wabush mines develop the Wabush area. They built their own railroad on a 42 mile stretch which connected with the Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway which comes down to Seven Islands. This railroad was built, even though this clause in respect of the 10 years existed at that time.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member permit a question. He said that another railway company could come to parliament and obtain a charter. This I believe was in respect of the unbuilt line of railway from Schefferville to Ungava Bay. Is the hon. member seriously suggesting that another company could come along, ask for a charter, and then take the risk of building a railroad through that distance of undeveloped country which he mentioned? I am sure he knows the country much better than I do, although I did fly over it last summer while on the way to Frobisher. Is he seriously suggesting this would happen when another company has been given by parliament the right to build a competing line running parallel to it?

I have another question which has to do with the area he mentioned, where the Wabush Mining Company has its railway. Does he not feel, because of the charter granted by parliament to this particular company, that it would have a big hand in negotiations with another company in respect of an extension to that line? Does he not feel that this charter extension gives this particular company an unfair advantage, if it wished to use it, in its relations with another company which might wish to develop a mine?

Mr. Blouin: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the first question, as this area between Schefferville and Ungava Bay is entirely in the province of Quebec, if because of economic developments some company wished to build a railroad there, they would not have to come to the Canadian parliament; they would just have to go to the Quebec parliament and obtain a private charter in the same way the Quebec-Cartier Mining Company did. They are private carriers; they are not common carriers because they are operating in one province only.

In respect of the second question, I do not think the charter of the Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway Company has prevented the Wabush mines developing this large area, because so far that company has invested $295 million and another $112 million in their pelletizing plant at Sept-Îles. I should like to repeat that even though this clause in respect of the 10 year period is in existence I do not think, if economic developments warranted the building of a railroad, that anybody else who wished to build a railroad would be prevented from doing so. They would merely have to apply to the Quebec parliament for a charter, and obtain it.

Mr. Martin (Timmins): Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question. I have been endeavouring to get this matter straightened out in my mind. Is it true that this charter which was granted to the company originally 20 years ago was contingent on that company completing the railroad through to Ungava.

Mr. Blouin: So far as I know this charter was granted in 1947 and renewed in 1957.

Mr. Martin (Timmins): Yes, but it was granted contingent on the railroad being completed from the St. Lawrence river to Ungava bay.

Mr. Blouin: The original charter, yes; but there was nothing to justify their going beyond Schefferville. The original charter was granted in respect of a line to Ungava, because of the desire to have access to a seaport. At that time the engineers said that the only way to ship this ore through a deep sea port was by building a line to Fort Chimo on Ungava Bay. Since then the engineering studies have indicated that this ore can be shipped feasibly over a rail line from Schefferville to Seven Islands. That is what is being suggested at the present time.

• (6:50 p.m.)

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Mr. Chairman, this bill was considered extensively by a committee. The officials of the Iron Ore Company appeared and told in a straightforward way about their future plans for the development of that area. I was very much impressed with their testimony and the story they told about this development in Quebec and Labrador. As one who does not know very much about the area, let me say I think this is an interesting idea and I support their request for a 10 year extension.

Some information was given today by an hon. member to my left to the effect that this company was asking for an exclusive franchise or a blank cheque. Actually the company is asking for nothing more than a 10 year extension. They have indicated the difficulties involved in this whole project, and that apparently no other company seems to have an interest. That to me is significant. I recall asking the representatives of that company during a committee hearing whether there was any such interest. If we do not grant this extension and take away this franchise we will do a disservice to this area because the rail line may never be built. In view of that fact I for one want to indicate my interest and personal support in respect of this request for an extension.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member a question? If I understood him correctly, he made some reference to a statement made by an hon. member in this area of the house. Is the hon. member trying to suggest that the concern expressed by Hon. Howard Green ten years ago was concern expressed through the top of his hat? I am not suggesting that Howard Green was not interested in the development of that area, but he certainly expressed some concern originally about the kind of action proposed by this bill.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Mr. Chairman, I was probably a member of the committee at that time, though I do not remember the particular hearing to which the hon. member has referred. Presumably Mr. Green was his usual optimistic self at that time, but things did not work out as expected. Surely we should not criticize his optimism. The only thing I objected to in the hon. member's statement was his reference to a blank cheque. By adopting this bill we will not be issuing a blank cheque. All we will be doing is extending the company's right to continue

something in which nobody else seems to be interested.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, it is all right to suggest that this charter does not have an exclusive aspect, but every time a property is discovered with some valuable ore deposits, this company will be able to dictate who can develop that property, just as the Wabush Company has done. Anybody who appreciates the troubles between the Wabush Company and the Iron Ore Company of Canada must be aware that this whole matter is not a simple one. We gave that company the absolute right to say who is going to operate a mine in the area in which it is located.

If we do the same thing in respect of the company in question no prospector will go into that area looking for whatever resource properties may exist there, because he will not be able to develop them without building a rail line at a construction cost of perhaps $500,000 per mile. We will in effect be allowing this company to decide what arrangement may be made for the development of this area. It may well go to the provincial government for a charter as a common carrier, in order to develop its own holdings.

Surely it is apparent that this company no longer intends to do what it originally had in mind. In the original charter it was stated that if within set periods the line of rail was not commenced or completed and put into operation the power in respect of construction conferred upon the company by the parliament of Canada would cease, and be null and void in respect of that part of the said line which remained incomplete. The company agreed that if it did not build the line outlined in the charter it would not have control of the construction of the remainder.

I am in agreement with the hon. member that the company found it extremely expensive to build a line in order to have a deep sea port on Ungava Bay. For that reason the company decided not to use that area as a shipping point. Almost all line construction now leads to Seven Islands, and the company is not at all interested in developing this other portion.

Surely there is no reason for extending this charter for another ten years. The hon. member for Skeena suggested that this company should put up a performance bond in the amount of $10 million, or $1 million per year for ten years. That amount of money would finance the construction of an additional 20 miles of line. Surely that is not an unreasonable amount in light of the fact that some 220 miles of line is contemplated. That is not an extravagant requirement.

Originally we gave this company an opportunity to develop this rail line in a certain area. There is an inherent commitment on the part of the company. I predict that within a short period of time the company will come back to this house or to the provincial government asking for another extension in respect of another 60 miles of rail line to be built in another direction. The original charter was quite explicit as to where the line was to be built, although the company was given a great deal of leeway.

It is my opinion that if we grant this extension the company will build rail lines in directions other than the one originally contemplated. While I have no objection to giving this company the right to develop their property or to construct a rail line, I believe the people of Canada should not allow it to develop its rail lines in a disorderly fashion—a short piece of line going this way, another piece going that way, and still another going another direction.

For the various reasons I have outlined I think this company should be required to abide by the original injunction to which it agreed in 1947. If the company is prepared to make a commitment similar to what has been suggested, I am prepared to support this bill. The very fact that they have not suggested a performance bond is an indication that the company has little interest in the extension of this line as originally contemplated.

• (7:00 p.m.)

Mr. Chairman, may I call it seven o'clock.

Progress reported.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): The hour appointed for the consideration of private members business having expired, the house will resume the business which was interrupted at six o'clock.

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

AMALGAMATION OF NAVY, ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The house resumed consideration in committee of Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof—Mr. Hellyer—Mr. Rinfret in the chair.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Chairman: This sitting is suspended from now until eight o'clock.

[*English*]

SITTING SUSPENDED

SITTING RESUMED

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Brand: Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose at six o'clock I was discussing several of the seven points which I believe are at issue in this very vital debate. If I may review them briefly, they concern the effect on morale of the proposed unification bill, the so-called savings about which the minister has been talking, and the so-called increase in efficiency which will result from unification. I mentioned briefly the issue of conscription, and what we mean by the expression "unification of the armed services".

Now I should like to go on to discuss briefly the sixth point, namely whether or not the unification proposed by the minister and the government will create any incompatability between our armed services and the armed services of other countries. Let me refer once again to the committee's proceedings which, at page 1320, contain a remark by General Moncel in response to a question by the hon. member for Queens. It reads as follows:

> Mr. MacLean (Queens): Do you believe that our oportunity to gain from the experience and resources of our allies, which you mentioned some time ago in reply to a previous question—chiefly, Great Britain and the United States—will be lessened if we have an entirely different organization in the form of a unified force?
>
> Mr. Moncel: Of course, it will.

He goes on to give an example. From General Moncel's reply one gathers there will be a great lessening in the amount of interplay that can go on properly between the armed services of this country and the armed services primarily of Great Britain and the United States. Yet the minister still persists in pointing out how efficient we are going to be if we have a force which will be, as he says, truly Canadian, with one uniform but no Royal Canadian Navy, no Royal Canadian Air Force and no Canadian Army: Just the Canadian forces. But is this realistic? Can we, so to speak, go it alone? Can we have an armed force, unique in every sense of the word, but different from the armed forces of our allies? Do we plan to fight our own wars or do we plan to let somebody else do the fighting for us? Is this the type of attitude that Canada exhibited during the last two wars? Of course it is not. But is it the minister's plan for the future? We are being inundated with plans for the future.

I read a rather interesting article in last night's Ottawa *Journal* under the byline of Peter Newman. I think it is a very interesting comment which should go on the record. Mr. Newman says this:

> It must be emphasized that none of these startling ideas are in the process of becoming government policy. They reflect only the serious questioning that's going on about Canada's military future.

A little later I will explain why I feel it is worth putting this article on the record, but let me diverge for a moment. When I listened to the minister's speech the other night I could not help but be struck by the similarity between the article which appeared in Tuesday night's Ottawa *Journal* written by Mr. Peter Newman and the speech made by the minister. Far be it from me to suggest that there was any collusion between the minister and Mr. Peter Newman. I would never think of suggesting such a thing; but the fact is they were both discussing in exactly the same way—and the words are indeed very close—the relationship between Mr. McNamara and the joint chiefs of staff in the United States. With this background, and realizing that there appears to be some rapport of some kind, I would like to read the following excerpt from Mr. Newman's article:

> A much more dramatic break with Canadian military tradition is being advocated by some of Ottawa's younger Liberals. They want, in effect, to demilitarize our unified armed forces—

Let hon. members note that the services are already unified in their view.

> —and turn them into an economic instrument. This would mean moving young men into temporary service in the armed forces during periods of economic recession,—

I have no doubt that the government is afraid of exactly that in the near future. It goes on to read:

> —giving them trade training while they serve, and letting them rejoin the labour force when jobs become available again.

This is what the government is planning for the armed forces of our country. It continues:

> At the same time, the Department of National Defence would be turned into the headquarters—

And this is the *pièce de résistance*.

> —for a sort of domestic and foreign peace corps.

This is an incredible summation for a journalist who over the past few years seems to

have had a tremendous affinity for hon. gentlemen opposite. I am sure that Mr. Newman would not think of writing anything in the Ottawa *Journal*, or any of the other papers which carry his column, which did not have a large element of truth in it. Imagine, Mr. Chairman, turning our armed forces into an economic instrument.

• (8:10 p.m.)

What about our commitments? The most important point of all is our ability to meet our commitments with a unified force. Many references were made in the evidence to this point. As reported at page 1384, Air Marshal Annis pointed out that he did not believe that with a unified force we could carry on our present commitments under NATO, NORAD and so on. As reported at page 1312 General Moncel said exactly the same thing, Let me just quote briefly what he said in reply to the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona, whose name I understand is familiar to the minister:

> —I will write you a commitment for the country which will generate the need for a unified force. It is very simple. But with your current commitments you do not want one. In fact, it is better that you do not have one.

Air Vice Marshal Hendrick gave evidence on this point at page 1451 of the report. Lieutenant General Moncel dealt with it again, as reported at page 1323. He was asked this question by the hon. member for Greenwood:

> Therefore, the real choice that we have to make, as a nation and that we are responsible for making in parliament, in the matter of making sense out of unification, is whether we are going to continue the roles that we have or concentrate on this mobile intervention force?

To that question General Moncel answered: "Yes".

I could draw your attention, Mr. Chairman, to many more comments of this nature. I think it is interesting to note that General Moncel made a rather appropriate comment when he said that we were moving on an unchartered course at a very high speed toward an unknown destination. And guess who is at the helm, Mr. Chairman—a man with no navigation experience at all, the Minister of National Defence.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, in view of the preponderance of evidence—

The Chairman: Order. I must advise the hon. member that the time allotted to him has expired.

[Mr. Brand.]

Mr. Brand: I have just one final sentence, if I may have the permission of the committee.

The Chairman: Does the committee give the hon. member unanimous consent to continue his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Brand: I thank the members of the committee for their generosity; I have one final summation to make.

In view of the preponderance of evidence, which indicates that we should stand back and take a second look at what is going on here, I submit we should heed the advice of these experts who appeared before our defence committee and the minister should take time for sober second thoughts about this legislation. Let him put if off for now, think about it, plan for it properly. Let him meet with the minister of external affairs, and perhaps they together can come up with some ideas about a force and a foreign policy which can be integrated. I think this is essential if we are to continue to be able to defend our country in the future as we have in the past.

Mr. Skoreyko: Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to take part in this debate, but on listening to the minister's speech last Tuesday afternoon it seemed to me there was an indication that he might be mellowing just a bit. Since I have had the pleasure of knowing the minister personally for a number of years, I thought that if I stood up and made a personal plea to him to reconsider his position he might do just that. I have known the minister, as I said, for a number of years and had always thought that he was an understanding and tolerant man. Regrettably I must say that some of his recent actions and some of his not so recent actions could well indicate otherwise.

I want to talk for a little while about integration and then about that now infamous word, unification. I am not going to speak on the subject with the degree of authority that someone who has considerable military experience might. I do not pretend to be an expert. However, I do have some views to express, mainly because I have had the opportunity of discussing this issue with many people right across Canada. I have talked to people of all ages, people with military experience and otherwise, people in the army, the navy, the air force and civilians.

I agree, I say at once, with the principle of integration. I think there are services that

operate economically and efficiently under integration—for example, hospital services, medical services, chaplain services, administration, and in some respects supply services. They can be and are integrated, with a saving of some considerable consequence. I am sure that with research and with a little greater knowledge of the subject I could make many suggestions where like savings could be effected. I also believe that practical business procedures should not be foreign to defence administration and that the application of some business sense and business law can effect some significant savings in the long run.

Getting back to this infamous word unification, Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the minister does not know what the word means. The previous chairman of the defence committee was not sure what it meant when he spoke in this house Tuesday last, April 11.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if you take away from servicemen the identification of their skills, the uniform that identifies them with a specific service, and you give all servicemen a pea-green uniform, then you have nothing left. You have no meaning or symbol; you have no tradition; you have no history. You really have no meaningful defence posture. I suggest that in his haste the minister is willing to sacrifice all of this identity because he wants at all costs to create this new warrior as his personal centennial project; and for the sake of the minister I hope that he is right and that he knows what he is doing.

• (8:20 p.m.)

The minister is not altogether without friends. I read the white paper when it came out in March of 1964. In April of that year I was invited to speak to a service club in Edmonton, and at that time I tried to show some of the anomalies and inadequacies in the proposal. The only newspaper in Edmonton, The Edmonton *Journal*, on April 9, 1964, took it upon itself to criticize me for expressing a view on the matter. I have the editorial before me. Subsequent action and the introduction of legislation proved that my initial contention was correct. The editorial said:

> Mr. William Skoreyko made some reasonable criticisms of the new defence proposals, when he spoke to the Macdonald-Cartier Club here, but he also fell into a number of careless or inaccurate statements—
>
> What Mr. Hellyer has emphasized over and over again, and what is a central theme of his white paper, is that housekeeping costs are to be reduced so that a higher percentage of the defence budget can be devoted to the purchase of capital equipment.

I agree with the sentiment of the last sentence. It continues:

> At another point in his talk, Mr. Skoreyko tried to make a problem out of the proposed gradual conversion of the fourth brigade (in reverse in Canada) "into a special service force."
>
> We quote the white paper's wording. He asked how the three services would feel, after being jumbled into one force, when they see a new force created with special uniforms and name.
>
> Mr. Skoreyko sees something that isn't there. We take the white paper and the minister to mean, simply, a force or unit for special service. Who, apart from Mr. Skoreyko, has suggested that it would have a special uniform?

I do not wish to criticize the editorial writers of the newspaper, though I know something of their political backgrounds. I would not ask the minister to communicate with them, telling them to write another editorial to tell the people of Edmonton that the previous editorial was wrong, that the minister has now decided on a pea-green uniform. The editorial goes on to say:

> By no means all Mr. Skoreyko's statements are open to criticism. But in so vital a matter as a radical change in defence policy he ought to be certain that none of his remarks is careless, inaccurate or misleading. Defence is much too important to be left to confusion.

I agree with the last paragraph. But that newspaper is not justified in asking us to refrain from speaking when the responsibility for unification or integration is that of the present Minister of National Defence.

Turning to another subject, I listened with considerable interest to the minister's speech of last Tuesday afternoon. Most of us, when we are apt to be affected politically have short memories, but I wish to refer to a paragraph on page 14788 of *Hansard* of last Tuesday afternoon, in which the Minister of National Defence attacked the right hon. Leader of the Opposition. The minister said:

> The second example I should like to give is the choice of the airplane for the strike role; I am referring to the CF-104. Here again, Mr. Chairman, there is a very unusual sequence of events. The choice that was made of the CF-104 was a government decision. It is true that eventually the chiefs of staff made a recommendation, but only after they had been directed to do so by the government—

Who, does the minister think, should have directed the chiefs of staff, if they needed directing?

> —of the right hon. gentleman and only after they had already said that this was not the best airplane to carry out the role and was in fact not suitable to carry out the role.

It is interesting, when reading the clippings, to see that the minister does not enjoy

the cleanest record when it comes to taking advice from people in authority in the defence structure.

I have in my hand a clipping headed, "Hellyer Rejected Plane Advice". To me that means that the Minister of National Defence is putting himself above a prime minister of a country. The minister says that the prime minister, obviously in 1961 or 1962, rejected the advice of the chiefs of staff and bought an aircraft. The present Minister of National Defence rejected advice, and he also bought an aircraft. The article says this:

> Hon. Paul Hellyer, minister of defence, rejected the recommendation of most of his senior military advisers when he decided on purchase of a fighter-bomber.
>
> Informed sources made the disclosure Tuesday.
>
> However, the sources added, the senior officers did not resent rejection of their advice nor did Mr. Hellyer question their ability in making it. Such decisions were up to the government and the military accepted them.

The minister sits on the government benches today; it is all right for him to recommend certain things to the chiefs of staff, but it is not all right for the former Conservative prime minister to have advised his chiefs of staff. This is an interesting article. It continues:

> Air Chief Marshal Frank Miller, chief of the defence staff, issued a statement Tuesday denying a Canadian Press report Monday that Air Vice-Marshal Wilfred Bean was transferred to Europe because he opposed purchase of the CF-5.

Perhaps the minister will take the opportunity to answer that charge:

> The statement did not deny that Air Vice Marshal Bean had opposed acquisition of the CF-5. It described his posting overseas to 4th Allied Tactical Air Force as routine. He had been assistant chief of defence staff.
>
> Informants said Air Chief Marshal Miller and Air Marshal Clare Annis, chief of logistics, as well as Air Vice Marshal Bean, favored purchase of the American McDonnell Phantom jet fighter-bomber on strictly military grounds.
>
> They noted that Air Chief Marshal Miller did not attend the press conference at which Mr. Hellyer announced choice of the CF-5 though he had attended a similar press briefing in December when selection of other defence equipment was announced by the minister.

One can see the degree of co-operation existing as early as August 25, 1965.

Another interesting point in this article is that the CF-5 program of up to 125 aircraft made by Canadair Limited, Montreal, is relatively cheap, as such weapons programs go:

> While the decision to turn down the Phantom and buy the CF-5 was in the long process of being made, the objections of senior officers to the latter plane filtered down through the RCAF, officials said.
>
> [Mr. Skoreyko.]
>
> As a result, they said, a major "selling job" had to be done among men who would fly and maintain the plane. There are already two Northrop-made CF-5s at Cold Lake, Alta., the RCAF's big jet training base, for demonstration purposes.
>
> Northrop has made no secret of the fact it accepted an extremely low payment—

It does not matter how cheap an aircraft is. Another article that I have describes the CF-5 as a peashooter.

• (8:30 p.m.)

I wish to refer to another editorial which appeared in the Winnipeg *Tribune* of April 12, 1967. It read in part:

> More than one year ago John Diefenbaker asked for an investigation of the proposed purchase of CF-5 aircraft to cost $215 million. The leader of the opposition made the demand because of continual changes in the assessed capacity of this plane.
>
> Briefly it had already been established that the CF-5 had:
>
> (a) No capability as a fighter.
>
> (b) No interceptor use.
>
> (c) No long-range capacity.
>
> (d) Could not be refueled in the air without expensive tanker aircraft.
>
> (e) No ability to take off from improvised fields with a bomb load.
>
> (f) No adaptability for close support as a bomber-strafer.
>
> (g) And deemed useless by the U.S. air force for service in Viet Nam without costly modifications.

Yet the minister criticized the present Leader of the Opposition for adopting the CF-104 which had been developed by the Liberals and which, as I am sure he will now admit, has done excellent service in NATO and elsewhere.

This is not all that has been said about the CF-5. An article which appeared in the Edmonton *Journal*, written by Charles Lynch and headed "Combat Tests on Tap for RCAF's New Jet" stated:

> One of the embarrassing things about Canada's purchase of the American Freedom Fighter aircraft is that, to date, the United States hasn't bought any for its own use.

That is wrong, now. They have bought about 100. The article goes on:

> Officials of our defence department have been saying all along that the U.S. intends to make such purchases, and that the United States Air Force desperately wants the Freedom Fighter, the Canadian name for which is the CF-5.
>
> Now, the evidence is beginning to come in and the defence department is delighted.
>
> What's happened is that the U.S.A.F. has persuaded Defence Secretary Robert McNamara, long a sceptic about the Freedom Fighter, to send 20 of the planes to Viet Nam for combat testing. Later,

in the fall, they will go to Viet Nam for strafing and bombing missions.

The writer goes on to say:

After all, the Tories turned down an earlier version of the Freedom Fighter in 1959, and it is unlikely that they will applaud the government's purchase of it now.

That is very true. How could we?

Freedom Fighters for Viet Nam cost $700,000 apiece, somewhat lower than the starting price in Canada of $900,000 each which would be inflated by other charges.

In the words of one Washington dispatch, the Freedom Fighter might well serve as a better peashooter than some of the planes now in Viet Nam. I should like to hear a little more about this fantastic aircraft, in the light of the hon. gentleman's criticism of the CF-104.

With reference again to the minister's speech of Tuesday, April 11: After an exchange of words with the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. gentleman said—and he was referring to my right hon. friend:

He was not going to be pushed around by the industrial military complex. He was going to show who was running Canada and cancel the Avro Arrow regardless.

Well, it seems the Minister of National Defence is not going to be pushed around by anyone. I will come back to that later.

If hon. members would refer to *Saturday Night* of March 1965 they will find there an article written by Kenneth McNaught which states, in part:

My conclusion is that the Liberals never really wanted to accept nuclear weapons, that they did so in order not to upset their principal supporters in the business community, who were worried about the possible effects of our recalcitrance on economic relations with the United States, and that we are now seeking a way out of the nuclear commitment.

Here he is saying that the Leader of the Opposition did not wish to be pushed around and thought it best that he cancel the Avro Arrow because it did not fit well into the economy. Because he did this he was showing that he did not intend to be pushed around. But the Minister of National Defence did not intend to be pushed around, either, because in 1962 he spoke up in the House of Commons, as only he could, in favour of a policy of no nuclear weapons for Canada. Then he changed his mind.

I wish to speak for a few moments about the veracity of this government and of the minister. We are now asked to believe the government when it says that all is well in the armed forces. We should have no doubt about the government's sincerity in connection with Bill C-243. But we have had considerable experience with this government. The desire to get elected was a major reason for some startling changes in their attitude a few years ago. But sincerity is not something which one practices only when it is convenient.

I have here an article which appeared in the Winnipeg *Tribune* of February 13, 1963 and I think it should once again be placed on record because it is a most interesting article. It begins:

The Liberals are the most bewildered and bewildering of all the four parties on the nuclear issue. Statements by Lester Pearson and Paul Hellyer after the Liberal council meeting this week have added to the confusion.

This is not surprising. It is in keeping with the party's attitude for the past four years.

Since 1960 the Liberals have been against nuclear weapons and for nuclear weapons; they have been partly against nuclear weapons and partly for nuclear weapons; they have been against nuclear weapons in Canada but maybe for nuclear weapons for Canadian NATO forces in Europe.

Here are some highlights in the Liberal record:

Paul Hellyer, Liberal defence critic, announced his party's defence program in the Commons on August 4, 1960. The main points were no nuclear weapons for use on Canadian soil or in Canadian air space; scrap plans to acquire the Starfighter for Canada's NATO forces; scrap the Bomarc-SAGE program for anti-bomber defence of this continent.

• (8:40 p.m.)

That was a noble stand.

The following day Mr. Pearson said in the Commons:

"In my view we should get out of the whole SAGE-Bomarc operation, and we should not spend any more money on radar gap fillers. Our objection to the Bomarc is not only that we do not think it is an effective weapon... our objection is the kind of defence strategy it represents and which we do not think will be effective, however effective the weapon may be. If the United States wishes to continue that kind of protection, let the United States do so. Let us withdraw from that direct form of continental defence."

That is also a noble statement.

The Liberal leader took a different attitude toward "commitments" at that time.

Mr. Pearson went on to say, "After all, this kind of defence is primarily a United States responsibility. It is the defence of the deterrent. We know how important that is; but it is a deterrent which is under the sole control of the United States of America."

Nor was the Liberal leader much concerned about anti-Americanism, for he continued, "It is not a defence, and in the nature of things I submit it cannot be a defence, of our territory in the traditional sense of the word, and it will soon be no defence of anything... It seems to me, Mr.

Chairman, that our experience in the past three years has shown that in attempting to participate in continental defence in the way we have, we are becoming nothing more than just the last two knots on the Bomarc tail of the defence kite."

I do not need to tell the committee what happened only weeks after he made those statements. For the benefit of hon. members on the other side who were not here at the time and would like to read the record, they will find it at page 7606 of *Hansard* for August 5, 1960. This seemed to be the Liberal party position until January 12, 1963, when the Prime Minister visited Toronto and had this to say at a meeting of the York-Scarborough Liberal Association:

"It (the Ottawa government) should end its evasion of responsibility, by discharging the commitments it has already accepted for Canada. It can only do this by accepting nuclear warheads, for those defensive tactical weapons which cannot effectively be used without them, but which we have agreed to use. An agreement with the United States for this purpose would have to be negotiated—

That was on January 12. A few days later it was not negotiation he spoke about. He said it should be reviewed. I do not need to put any more of this article on the record, Mr. Chairman.

I again point out one simple fact. The Minister of National Defence is asking us to accept his word that everything is all right so far as Canada's defence structure is concerned. His attitude is, "We will look after the armed forces. Leave it to us. Pass the bill and let us get ahead with the job." All I say is that we have had considerable experience with the government. We have had considerable experience with the Prime Minister. We have had considerable experience with the veracity of the Minister of National Defence. I am not sure that as a member of parliament I want to turn over to him the sole responsibility of taking care of an essential part of our country's defence.

How confident is the minister that the program he has embarked on is the right one? I suppose any normal human being, after making a statement of fact in the House of Commons, would assume that, if it was a statement on a subject of vital interest to Canadians, they would read it in the press, and if further interested they would find ways and means of obtaining more information relative to the subject. That is not the case with the Minister of National Defence. He made a speech in the House of Commons, and then to make sure it was read, though it really did not matter whether it was read or not, he went out and spent $5,398 of the taxpayers' money to make sure that it was read. I quote this report from the Edmonton *Journal* of March 14:

Defence Minister Hellyer disclosed in the Commons Monday that his department spent $5,398—

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted for his speech has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

The Deputy Chairman: Is there unanimous consent in the committee to allow the hon. member to continue his speech?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Skoreyko: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was quoting a newspaper report dealing with the degree of confidence that the minister had in his own policy statement. It says that the minister ordered 45,240 copies of his December 7 speech for distribution at the taxpayers' expense.

Mrs. Rideout: Don't be nasty.

Mr. Skoreyko: I beg the lady's pardon. I say again, Mr. Chairman, the minister is asking us to turn over to him, without debate—

Mr. Matheson: Without debate?

Mr. Skoreyko: —the full responsibility for the job he is trying to do. I am not sure he knows what it is that he wants to do. I am more and more convinced he does not know the implications of the word unification. He has still not told us the state of affairs respecting our commitments to NATO and NORAD. When he finds time to answer some of these questions we may be able to take a better and closer look at this bill.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, you know I am the soul of brevity and I just wish to take two or three minutes to correct some inaccurate information given to the press last evening by Mr. Lee who, I understand, is the information officer for the minister's office. Yesterday I asked the minister this question, as recorded at page 14829 of *Hansard*:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. I am informed that a dozen chief petty officers and petty officers from the Royal Canadian Navy, coming from the east and west coasts, are attending a supply course in the district. As one feature of that course they are present in the gallery of this chamber. Before coming here they were told to remove their uniforms because the unification debate will be taking place and it would not be appropriate for them to be in naval uniform on this occasion. Can the minister explain this situation?

The minister replied:

> Mr. Speaker, not only am I unable to explain it, I had not heard about it until this moment. I will make inquiries.

However, as soon as I had asked the question Mr. Lee went around to the press and to the radio people in the house and informed them that the reason these men were not allowed in the house in their uniforms was because this was a tradition from the time of Charles I. While there was no law in this respect—he had consulted the legal office of the minister's department—it was a tradition and a practice in all parliaments of the Commonwealth.

This is quite incorrect. During my experience here of nearly 22 years I have never seen a member of the armed forces denied admission to the galleries. I have made inquiries since yesterday and I can truly say that no Speaker and no Sergeant-at-Arms has ever issued an order that members of the armed forces who come to the galleries, unarmed and in uniform, shall be denied entrance to the galleries of the house. The same rule applies to the mother of parliaments.

As a matter of fact I was at Westminster in Great Britain when, for one moment, being a member of parliament from Canada I was what is known as a distinguished visitor. The procedure is that you line up and your name is called. In front of me was an admiral of the Royal Navy in full uniform and we sat together in the distinguished visitors gallery of the house, one of my brief moments of glory in a rather mediocre career.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Anyway the practice is the same in the mother of parliaments. Last evening I was asked to appear on television at a private television station. I made some comments on this matter. One of the members of the press finally came to me with the statement made by Mr. Lee. I said this was nonsense. Strangely enough a gentleman who stays at the University Club of Toronto immediately wrote me as follows:

> Dear Mr. Herridge: I have just heard on "The World at Six" C.B.C. radio program of your hassle with Mr. Hellyer over his ruling that it was improper under a tradition going back to Charles I for military or naval personnel to appear in the gallery of the House of Commons in uniform.

Of course it was not a hassle with the minister; it was a question of something which originated with the minister's information officer, parliamentary assistant and chief factotum. The letter continues:

> This is nonsense. In 1917, after being wounded and invalided home, I was for a year private secretary to Sir Edward Kemp then minister of militia and defence in the Borden government. In September or October of that year I sat on the floor of the house in uniform, in front of the minister, during the debate on the Military Service Act providing for conscription. The gallery was liberally sprinkled with officers and other ranks of the army and navy—no Canadian air force then existed—all in uniform.
>
> The reason for my presence was that I had assisted in drafting the bill which was finalized by the late Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, then solicitor general, who steered it through the house.
>
> The late Major Gen. Eugene Fiset, then deputy minister, later Lieutenant Governor of Quebec, would normally have been on the floor on that occasion and had, of course, been there many times during the war years always in full uniform.
>
> It looks as if Mr. Hellyer has pulled another boner.
>
> Yours sincerely, Everett Bristol,
> late Major 15 Bn. 1st Can. Div.

He is quite mistaken. It was not a boner on the part of the minister; it was a boner on the part of the gentleman behind the scenes. However, I am sure all of us, the minister and everyone in this house regardless of party, welcomes members of the armed forces of Canada to the galleries of this chamber. I am very pleased to see that Mr. Lee's decision already has been revised, because in the gallery behind me are two members of the Royal Canadian Navy in uniform.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Herridge: Regardless of our opinion for or against, this debate on the unification bill is of great importance to the Canadian people and of great interest to members of the armed forces.

Mr. Mandziuk: Mr. Chairman, many members have been prompted to speak for various reasons. My reason for speaking is the fact that I completely agree with the Minister of National Defence on the principle—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Mandziuk: Wait until you hear the rest of it—on the principle that it is the civilian authority which runs the nation and not the military. This is a principle which I believe the minister has enunciated more than once. I completely agree with him. I do not see how any Canadian could disagree with him on that score. History has shown us that in any nation, where the army or the military forces

have taken over the government, civil freedom and civil liberties naturally were kicked out the window. I also wish to speak in respect of Bill C-243 as a Canadian expressing a civilian point of view. I have listened with interest to what gentlemen on both sides of the house have had to say. I attended some meetings of the committee on national defence and have read very faithfully the comments which have appeared in the press.

As a Canadian with near relatives who have served this country as members of the forces I am as confused as some of the gentlemen who have spoken during the last number of days. I am confused, and I believe people in the rest of Canada are confused by the very fact that there is such a divergence of opinion between the Minister of National Defence and those who either were fired from the forces, or left before their normal retirement period. I am referring to those men who performed a distinguished service to this country as members of the army, navy or air force. These men who have served this nation well do not agree with the proposal submitted by the Minister of National Defence and his government. What axe do these men have to grind? Is this what one might call a conspiracy against the government? I do not think so; I do not think they are doing this for political reasons. They simply do not believe in this policy.

Whose judgment should the people of Canada accept? Should they accept the judgment of these distinguished men who have been in the services or the judgment of the government which is proposing something altogether new? This is confusing. Another thing which leads me to believe there must be some substance in this is that on the opposition side we have men who have distinguished themselves in the army or the navy, and have served this country well. These men are of the opinion that this policy of unifying our forces and making them into one force is not to the advantage of this nation and is not something which will provide a proper defence for this nation. Whom should the people of Canada believe?

I even have had a letter from a constituent who wonders why green was chosen as the colour for the uniform. Why not yellow, white, grey, black or any other colour? If we were in Ireland and the Irish Republican army were dressed in green we would not be surprised; it is the Emerald Isle. I do not think that green is an attractive colour. I do not look at our stewardesses on the airplanes more than once now, because they are dressed in green. They looked much better when they wore air force blue. Why, of all colours, did the minister choose green.

Mr. Hellyer: Would my friend like an answer to that question?

Mr. Mandziuk: Yes.

Mr. Hellyer: I did not choose it. The armed forces have been responsible for the colour of the uniform, as they have in respect of all the other details related to the principles we have been discussing in this house. Surely the hon. member would not wish to reflect on their choice. It was a spontaneous choice and they have been responsible for the development right from the outset.

Mr. Mandziuk: Thank you. I am glad the minister gave us this explanation. If he were as frank in respect of all matters which come up in this discussion, I think we would make more progress.

Mr. Matheson: Read *Hansard.*

Mr. Mandziuk: I will be putting more questions to the minister before I am through. One of my colleagues on this side of the house was considerably perturbed, and really wondered who was behind this and who conceived the idea of the unified force.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Who fathered the thought behind this program? My colleague did not want to give that honour to the Minister of National Defence, and I agree with him. I believe this idea was fathered by another gentleman who sits in the front benches. That gentleman holds the portfolio in the ministry of external affairs. He is a man who, during the last several years, has gone to great pains to establish peace in the world, and I take my hat off to him. He is an idealist and feels that Canada can play a great part in stamping out small conflagrations. He believes that Canada has a great part to play in policing the world. And we have considerable experience in this regard as a result of our efforts in the Gaza strip in keeping the Arabs and the Jews away from each other's throats.

Our boys have been stationed in various areas of the world, keeping the peace, and as things now are it looks as though they will be there forever. Hon. members of this house will recall that the Minister of National Defence jumped at the idea of sending our troops to keep the peace in Cyprus. The United Nations had no funds at that time and we had to shell out the money. This exercise

was supposedly to last for three months, but our troops have been there for several years. The minister has been very quiet about this fact and has made no forecast as to how long they may be required; but the taxpayers are paying the shot. There is no hope of a settlement because presumably no steps are being taken to encourage a settlement, or at least the newspapers have not been reporting these steps.

The minister of external affairs has indicated that he hopes his peace efforts will be successful in Viet Nam, he is in favour of sending our boys to Viet Nam to keep the north and south Vietnamese from fighting. He believes in keeping peace in the world. I do not doubt the minister's sincerity, but I wonder why he feels that Canada should no longer worry about her own defence. That worry has been prompted by the words of the Minister of National Defence regarding the proposed mobile force which can be sent to any part of the world under the auspices of NATO, the United States or some other power.

The Minister of National Defence is becoming complacent about Canada's position, because of the considerable diminution of the cold war. We have all observed the outstretched hand from Moscow and we are not going to refuse to grasp those hands which offer friendship and peace. We have all listened to those friendly overtures from that red empire, which now occupies most of Europe. We have all heard of communist attempts to establish consulates in western countries, including Canada.

It is my belief that we are being hoodwinked by the cultural exchanges of communist students and students of the western world. We are beginning to believe that there is no longer any danger of difficulties with the U.S.S.R. It is my feeling that this is the belief of the minister of defence and the minister for external affairs. Apparently on that premise they have adopted this unification program.

Our position is becoming somewhat confused. We have spent a great deal of money in conjunction with the United States to set up a defence against the onslaught of the red army. We have spent a great deal of money in respect of our NATO efforts. I hasten to add that were it not for NATO many countries in Europe would not be free today. We will not refuse to grasp the hand of friendship. Before we place trust in the friendship of men like Kosygin and Brezhnev we should ask them to go further to show their good intentions.

In this regard, Mr. Chairman, the Soviet union should remove the iron curtain and that abolish their border restrictions so that Canadians and citizens of other western countries can visit their lands, and in order that the people of those iron curtain countries can visit and even emigrate to western countries. These communist countries should allow the wives and children of people living in Canada to rejoin their families. Once they have shown that type of goodwill, perhaps we can accept their proffered friendship without restraint.

The right hon. leader of the official opposition suggested when he was prime minister that Khrushchev should free the 14 nations that compose the U.S.S.R. empire today. These people have different cultures, languages, and history. They should be allowed to vote freely, to retain their status in the union or to become independent. In this way the Russians could show their goodwill.

Apparently the Minister of National Defence is not concerned in this regard, but concerned only in grasping the outstretched hand. I suggest there is a good reason for this extension of friendship to the Americas by the U.S.S.R. That reason relates to the fact that officials in Moscow and Peking have ideological differences and are at loggerheads. Let us not forget that the Chinese have a claim against Russia in respect of some lost land in Siberia. The Chinese feel that Stalin was a good man and that the present-day officials in Moscow have torn him from his exalted position. One faction idealizes Khrushchev while the other does not. Let us never forget that neither of these two giants has renounced the idea of burying the western powers, just as Khrushchev suggested to the United States.

What will happen if these two great communist powers embrace each other again as they once did? They will likely march together hand in hand to capture the entire world. If that should take place the U.S.S.R. will again show its teeth by building a bigger wall in Berlin. If the worst happens Canada will become a buffer zone between the United States and the Soviet union. This will be the battleground between these two nations, and let us not fool ourselves in this regard. Which side will we join? I mean every word when I say that I would rather be clawed by the American eagle than crushed by the Russian bear.

National Defence Act Amendment

• (9:10 p.m.)

One thing leads to another. We are pleased to see the world heading for what we think is peace. But is our force going to have no other duties to perform than policing difficult areas in the world? Are we going to have a force which will contribute to the defence of this nation? Have we no national pride? I believe that those gentlemen who have served in the forces, and the gentlemen on this side of the house who are opposing this bill so strenuously, deserve support; and I think they are getting a great deal of support in the country.

I received a telephone call just today. I asked the gentleman, a constituent of mine, "What is the reaction to this continuous debate on the unification bill?" He said, "Our request is, kill it." This is actual fact. I do not think we will kill it because the minister has sufficient guarantees from some of the smaller groups in the house to push the bill through; but he will not push it through until the country realizes what the bill means. Once the country realizes what it means, and that there is something rotten in the state of Denmark, the minister and the Liberal party will pay for it in the next election.

Ladies—excuse me, Mr. Chairman.

An hon. Member: There is one here.

Mr. Mandziuk: Yes, there is a lady here.

Another point is economy. We heard a great deal from the minister a couple of years ago to the effect that it would be economical if we unified our forces. We do not hear so much about that today, because the estimates show that the minister's department is spending more than it ever did. Of course, that is the usual thing. That is what this government has been doing in every department. They talked about economy in 1963 and 1965, but that is now forgotten. Political promises are made only to be broken. That is the way this government has been carrying on. Where is the economy in this proposal? Canadians swallowed the idea that it might be more economical to have one unified force rather than providing supplies for three forces.

In 1966 the minister said that a survey was being made of our defence establishments with a view to cutting them down, and as soon as the survey was made a decision as to their future would be reached. There is no harm in having a survey. But when asked from time to time whether he had made his decision, the answer was always no, a decision had not been made. In spite of that, certain defence establishments were nibbled away. I have in mind the one in my riding, the Canadian joint air training camp at Rivers. Personnel of the various units were moved out; they vacated the houses they had been renting in the area. Their children have had to get out of school. The population of that training establishment has been reduced, in spite of the fact that the minister says he has not made up his mind. When I placed a question on the order paper asking the minister when this establishment was going to be phased out, his answer was that it would not be done this year. But apparently it will be done some time in the future, if what his department is doing is any indication.

The minister should be honest and frank, just as frank as he was about the colour of the uniform, and tell these people what is to happen with that camp. Why prolong the agony? Why not tell them whether the establishment at Rivers is to be retained or phased out? The minister flew down there last fall in order to appease some of the vociferous Grits who were complaining, together with the Tories, that they wanted the issue brought to a head and wanted to find out whether this establishment was to be phased out. The minister neutralized some of the vociferous complaints, because these people are now keeping quiet. They trust that the minister will keep the establishment in operation, but it is being nibbled and nibbled away.

What function does this training establishment perform? It was set up in 1939. It has all the buildings and runways necessary for parachute-jump training. The river there has been dammed. There is a wonderful lake where the troops can practise jumps on the water. They have a joint school. The high school is only three miles from the base and it is at the disposal of the students at the base. Considerable sums of money from Ottawa were poured into the erection of the school at Rivers. The facilities at the base were not suitable or sufficient for the junior and elementary grades; they did not have the proper teaching staff, and these students have been attending the Rivers school.

What is the situation there today? I say that this establishment is being chiselled away. Rivers high school has lost 44 students because their parents have been moved to God knows where. The elementary school has suffered because two rooms are now receiving no school grant. We have in this small community 1,600 people. This establishment depended on defence dollars for its existence. I tell the minister quite frankly that today

there are 55—this is the situation today because I have today's statistics—houses and suites which stand empty. The people of Rivers built these houses for business purposes. They were rented by the personnel at the base. As I say, 55 houses and suites are now empty. Three houses built with the assistance of C.M.H.C. mortgages have been empty since last year. A house that cost $15,500 last year can be bought for $9,000 this year. I suggest that if the minister wants to retire somewhere in Canada he can buy a cheap house there. These people are going through the agony of uncertainty.

The minister tells us that the base will operate this year, but what will happen in 1968? This base has been nibbled and nibbled away and there will be nothing left in 1968. All the millions of dollars that were poured into the base to provide all these facilities will go to waste, Mr. Minister. Why is this? Why not be frank and tell the people what you are going to do?

An hon. Member: He doesn't know.

Mr. Mandziuk: I agree that he doesn't know. The survey has been carried out, but the minister has not yet made up his mind. I think he has made up his mind but will not tell us his decision. Last fall he made up his mind to receive a delegation from Rivers. The Minister of Defence Production was to set a date for the delegation to attend here. That date still has not been set, and these people are angry and unhappy.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman, as a contribution to this debate. We are disturbed because under the guise of economy more money than ever is being spent by the Department of National Defence; under the guise of economy certain areas in Canada will be ruined, because Rivers air training camp is not unique and I understand training camps in other parts of Canada are threatened with the same fate. The minister, just like Nero, fiddles away while Rome burns. This nation is in desperate straits and it must be given some clarification.

• (9:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to say a few words at this point in the debate.

I have no wish to prolong the debate for I feel it has already lasted long enough. I listened closely to several speeches and, to my mind, they are all alike.

I shall not say exactly the same thing as the other members, because I have different convictions. What I have to tell the house will therefore differ from what has already been said.

I believe there is general agreement with regard to maintaining armed forces and their role. The two parties, Grits and Tories, wholly agree on that score. The only disagreement between the two concerns unification.

I do not think that is so important. I do not see why there is so much insistence on telling the minister and reminding the goverment that this is not the time to unify the armed forces. Unified or divided, they will always be armed forces and that does not change the situation.

Mr. Chairman, we are in favour of unification too. We want the least division possible because the more united things are, the better. I do not think that dividing the armed forces will improve things. I suggest that perhaps everything will go better if we unify them. It is something worth trying. If that does not work, we can always come back to the present situation.

In my opinion, the Progressive Conservatives are wrong to maintain their argument, to maintain that the status quo must be preserved at all costs. In life one must move ahead. That is progress. We, for our part, are in favour of any possible progress, of anything that can be improved. We are all for that. And that is the reason why we will vote for unification of the armed forces. That does not mean we fully agree with the government on that matter, because I feel that the armed forces we keep in Europe, supposedly to maintain peace, should be brought back to Canada.

I think that we should bring back home all our troops which are in Europe at the present time. I ask the minister and all the hon. members this question. Who are our enemies? Why do we maintain troops if we have no enemies?

[*English*]

Mr. Webb: May I ask the hon. member a question? He just stated that he agrees with the policy which the government is introducing now. There is no question but that this policy will result in conscription to supply our armed forces with the necessary personnel. I should like to ask the hon. member whether he agrees with conscription?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Chairman, I do not favour conscription, far from it. But, on the

other hand, I agree with the maintenance of an armed force in the country, not outside the country. I see no point in maintaining armed forces outside the country and I even believe that it is against unity and peace in the world to send armed forces to Europe.

Coming back to the point I wished to make, I want to say that the troops we maintain in Europe cannot be of much use. An analysis of the situation will show that if we accepted the facts as they are, we would come to the conclusion that a withdrawal of our troops from Europe would be better.

If we want peace, it is certainly not by waging war that we shall have it. If we really want to help the destitute and needy people of Europe, it is not by showing them guns or by keeping them in fear that we shall succeed.

You know, it is by practising love and charity that Our Lord made conquests. Now, we must practise charity. Since we are able to practise charity in Europe, let us do so. European people want peace. Instead of sending them guns, deadly weapons and armed forces, let us provide them with bread to enable them to live and develop like all other nations.

This would enable us to reduce our armed forces and as a result achieve considerable savings on that score. These savings could be used elsewhere. In fact, we could help entire countries for several months.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that if we want peace, we have to show it. It is not by showing off our armed forces that we will win. Once again we will succeed through love and charity. We shall win by doing good.

We all have a mission to fulfil. If we fulfil it well we may do great things for the world, for the development of individuals not only physically but morally and intellectually. We could help so many people with these same sums of money. We are wasting considerable money on our armed forces.

Yet we are not doing Canada much good. If we decide to unify our forces and strengthen our armed forces in Europe and in Canada, Mr. Chairman, what will that mean? It will mean more taxes for Canadians, who are having a hard time as it is. They must be shamefully over-taxed in order to maintain and finance our armed forces today.

What will we gain by making enemies in Europe and by making enemies of the Canadian people? We know that all is not well in Canada, that there is dissension and dissatisfaction throughout the country. We see strikes happen here and there, and that may be the reason for the general dissatisfaction. In fact, it is one strike after another; when one is settled, ten others are called. We will not settle the problem in that way.

Now if we sent our armed forces to Europe and if we were attacked tomorrow morning, how would we defend ourselves?

Mr. Chairman, I submit all those things to the attention and consideration of the minister.

Mr. Chairman, we are often unable to bring unity in our homes, our industries, our country, let alone in a world torn with fear, envy and hate.

• (9:30 p.m.)

When a legislature such as ours is no longer afraid of what people will say, it may be in a position not only to act justly, as the Almighty wants us to, but also in legislating and seeing to it that justice may prevail in North America. Once again, it may disclose to other nations the secret of enduring freedom and show the world the way leading to a durable peace. Where in this world can we urge people to live in our modern society and build a brave new world? We must build a complete new world. The world of warfare and destruction is far from being a novelty, Mr. Chairman.

In fact, there is nothing older, more cruel, more diabolic and more inhuman. Let us get out of the dreadful chaos which leaves the people fearful, destitute and insecure.

If we have insecurity in Canada, it is mostly due to those armaments, those funds squeezed out of Canadians while they are deprived of their purchasing power, their power to live properly and comfortably, with all that earmarked for the upkeep of our peacekeeping forces under the pretext that other countries will be saved.

What did we do during the last 1939-45 war, Mr. Chairman? We fought against the great communist theories and we implanted communism in 50 per cent of the countries throughout the world.

That is what we have achieved, and we are now fighting against the same ideology. We must strengthen our forces and our finance. We must discover all these techniques by our own means, and we must also devote all that to destruction.

For once, let us try to work like men. Let us work to rebuild ideals, to save the situation and to establish, once and for all, a lasting peace in our country, a country that abounds with riches.

Mr. Chairman, if we mind our own business, if we put our nose where we should put it, in short, if we do not attack anybody, it happens very seldom that others attack us. Then, if we take care of our own business, if we stay home, if we provide people with bread instead of guns and weapons of death, we will really work for the good of mankind. We will show that we will really work for peace and not only for war.

Man has risen through technology and industry. We have become giants in this field, able to wipe out continents, explore the stars, exchange information between continents, through means we could not even think of hardly 50 years ago.

But the fact remains that there are serious problems to be solved in this country. We must realize that most of the problems go about on two legs and the colour of those legs does not alter the problem.

Mr. Chairman, until such time as we resolve to create a force composed of capable, intelligent, honest men who will not be corrupted by money or power, in short, men capable of building our country, we will continue to live in fear and growing division.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the only thing we will achieve by broadening the scope of our armed forces, by increasing the moneys to be spent to that end, will be merely to enrich arms manufacturers, shipbuilders and financiers. They are the ones, Mr. Chairman, who will be favoured and well paid at the expense of the Canadian people who are bled white in order that we may maintain our armed forces.

Therefore, we should fight against this and withdraw our forces from Europe. I am in favour of a good common force in the country, a mobile, active and modern force, but that is all. We will defend ourselves when we are attacked. For a long time now we have put our nose in other nations' business and some day we will suffer for it, because we are too active and too curious about things which are none of our concern.

That is what I wanted to tell the minister. That is my idea of the army and the funds earmarked for its upkeep.

If labourers copy capitalists and claim more and more, while they work less and less, this will cause a continuous increase in the prices of goods that other labourers and other citizens have to buy.

We have heard that we must strengthen our armed forces and increase the number of their units. Mr. Chairman, we should above all set up an army of another kind, an army of avowed revolutionaries, of resolute men who will attack boldly injustice and corruption, because they will not fear to have light shed on their personal life.

We need an army of competent men, an army of responsible men, an army of men who understand the human being, and an army of Christian men. That is what we need. Those are the ideals which we should pursue and which we should proclaim throughout the world.

We need men and women capable of facing the problems instead of shunning them, men and women who will apply the strict principles of honesty and unselfishness in their daily lives.

There are too many fat people and too many skinny people in the world. There are enough resources in the world, Mr. Chairman, to satisfy the needs of everyone, but not enough for the cupidity of everyone.

But men do not yet have enough love, they do not share enough, so that everyone may have enough in this age when God and man want everyone, black, white, brown, yellow, red, to walk proudly in equality, dignity and peace.

It is selfishness alone which breaks up the homes and divides the races, and this increases hatred. It is selfishness alone which devilishly destroys any hope we may entertain to see a moral maturity develop to the level of the technical and industrial opportunities of our time.

Man has become an unbelievable industrial giant. It is now possible, in the modern world, to feed everyone properly, to give everyone decent and adequate shelter, in short, it is possible for everyone to have an opportunity in life, whatever his environment, his education or his economic or social condition.

Down with the old hatred, the old fears, the old desires of the human heart. America must understand that and say with all its will power and self-control: We are going to make great strides, we are going to push the clock ahead, so that all mankind may reach the next phase of human development. Otherwise, the world will destroy itself, or we shall

head into an era of somber slavery, and then we will have the atomic war.

We know what the atomic war can mean; we know also what will be left after an atomic war. Therefore, we have no reason to venture into atomic wars, we have no reason to equip our country with atomic or nuclear weapons.

• (9:40 p.m.)

There are countries which never waged war, which live in peace. They are capable of helping, not by providing guns, but by providing comforting help. That is how help can be given. It is not by showing off the power of our armies that we will conquer the world, but rather by showing others that we can help ourselves, that we can develop ourselves thanks to a system whereby every Canadian can live comfortably in his country where wealth is abundant.

Our wealth must not be used only to make cannons but also to improve the welfare of all mankind. Money cannot even be found to increase family allowances. Many families live in slums; their income is inadequate. When our people work, their salaries are cut by 50, 60 per cent to maintain armed forces, to make cannons and tanks, and that to make a few individuals wealthy. We must not let that happen, Mr. Chairman. Right now we stand on the threshold of an era of tyranny, an era of death and destruction; or an era of a new kind of man, different from the man of the stone age, the steel age, the dollar and sex age.

Mr. Chairman, we Canadians, could accomplish great things, if we wanted. Not one of those opposed to the unification of the armed forces has asked for the withdrawal of our forces from Europe, has asked the government to mind its own business. By minding its own business, it could then help foreign countries.

If we could reduce our defence expenditures, we could promote and develop agriculture on a large scale. If we were able to produce bread, we could then give some to India, to Africa and to all needy countries. Then, we would be peacemakers, we would act like men, like Christians, like people who love one another. We would strive for the reinstatement of peace throughout the world and inside our own country.

I shall say no more. My feelings, I hope, will be taken into consideration. If we cannot withdraw our forces immediately, let us do it gradually. Afterwards, we would be in a position to help other countries, as I said before. We supported France and England with all our might.

[Mr. Latulippe.]

Today, France turns her back on us. What guarantee have we that Great Britain will not do the same thing tomorrow morning? I knew soldiers in Great Britain who were not satisfied with the situation, Canadian soldiers who stayed in Britain after the war. They are living in Britain and are not even getting any pension from that country. Our soldiers are not satisfied. If they are not well treated, Mr. Chairman, why not repatriate them?

After all, what are we doing for peace? What can we have done to settle other countries' problem? Even though we make suggestions, even though we travel, even though we send the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) to make speeches, all that does not matter. Other countries pay no heed to that. Then, we have no business sticking our nose into those countries. Let us withdraw. That is what we must do. And if we do it, we will be acting as Canadians who want to live not die.

We can do that. As a matter of fact, it is easier to achieve than to enlarge our armed forces, to continue to invade other countries and to spread fear with our guns and our engines of war.

It is not through fear or hate that we will instill something in the hearts of men. We will put justice in the human heart when we are able to keep peace and, to do that, we must start by establishing peace at home and allowing our citizens to live in peace. Now, to live in peace, the needs of our citizens must be met, they must have at least the necessities of life. At that time, we will be able to say to our French speaking or English speaking Canadians: Work under the aegis of the Canadian flag and you will be able to develop your country.

Be alive, be proud of your country, be proud to walk under your flag. However, if it is a blood-stained flag, a flag that was sullied in Europe, French speaking as well as English speaking Canadians will refuse to walk under it. If we possibly can, then it is our duty to keep our flag immaculate, and to show Canadians a brand new unsullied flag. We can do it if we want to, and I ask every member of this house, in this decisive and important hour, to give at least some thought to the fact that we can settle our problems without increasing our armed forces and shamefully overtaxing the population for defence purposes and for the production, in Canada, of guns, planes, tanks and so on.

We can accomplish other things besides. We need bread and not guns. We must have justice and peace prevail and not hate and division. This objective will only be attained through love and charity and through an increase in our national production. Then we could help needy countries according to our means, with our surplus production. Our contribution will not be guns, but drugs and bread, in short, all that people require to progress intellectually and morally and in other respects.

[*English*]

Mr. Ballard: Mr. Chairman, after hearing the previous speaker, a member for the Ralliement Créditiste, it is easy to see why he and his party will vote with the government. The hon. member qualifies himself almost for a Nobel peace prize, paralleling, in his speech, other hon. members who also qualified for peace prizes. The hon. member was more forthright in his remarks than have been members on the government side. He intends to solve the world's problems by financial means, by encouraging food production, and so on. In this way, by helping the peoples of all the world, some future conflagration may be prevented from breaking out.

It is interesting to note that the contempt felt for the United States was greater after huge gifts of foreign aid had been given than the contempt felt before those gifts had been given.

If we do as the hon. member suggests, if we bring our armed forces back to Canada and give them the role to play that he suggests they should play, we shall wind up with having the largest police force of any nation. We shall have a force of boy scouts who do nothing but put out forest fires, and that sort of thing. When I speak of forest fires, I do not do so in the same way that other hon. members have spoken of forest fires.

I suggest to the hon. member that as a centennial project the members of the Ralliement Créditiste should travel around the world informing other people about the Social Credit creed. The people in the various troubled spots of the world will become so confused that they would have no stomach for causing more trouble.

It is always interesting to hear hon. members with high ideals, like the one immediately preceding me in the debate. Unfortunately, however, those ideals are being preached to the wrong people. The hon. member should convince those who are behind the iron curtain; he should convince the people in the troubled parts of the world to live in a spirit of brotherly love, to expend their efforts more in raising food than in making weapons.

I do not pretend to be an armed forces expert. As a matter of fact I had not intended entering this debate. I decided, however, to enter it, after becoming concerned with the government's lack of co-operation in showing exactly what is meant by unification.

• (9:50 p.m.)

As a result I have read some of the evidence which was placed before the committee on defence and I find that most of the witnesses were also confused as to what was meant by unification. It is fortunate that the minister was able to find someone in the senior ranks who agreed with this concept of unification, whatever that happens to be, before he ran out of officers. Statistics show that one after another a great number of officers in all three services were fired, or retired early, because they did not agree with the concept of unification as laid down by the minister.

The minister has his own interpretation of unification. It is not spelled out in the white paper. Most of the witnesses expressed a fear that there was some hidden reason for ramming this bill through parliament at this time. Most of the witnesses said we were not prepared for unification. Some of them said they did not understand what unification meant. In the absence of definite information from the minister we can only assume that he himself does not know what unification means; possibly he is a tool of some higher authority.

There has been considerable criticism of the common rank structure. There has been criticism of the effect this bill will have on morale. There has been considerable discussion about the economics of this policy. The minister has not been able to show us that there will be appreciable savings as a result of this step. He has not been able to show that we shall have sufficient personnel to maintain a unified force. One of these senior service witnesses estimated we would need 150,000 service personnel at a cost of slightly over $2 billions in order to maintain the commitments we have undertaken.

It seems strange to me that the minister, if he desires this bill to go through, cannot be honest with the house, and explain what unification means and how it will bring economic benefit to this country. Can he assure us that we shall have sufficient personnel

whose morale is sufficiently high to maintain our defence forces at the standards we have known in the past?

One of the witnesses before the committee was Air Marshal W. A. Curtis. He found it peculiar that we should be discarding the three separate services and placing them in one uniform under one command. He had this to say—and I quote from page 2149 of the 33rd report of the committee on national defence:

In 1918 the British government decided that air operations were so important a part of war that they should be a separate service, and on April 1 of that year the RAF was created.

In 1924 when the entire defence budget was only a fraction of today's, the Canadian government decided to separate the Canadian Air Force from the Army, and on April 1, 1924, the RCAF was born.

The United States government was convinced during World War II that the United States Army Air Corps should be a separate service, and as a result the United States Air Force was formed in 1947.

In my opinion the proposed organization whereby the Canadian Air Force becomes nothing more than a branch of the ground forces, is a fantastic attempt to turn back the clock.

A little later on, he said:

I have quite naturally discussed the proposed changes to our military organization with friends in other countries, and the reaction goes all the way from shaking the head in disbelief to asking whether the Minister is out of his mind.

The same thought occurs to us on this side of the house. We wonder whether the minister is out of his mind. Our two largest allies have separate forces, yet we are in the process of unification. The military experts, on whom we rely for the training of our forces, break the forces down into three component parts; yet we are talking about unification. It makes some members on this side ask the same question as was asked by Air Marshal Curtis: Is the minister out of his mind? I am sure the minister is not out of his mind; he is just stubborn. Otherwise he would be forthright enough to give us the answers to our questions, or else he would delay the passage of this bill or listen to the advice of military experts in this country and in others. I will leave it at that, for now. I ask the question: Is the minister out of his mind?

May I call it ten o'clock?

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Knowles: What is the menu for tomorrow?

[Mr. Ballard.]

Mr. Hellyer: Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, we will continue with this debate.

• (10:00 p.m.)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

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

IMMIGRATION—REPORTED PRESENCE IN CANADA OF GERMAN WAR CRIMINALS

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, on April 1 of this year there was a program on the C.B.C. with respect to certain nazi war criminals now living in Canada, which caused considerable concern to many persons who heard the program. Later on the same date a Canadian Press dispatch dealt at somewhat greater length with the question. I am going to quote the press dispatch so that the house may understand what I am talking about. It emanated from Ottawa and read:

Ottawa admits it got list of war criminals.

The External Affairs Department confirmed yesterday that a list of names of people alleged to be nazi war criminals living in Canada was given to the Canadian embassy in Vienna last year.

Simon Wiesenthal, the man who found Adolph Eichmann in Argentina in 1960, said in Toronto Friday that the names of 15 eastern Europeans who had committed crimes in Poland and the Baltic countries had been given to the embassy in Vienna about six months ago.

He said the people were not of serious consequence in the nazi hierarchy.

An External Affairs Department spokesman said Wiesenthal had handed the list of names to the embassy with no documentation. The names were sent to Ottawa where they were distributed to "the appropriate government departments."

He declined to say how many names were on the list.

The C.B.C. news report and this press dispatch have given concern to a good number of people and I have had letters on this subject and some phone calls from those persons who were concerned. To illustrate the concern of some Canadians with this situation I wish to quote one letter which I received:

Dear Mr. Herridge,

I was quite shocked tonight to hear via the C.B.C. that we are harbouring at least 15 nazi war criminals in this country. The author of this statement is a chap called Wiesenthal, or reasonably close to this spelling, who operates out of an office in Vienna. He is Jewish and has dedicated his life to tracking down nazis who were and are responsible for many atrocities and he has had some considerable success. He claims that he advised the Canadian government of this fact some time ago but does not know if they have taken any action in this regard.

I would certainly like to have this matter raised in the house and can think of no one better equipped than yourself.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Herridge: I am very glad I got applause on this occasion, from the limited audience on both sides of the house.

I now wish to refer briefly to an editorial which appeared in the Vancouver *Sun* on May 1, 1953, after Mr. M. J. Coldwell, former national leader of the C.C.F., had raised this matter in the house. He was very concerned at that time that we were somewhat lax in allowing these people into the country. This is what the editorial had to say:

There is sound sense in what M. J. Coldwell, C.C.F. national leader, says in warning against letting fascist and nazi sympathizers immigrate to Canada. If as he claims too many of these people are getting in the department of immigration is at fault and should institute more rigorous checks.

We wouldn't accuse anyone in the department of being secretly sympathetic to totalitarian thinkers of this shade. But the current strict check on communists possibly causes an unconscious attitude of carelessness at the other end of the political spectrum. The inquiries into the political pasts of the intending emigrants should be more searching.

I wholeheartedly agree with that editorial and with the prior remarks made by Mr. Coldwell in the house. That is why, Mr. Speaker, on April 4 of this year, as recorded at page 14488 of *Hansard*, I asked the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) this question:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, and I do so at the request of a number of persons who are quite concerned about this matter. In view of the statement made on the C.B.C. on April 1 by Mr. Simon Wiesenthal that Canada is harbouring at least 15 nazi war criminals and that he advised the Canadian government of this fact some time ago, has the minister been advised by Mr. Simon Wiesenthal of these war criminals being in Canada and, if so, what action does the minister intend to take on this information?

I shall look forward to the reply to my question by the minister or by the person representing him here this evening. I shall be anxious to know what action the government is taking in an effort to locate these former nazi war criminals, because I believe, as I think a good many other members of this house and the Canadian people believe, that the sooner the government takes action to rid Canada of people of this type the better it will be for the maintenance of democracy today and in the years to come.

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am informed that Mr. Wiesenthal did indeed come to Canada several weeks ago. He came to Toronto in connection with the release of his most recent book. Last summer Mr. Wiesenthal did, as the hon. member said, write to the Canadian embassy in Vienna to provide the embassy with the names, and in some cases the addresses, of people who he alleged were war criminals resident in Canada. The evidence respecting four out of approximately 12 such persons was considered by Mr. Wiesenthal to be particularly strong. He did not, however, supply our ambassador with detailed documentation concerning his allegations.

The information received from Mr. Wiesenthal was passed to other Canadian government departments, and the government departments concerned are continuing their examination of the general questions raised by the allegations that there are war criminals residing here. I am sure that the hon. member would be the first to agree that we should be governed by the system of law that we have in force, and, therefore it might be useful for him to know the exact circumstances under which these cases are considered.

A most careful study has been given to this matter and it is the considered view of the departments concerned that, even if such a person has in fact been guilty of a war crime committed abroad, it is unlikely, should he have acquired the status of a landed immigrant in Canada, that he could be punished in or deported from Canada for such activities. The Canadian Criminal Code does not extend to crimes committed outside this country—with one or two exceptions which are not relevant to the present circumstances—and, once an immigrant has acquired Canadian domicile, he is not subject to deportation for any but a specific and limited number of crimes which have been committed in this country and which are not relevant to the matter at issue.

I am sure the hon. member will recognize that there is a conflict in principle here between the grave concern we may have that persons who may have been guilty of the most abhorrent crimes have not been brought to justice and a basic principle which we have inherited from British justice, that criminal law should not be made retroactive in its application. However, with regard to the

policy of the Department of Manpower and Immigration concerning the admission of persons in respect of whom there might be evidence of this kind, in the future I am sure the Minister of Manpower and Immigration and his officials will take notice of this question and bear it particularly in mind with regard to future applications.

HEALTH AND WELFARE—PROTECTION OF NUTRITION STANDARDS FOLLOWING MILK PRICE INCREASES

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, two days ago, in view of the fact that the price of milk was to go up by two cents a quart within a month, I asked the Prime Minister what plans he and the government have to protect the nutrition standards of individuals and families on low incomes. Mr. Speaker said that that was a question which should not be asked at that time, on orders of the day. We have talked about reforms here in this house and I should very much like to see a change made in the rules so that it would be possible to ask such questions on the orders of the day, especially questions which have to do with nutrition, housing and other important problems which affect the consumers of the country.

• (10:10 p.m.)

My question was based on two news stories, one of which appeared in a Toronto paper and the other in an Ottawa paper. The Toronto paper mentioned that a two cent increase in the price of milk is expected on May 1. The Ottawa paper mentioned two cents or three cents. When I investigated the story I was first inclined to think that what we had been told was correct, that this increase in the price of milk would help the farmer. However, I discovered that the director of the milk marketing board for Ontario clearly pointed out that in any case only one cent of the two cent increase woud go to the farmer, and if the story in the Ottawa newspaper is correct that three of the leading dairies here will increase the price of milk by three cents, the farmer will still get only one cent and the dairies will get the other two. He also stated that the one cent received by the farmer would be practically wiped out because of a decrease in the consumption of milk. As a result I am beginning to wonder whether this increase will go to the farmer or whether the dairies will cash in.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

I am concerned with the living standards of the people in this country on low incomes. According to Canada's food guide, a publication of our own Department of National Health and Welfare, children up to 11 years of age require 2½ cups or 20 fluid ounces of milk per day, adolescents require 4 cups or 32 fluid ounces per day, adults require 1½ cups or 12 fluid ounces per day, and expectant and nursing mothers require 4 cups or 32 fluid ounces per day.

Nutritional experts suggest that milk is essential for growing children, pregnant women and nursing mothers, and that there is no other food which will provide calcium in sufficient quantity. A child would have to consume 7½ cups of raw cabbage in order to obtain the same amount of calcium obtained in one quart of milk. When considering that a child needs 2½ cups of milk per day one realizes how ridiculous it would be to suggest that cabbage could be used as a substitute.

I am also informed that one would have to drink 11 cups of orange juice to get the same amount of calcium obtained in one quart of milk. Calcium is a basic need for healthy teeth and bones.

According to the best information I have available the consumption of milk has been dropping over the years. In 1940, Canadians consumed 1,160 pounds of fluid milk per year per person. By 1950 this consumption had dropped to 1,140, by 1960 to 900 pounds, and in 1965 the consumption was 907 pounds per person. There were increases and decreases in consumption in the intervening years, but the figures I have given indicate a definite trend.

I do not know all the reasons for this trend but the basic one is the increased cost of milk during the years. On January 31, 1940, whole milk cost 11 cents a quart here in Ottawa. By 1951 the price had increased to 22 cents a quart. Last year there were two increases in the price of milk, one in March and the second in July. Today the cost of a quart of whole milk in Ottawa is 30 cents.

These increases in costs are beginning to interfere with the nutritional standard of people in this country. I should like to know what is going to be done about this situation to assist those families on low income. These days we hear a great deal about physical fitness. A man who raises chickens once said that if a small chick's nutritional needs were neglected for even one day, the chick would

be unable to recover that loss during its entire life. If that is true for chicks, what about children?

Mrs. Margaret Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) and I appreciate her concern in this most important matter. I must hasten to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I prefer not to compare children with chickens. In my opinion children have a far higher priority. My interest is a very personal one because I have three children and I recognize the importance and need of nutrition and nutritional value for the children of today and for our future generations.

I am sure the hon. member is well aware of the fact that the government is as concerned as everybody else that Canadians have access to food of the highest nutritional quality. While I cannot with any great wisdom comment on a possible increase in the price of milk, I can assure the hon. member that the Department of National Health and Welfare is obliged to ensure that milk is clean and safe and meets adequate standards of nutrition and purity. One of the most economical and best sources of nutrient value in milk is in powdered milk, and as far as we know to date this commodity will not be affected by the price increase.

I should like also, if I may, to draw attention to a recent conference that I had the great privilege and pleasure of attending. I refer to the conference on child and maternal health. That conference was sponsored by the Department of National Health and Welfare and problems of this nature were brought very forcibly to the attention of all who were there. I think this government has made every effort to ensure that all Canadians, whatever their means, will be able to provide their families with sufficient quantities of milk.

I would refer particularly to the Canada Assistance Plan. This plan was enacted by parliament to ensure that people who do not have means adequate to provide food and other necessities can, through the assistance of the provincial and federal governments, meet the needs of their families for these necessities. I would like to assure the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway that not only am I concerned about this problem but the department for which I have the great honour to work shares her concern, and indeed concern for all the people of Canada.

[*Translation*]

POSTAL SERVICE—REQUEST FOR IMPROVEMENT IN GASPÉ AND BONAVENTURE CONSTITUENCIES

Mr. Albert Béchard (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, on April 12, 1967, I put the following question to the Postmaster General (Mr. Côté):

> In view of the large number of representations received from the far-away county of Bonaventure and a few communities in the county of Gaspé because of the long delays in the local delivery of mail, could the minister investigate to see whether such a deplorable situation could be corrected, if he is anxious to achieve the intended purpose in implementing the mail delivery by truck?

In raising such a question, which I admit, Mr. Speaker, is not of national urgency, my intention was not to delay unduly the normal proceedings of this house nor to embarrass the minister, but rather to point out to him in a particular way a problem which, in the area concerned, is considered as one of great local urgency.

In order to show more clearly the seriousness of the problem, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be appropriate to give a brief historical account of the recent changes that occurred in the delivery of mail in the constituencies of Bonaventure and Gaspé.

For many years, numerous representations were made to the Post Office Department, through local parliament members, responsible bodies such as the district chamber of commerce, several local chambers of commerce, municipal councils, etc., in order to improve postal service on the southern shore of the Gaspé peninsula, from Cross Point, in the constituency of Bonaventure, up to Gaspé, in the county bearing the same name.

The Gaspé peninsula, which unfortunately is always considered as too remote every time one insists on establishing industries in that area which would improve its economy and even attract members of the professional classes, doctors, lawyers, to provide normal and essential services, has suffered and is still suffering from this remoteness, as regards mail delivery.

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

• (10:20 p.m.)

The present minister is well acquainted with the Gaspé peninsula; since his appointment to the department which he is now heading he has thoroughly visited the Gaspé area and obtained on the spot, not only from those who make use of the mail, but also from the post office employees and civic authorities some information in the light of which he has set himself to the task not to attain perfection in the mail distribution in the Gaspé peninsula, but at least to bring some considerable improvements.

For example, in order to dispatch the outgoing and incoming mail in the shortest possible time, the Post Office Department initiated on February 1 last on the southern coast of the Gaspé peninsula, the transport of mail by truck, forgoing the traditional mode of transport, the railway.

An experiment had been made last year whereby second class mail and newspapers were moved by truck; the experiment had proved most satisfactory to the whole population.

In spite of this, Mr. Speaker, the new system inaugurated on February 1 last does not seem to operate to the people's satisfaction. It must be said that the numerous storms that struck the Gaspé peninsula last winter did not help matters. Still, February, March and half of April have gone by and the situation has not improved. Delays do not seem frequent in the delivery of mail from Gaspé to outside points, such as Montreal, Quebec and Ottawa, for instance.

As proof of this, I have here a letter from the secretary and general manager of the Gaspé C.F.U., Mr. Jobin, to the Postmaster General. Dated April 10, mailed on April 10 at Black Cape, in the Gaspé peninsula, it reached the House of Commons on April 11.

In general, complaints deal with mail deliveries between local post offices. The trouble is with the routing of the mails between post offices in Gaspé.

In the same letter addressed to the Postmaster General by Mr. Jobin,—he mentions, for instance, a letter mailed on March 31, 1967, in New Richmond, in the riding of Bonaventure, to the parish priest at Grande-Rivière, 85 miles away. It reached its destination on April 5. It took 6 days to cover 85 miles, whereas another letter from Gaspé took only one day to cover 700 miles.

[Mr. Béchard.]

Mr. Speaker, that is a new service and, as in the case of any new business, before the personnel is used to its operation and its organization in every detail, it may take some time, and some difficulties we are not accustomed to may arise.

Tonight, however, I would ask the hon. minister, whose efficiency is only equalled by his talents and stature and who, in establishing transportation by truck in Gaspé, wanted not to delay the delivery of mail but to improve it considerably, to insist that his officials keep their eye on the present situation in Gaspé, in the best interest of those who use the mails and of the Post Office Department in general.

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I readily understand that the parliamentary secretary to the Secretary of State (Mr. Béchard) is somewhat disappointed by the reorganization of postal services in the Gaspé peninsula.

If I were living there, I would possibly be disappointed also. But I should like it understood, Mr. Speaker, that we have undertaken a complete reorganization of mail delivery in the Gaspé peninsula. This reorganization is in two stages: the first, as the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Béchard) mentioned, was first to carry outside mail by truck instead of by railway. And the same thing applies to the mail from Gaspé to the outside.

The second stage is the reorganization of mail distribution within the Gaspé peninsula. This phase, not yet completed, produces some temporary delays in mail deliveries.

For instance, sorting which used to be done on the train between some centres of the Gaspé peninsula, is now done in the offices and the distributing offices which we organized.

We still have to organize the rural routes before June 1st, and many small post offices will also disappear because too much mail is now spread about in too many small post offices and the postmasters, even though they would like to complete the mail bags intended for a given place, must, to complete a bag, put in it several letters which are often sent to a community where the addressee does not live, and that causes undue delay.

But I can assure the hon. member that, before very long, instead of finding fault with the Post Office Department, he will only have congratulations to offer that department,

because we think that within a few months, the reorganization will be fully completed and the Gaspé peninsula will then enjoy one of the best mail services in Canada. That experiment which we tried this year in the Gaspé peninsula will surely be carried out elsewhere in the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must tell the hon. member that an inspector has been on the spot since last Monday—he got there during a snow storm at that—to inspect all post offices and to explain to the postmasters the new departmental instructions. I believe this will result in an improved service within a short time.

[*English*]

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, April 14, 1967

The house met at 11 a.m.

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

AMENDMENT RESPECTING RIGHT OF STUDENTS TO REGISTER

Mr. Jack Roxburgh (Norfolk) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-289, to amend the Canada Elections Act (students' franchise).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Roxburgh: During the general election of November, 1965, many university students found themselves disfranchised under the provisions of subsection 9 of section 16 of the Canada Elections Act. I should like to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that pursuant to subsections 6 and 7 of section 16 of that act, ministers and teachers may move into a new constituency at any time in the interval between the date of the issue of the writ and polling day, and register as voters. All this bill is asking is that registered university students be given the same privilege.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

AIR POLLUTION

PROVISION FOR ABATEMENT ASSISTANCE TO OTHER AGENCIES

Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parkdale) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-290, to control air pollution.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

• (11:10 a.m.)

Mr. Haidasz: Air pollution is today one of the most vital and urgent problems confronting Canada. Pollutants in the air are causing injury to people, animals, vegetation and property. The progressive increase and complexity of air pollution brought about today by urbanization, industrialization, automobiles and the nuclear age, call for increased national leadership to protect all our national resources, including clean air. Within the limits of federal jurisdiction, this bill provides for action to assist provincial, regional, municipal and private agencies to abate air pollution.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

TRADE

MAINTENANCE OF PROTECTION FOR CANADIAN AGRICULTURE IN UNITED KINGDOM

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the departure on Monday, I am informed, of quite a large number of Canadian ministers for the United Kingdom will leave a large void in the treasury benches for the time being. I presume that one of the subjects to be considered will be Britain's application for entry to the common market. I would ask the Prime Minister whether he would assure the house that the cabinet delegation, while admitting Britain's right to make her own decisions as to the course she will follow, will press strongly for the protection of Canadian agriculture in the maintenance of those preferences that are now in existence?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the delegation undoubtedly will listen with interest to a report by the United Kingdom government on its recent policies and approaches with regard to entry into the common market. I can assure my hon. friend that in any discussions that take place we will make Canadian interests quite clear in this matter.

Mr. Diefenbaker: And does that include agriculture, to which I specifically made reference?

Mr. Pearson: Yes, indeed it does, Mr. Speaker.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—REQUEST BY UN SECRETARY GENERAL FOR CEASE FIRE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, over a week ago the Prime Minister promised to look at the text of the appeal by Secretary General U Thant with respect to a unilateral cease fire in Viet Nam, and particularly to look at that part of the text which was quoted in the press as follows:

It becomes ever more clear to me that this impasse can be broken and a halt put to the increasingly horrible slaughter and destruction of the Viet Nam war only if one side or the other shows the wisdom and the courage and the compassion for humanity to take the initiative of a

first step, that is to say, by undertaking unilaterally to put the standstill truce into effect and thereafter to fire only if fired upon.

The Prime Minister was going to look at this text and, I believe, seek some clarification from the Secretary General's office. Is he now in a position to say what is Canada's position with respect to this request by U Thant?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the United States government has already indicated its willingness to accept at once the Secretary General's proposal that the fighting stop and peace negotiations begin. That proposal which would have brought the war to an end and have instituted a cease fire was rejected by the government of North Viet Nam.

The Secretary General made an additional proposal to which my hon. friend has referred, that unilateral action be taken by one side—in this case that could only be the United States and the South Vietnamese side—that the fighting stop on one side irrespective of action taken on the other side. This proposal is no doubt being discussed by the Secretary General during his present trip to Asia.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs expects to see the Secretary General next week in London when he will be discussing this whole matter with him, including the proposal to which my hon. friend refers. I should add that the Secretary of State for External Affairs tells me the meeting may not be in London, but he will be seeing the Secretary General shortly.

Mr. Douglas: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the Secretary General has again made an appeal for a unilateral cease fire, which he has repeatedly said would be applied only if the other side did not fire on United States forces, do I take it that the Canadian government is not yet prepared to support this appeal to the government of the United States?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, any proposal to bring about an end to hostilities certainly will be considered by this government. As I have said, the Secretary of State for External Affairs will be discussing this matter with the Secretary General of the United Nations following his visit to London next week.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in view of the widespread feeling on the part of Canadians that there should be a pause in the bombing in Viet Nam, may I now ask the Prime Minister a supplementary question? Will he reconsider the decision he made some months ago and have placed before the House of Commons a resolution so that Canada can speak with unity on this subject, and so that Canada's position will be clearly understood?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the committee on external affairs is meeting at the present time, and this matter could be discussed before that committee. I cannot think any useful purpose would be served at this moment by putting such a resolution on the order paper.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister then suggest that the Secretary of State for External Affairs make known the view of this house, which seems to be fairly general, in a clear and definite statement instead of leaving the equivocal uncertainties which exist in this connection?

Mr. Pearson: I take it that the right hon. gentleman is referring to his own view that the bombing should be stopped and no action taken concerning the infiltrations from the north into the south. That is not the position of this government. The position of this government is that the war should stop and that there should be a cease fire at once.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

NORTHWESTERN QUEBEC—DEVELOPMENT OF RESOURCES UNDER ARDA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Forestry and Rural Development, who is responsible for ARDA.

Did the minister have any talks with northwestern Quebec organizations with a view to proceeding to the development of the James Bay area, where tremendous resources could be developed if only ARDA assistance were available.

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry and Rural Development): Under federal-provincial agreements, Mr. Speaker, organizations in northwestern Quebec should discuss this matter with the provincial minister responsible for ARDA, not with the federal minister.

[*English*]

FLOODS

FRASER RIVER—REQUEST FOR PREVENTIVE ACTION BY GOVERNMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the right hon. Prime Minister. When replying to a question raised by the hon. member for New Westminster a few days ago the Prime Minister indicated that the officials had been instructed to look into the question of the flood danger in the lower Fraser valley. I wonder whether the Prime Minister has had a report on this situation, and whether he could make a statement to the house at this time.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker; I have had a report from the officials and experts to the effect that it is too early to reach any conclusion concerning whether there is going to be really dangerous flooding in the Fraser valley, but that we should certainly be on the alert because this could happen. We have advised the provincial authorities who are in daily touch with the situation that the federal government will help in every possible way if this danger should materialize, and that we will be ready to meet any reasonable request for assistance in this regard.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

BELL ISLAND, NFLD.—ASSISTANCE FOR UNEMPLOYED MINERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Joseph P. O'Keefe (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Can the minister inform the house what steps have been taken or what measures are contemplated to assist the residents of Bell Island in Newfoundland as a result of the sudden closing of the DOSCO iron mines?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I believe a similar question was put to the Prime Minister yesterday by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam. We have been in continuous consultation with the government of Newfoundland concerning appropriate measures which would assist the island.

In anticipation of the lay-offs, in the spring of last year we designated the island as an area whose work force would be eligible for grants rather than loans under our mobility program. So far this measure has resulted in moving out of the island almost one quarter of its population of 8,500 persons. The workers concerned have either been placed in employment or are being provided with retraining. The radically changed provisions of our mobility program, which became effective two weeks ago, will increase our ability to give effective help to the remainder of the population.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Manpower and Immigration what plans the federal government has in respect of the three quarters of the population who have not been moved out of that island, who are still apparently unemployed and suffering great hardship at the present time.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, I believe I answered the question in so far as the jurisdiction of my department is concerned. I do not think there is any one answer in so far as the second part of the question is concerned. It is always difficult for any community when the only company or plant is closed down. There are problems of reclassification, retraining, relocation and so on involved. It is not easy for us or anyone to solve this problem. We are trying to relocate these people and retrain them. That is all we can do at this moment.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary question. Yesterday the Prime Minister stated that more than one department was involved in the discussions between the federal government and the government of Newfoundland. I should like to ask him whether any plans are under way to assist in the development of new industry in that area. What other departments are negotiating with the government of Newfoundland to help the people of Bell Island?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the people on that island have been helped and we are continuing to help them in the manner indicated by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Will the Prime Minister consider pulling the Minister of Industry off his world trip and sending him personally to Bell Island to do something about this situation? It has been known for many years that the island was in trouble.

Inquiries of the Ministry

TRADE

INQUIRY AS TO CONCLUSION OF GENEVA NEGOTIATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent (Ont.)): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Because of the serious implications to the agriculture industry of any changes in tariffs in regard to fruits and vegetables I should like to ask the minister, who I know is very close to this matter, whether he is optimistic that the very serious negotiations being carried on at Geneva at this time will be completed before the prescribed time limit set by the United States.

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Yes, Mr. Speaker. According to the authority under which the United States is negotiating the negotiations will come to an end at mid-year. They have no legislative authority to negotiate beyond that time. Most of the nations—I think it would be fair to say all of them—are now negotiating on the basis of a target date of April 30 for completion of the substantive negotiations so as to allow an adequate opportunity to complete the details and related arrangements that are necessary in the time intervening between then and mid-year. We are negotiating on the basis that the target date for terminating arrangements will be met.

BID BY CANADIAN COMPANY FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NUCLEAR REACTOR IN FINLAND

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. A. Webb (Hastings-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the fact that General Electric of Peterborough, Ontario was the successful one of three bidders for the construction of a $100 million nuclear power station in Finland, and in view of the Russian pressure put on the Finland authority to delay the project in order to provide Russia with an opportunity to bid on this project, have the Canadian authorities been aware of this situation and what action have they taken to counteract the Russian pressure?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think both the preface and the question should be placed on the order paper.

Mr. Webb: Mr. Speaker, this is a very urgent matter which might involve the loss of a $100 million contract. I do not think there is anything more urgent.

[Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert).]

Mr. Speaker: I wonder whether the contract will be saved by the hon. member's question, or by the answer which might be given.

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I think it is urgent that the Secretary of State for External Affairs ascertain the position in this regard through the proper diplomatic channels, so that Canada's opportunity will not be jeopardized by any intervention on the part of Russia.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this matter comes under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. However, he and I will discuss this matter at once.

GRAIN

REQUEST FOR ADVICE ON SPRING PLANTING ON PRAIRIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. E. Pascoe (Moose Jaw-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have an urgent question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce. With wheat seeding operations on the prairies about to start is the minister in a position to advise farmers whether they should increase or decrease their wheat acreage this year in view of the apparent difficulty in negotiating a new international wheat agreement?

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I do not know how much advice the western farmers need from me about planting wheat. However, earlier this week I had the opportunity to be in Regina, and stated that according to the forecast by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics western farmers will plant more acreage in wheat this year than in any year in history. I think that indicates the confidence they share with us that a new and better world wheat trading agreement will result from the negotiations now taking place.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

HAL BANKS—INQUIRY AS TO PROSECUTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to ask my first question of the Minister of Justice. Being the first question it will be a simple one. Can the minister inform the house whether Harold Chamberlain Banks is going to be charged

with an offence under the Criminal Code as a result of consideration being given to this matter by the minister, the attorney general of the province of Ontario and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police?

Hon. P.-E. Trudeau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the simple answer would be that in normal cases the administration of justice does come under the province, but there may be special circumstances here. With your permission, sir, I would take the question of the hon. member for Kootenay West as notice and look into it.

CANADIAN CENTENNIAL

REPRODUCTION OF COAT OF ARMS MEDALLION FOR PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State. I have before me a document entitled "Coat of Arms of Canada", issued by the Secretary of State, showing the coat of arms with the union jack, the unicorn, the lion and the fleur-de-lis. Has there been any change made of the coat of arms for Canada in recent days or weeks?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Not that I am aware of, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Then I want to know on what basis the centennial medallion which is shortly to be distributed is accompanied by this explanatory note: "The obverse or front side of the medallion has on it the Canadian coat of arms with the word 'Canada' ". I have here a replica of the particular medallion, which is an emasculated neuter. I ask on what authority that is going to be distributed to the school children of Canada when there has been no change in the coat of arms?

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the medallion for some months, and unfortunately I cannot say from recollection what differences there may be. But I shall of course be happy to look into the matter and make a report to the house.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, will the minister indicate on what basis the lion and the unicorn, the words *A mari usque ad mare*, and some other portions of the coat of arms have been removed; I ask why this kind of caricature is going to be distributed to Canadian children when it does not represent Canada's coat of arms.

TELEVISION

DISCUSSION WITH C.B.C. RESPECTING EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State. In view of the fact that the board of directors of the C.B.C. in its comments on the white paper on broadcasting which were made last November requested a discussion on the question of who might operate educational television broadcasting, may I ask the Secretary of State whether there was any discussion between the government and the C.B.C. with respect to this matter before the policy decision was made which is now before the house.

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Yes, Mr. Speaker. During the formulation of the policy itself the C.B.C., as the major adviser to the government on broadcasting matters, was of course consulted. The matter was discussed. There is no compulsion, of course, to always accept the advice of your advisers, and in this particular case the advice of the C.B.C. was not accepted, by virtue of the fact that the C.B.C. is primarily a program producing agency while an educational television agency as conceived by the government is primarily one of providing facilities only and renting air to other program producing agencies.

Mr. Knowles: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it not a fact that in the field of educational broadcasting the C.B.C. has been only an operating agency?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question is argumentative, and is not in order.

[*Translation*]

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

NORTHWESTERN QUEBEC—REQUEST FOR ACCESS ROAD TO JAMES BAY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

The government has placed $100 million at the disposal of the department to build roads in the far north to improve communications. Has the minister been asked to build, out of those $100 million, an access road leading to James Bay in northern Quebec?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member's question should be put on the order paper.

National Defence Act Amendment

[*English*]

HEALTH AND WELFARE

REQUEST FOR REGULATION OF CIGARETTE ADVERTISING IN BROADCASTING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Some days ago the minister's parliamentary secretary indicated that the government was giving consideration at this time to the regulation of cigarette advertising on radio and television. Can the minister indicate when a decision on that important question may be expected?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): No, Mr. Speaker, it is not possible for me to say when a decision will be made on this point.

FINANCE

PRUDENTIAL FINANCE—FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN REIMBURSEMENT OF SHAREHOLDERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that the premier of Ontario has indicated possible financial help to the unfortunate shareholders of Prudential Finance, does the federal government intend to participate in this plan of reimbursement to the persons who have suffered?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the plans of the government of Ontario. However, I can say that the government of Canada has no intention of participating.

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

AMALGAMATION OF NAVY, ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The house resumed, from Thursday, April 13, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof—Mr. Hellyer—Mr. Batten in the chair.

The Chairman: Order. When the committee rose last evening clause 2 was under consideration.

[Mr. Speaker.]

On clause 2—*Canadian forces, Canadian armed forces.*

Mr. Ballard: Mr. Chairman, when the house adjourned last night I was in the process of pointing out to the minister that he was flying in the face of convention by trying to unify Canada's armed forces while in the past few years our two traditional allies, the United States and Great Britain, have proceeded to a policy of deunification. I pointed out that at one time Great Britain, Canada and the United States all considered their respective air forces so important that they set them up as separate units. As a matter of fact the United States separated the air force from the army and the navy in 1947.

Toward the end of the sitting yesterday I echoed a question asked by Air Marshal Curtis; "Is the minister out of his mind?" I do not think I am alone in questioning the ability of the minister to make a decision such as the one he made. As a matter of fact I also pointed out last night that the minister found it necessary to fire or retire a great number of high ranking military officers until he found a corps of officers who would agree with the stand he has taken.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Ballard: So the minister is sitting on his side of the house stubbornly ignoring all the pleas and suggestions put forward not only by members on this side of the house but also by senior ranking officers who have gone into retirement, either voluntarily or been forced to do it. Even the press of Canada has written about the stubbornness of the minister. As a matter of fact one of Canada's foremost columnists, Mr. Charles Lynch, wrote the following in the Ottawa *Citizen* of Wednesday, March 22:

> Mr. Hellyer has locked himself into so rigid a position in support of the unification bill that it is hard to imagine him accepting major modifications.

We are not asking for major modifications. We are asking for minor, reasonable and sensible modifications to the bill now before us. Mr. Lynch went on to explain the reason the minister will not accept any changes. He wrote the following:

> If he did accept them, it is hard to see how he could stomach the political implications of such a humiliation—and that is how his critics would interpret it.
>
> At best, he would have to move to some other portfolio, accepting a major setback to his political ambitions.

So it is not only we on this side of the house and some members of the minister's own party who recognize the fact that the minister has political ambitions. It is recognized by all across the country that the minister has designs on the highest office in this land, and in my opinion he is prepared to frustrate the defence efforts of this country in order to further his own political ambitions.

Mr. Byrne: Who is Mr. Lynch? He is not a member of parliament.

Mr. Ballard: Mr. Lynch says also:

> The simplest solution, and the one that most likely would have been adopted had rigor mortis not set in as stiffly as it has, would be to amend the bill in a way that would preserve the army, navy and air force identities within the proposed unified structure.

In other words he suggests integration but not unification. The opinion is now fairly widespread regarding the unacceptability of the concept of unification. As a matter of fact some of the prominent witnesses who appeared before the defence committee were quite convinced that a change in the armed forces to bring about the unification which is now proposed would automatically alter our defence commitments. I should like to quote two or three of these, Mr. Chairman, but I do not want to quote them all because that would be too time consuming. First of all I should like to quote from the evidence of General Charles Foulkes as recorded on page 1220 of the evidence before the defence committee:

> • (11:40 a.m.)
>
> However, the roles of these two brigades in NATO are not indicated. Nobody knows what they are going to do—if they do, they do not say so—or under whose auspices these forces will be employed in this world-wide pacification role.

We are suspicious that Canada's defence forces are being tailored for a particular purpose. We suspect that the defence forces are being groomed with the idea in mind of dropping out of our defence commitments in NATO and NORAD and carrying on with only our commitment to the United Nations.

I should like to suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the minister should take a look at history. He would find a very distinct parallel between what is taking place today and what took place prior to the war of 1939-1945. He would find that the attitude of Great Britain and other countries was pacific. At that time the major nations of the world were putting a tremendous amount of faith in the League of Nations. They considered that the greatest deterrent to any armed conflict was the world opinion that would be against any kind of war. As a matter of fact, even in the last days before the war the British people were convinced that the public opinion that would be aroused against any action taken by Adolf Hitler would force him to recant and proceed with his plans in a peaceful manner.

We find ourselves in the same situation today, Mr. Chairman. We have people advocating that we ignore what is commonly called power politics and pin our hopes entirely on the United Nations. As a matter of fact the Prime Minister of this country, before he was prime minister, made a speech at the University of British Columbia on this thought that public opinion would deter any future war. He was speaking to the University of British Columbia on the transformation of the traditional concept of international power politics to the rule by international law, international organization and international force. He had this to say in 1961:

> During this period of transformation, it is certain that force will continue to be a basis of policy. In the past, it has often been used with cruel injustice. But not always. In the hands of conscientious patrons it has also been the instrument for maintaining rough international justice, as well as security and stability. It is when great power is controlled by governments that cannot be counted on to use it justly or responsibly, that we grow fearful. So we collect counterforce and use it through power politics to prevent ourselves being overpowered. If we did not, diplomacy and the negotiation of disputes would be determined by the threat of one sided force in the background.
>
> This, then, is the situation which in reality determines our approach to the ideal disarmament and the abolition of national force. All our high sounding declarations must be interpreted in that context. We should not try to deceive ourselves.

Well now, Mr. Chairman, this was the attitude of the present Prime Minister of this country. He said, and I repeat:

> This, then, is the situation which in reality determines our approach to the ideal disarmament and the abolition of national force. All our high sounding declarations must be interpreted in that context.

How does this statement fit into the present situation? We find that the Minister of National Defence is trying to abolish the traditional fighting forces of this country. We find the Secretary of State for External Affairs trying to assure this house that we are not going to change any of our international commitments. When he was referring to NATO and NORAD he made it very plain to this house that the government had no intention of changing those commitments for the moment. There was no suggestion we would carry on these commitments for a year or five

years or ten years; he said "For the moment". I think we are entitled, and the people of Canada are entitled, to know that these commitments will be continued for an indefinite period.

As we all know, the NORAD agreement will be renegotiated next year. The question I should like to ask is this. Will our defence forces be changed to such an extent that we will not be capable of being a partner in NORAD? Is this a deliberate move by the government of this country to develop forces capable only of action in respect to our commitments to the United Nations? The attitude of the Prime Minister leads one to believe that he is staking his political future on the hope that moral suasion will be an effective deterrent to war. If it is, it will be the first time in history that this has happened.

It might be pointed out that the only countries that have really followed the dictates of the United Nations have been the western countries. The eastern countries, for example Soviet Russia, have used the veto over 100 times. The only large concessions that have been made have come from the western countries. In spite of this the Prime Minister of this country, according to his speech to the University of British Columbia in 1961, believes that the United Nations can mobilize the moral forces of the international community against any bloc which threatens world peace. I remind you that the same thing was said of the League of Nations before the war of 1939.

Referring again to the speech delivered by the Prime Minister I find this:

> The United Nations assembly is creating something in the nature of a world public opinion. This does have an effect in checking, if not yet in preventing, aggressive actions by predatory individual states. It has its own power for peace.

Lord help us, Mr. Chairman, if we rely strictly on world public opinion for the peace of this country. I say I suspect the change in the military forces of this country and the adoption of an untried method of operation is directly designed to tailor the forces of this country for the United Nations, and for the withdrawal of this country from its commitments to NORAD and NATO.

• (11:50 a.m.)

I am not alone in that thought. Lieutenant General Moncel, when questioned about changes in commitments, said this at page 1305 of the committee evidence:

> —if you do change your commitments and produce a unified force to meet these much reduced commitments, then you should bear in mind that you are never again going to have a commitment that might call for something other than a unified force.

Lieutenant General Moncel was saying that once a force is unified it can only be used in the context where a unified force is necessary, and it will not be useful for NATO or NORAD. Air Vice Marshal Hendrick at page 1451 of the committee evidence agreed with Lieutenant General Moncel and said:

> The policy changes, in my view, are there by implication; by the withdrawal from NORAD, the withdrawal from NATO, and the concentration of our efforts in the support of the United Nations. This seems to be inevitable from the events that are taking place and the equipment policies that are going on.

It is all very well for the Secretary of State for External Affairs to say that we do not intend to change our commitments for the moment. We want to know, are the defence forces of this country being tailored to suit United Nations projects to the exclusion of commitments that we have with NATO and NORAD? Lieutenant General Moncel has suggested that this is so. He said that once you start down the road of unification there is no turning back.

Members of this house and the people of this country have a right to demand a fuller explanation from the ministers than has been given up to the present time. I suggest that consideration should be given to withdrawing this bill, and more thought should be given to the commitments we have abroad.

Mrs. Wadds: Mr. Chairman, I have listened carefully to many excellent speeches in this debate. Many of the speeches were by hon. members with tremendous experience as soldiers and outstanding records in this regard to back their opinions. If experience in war is not the best qualification for participating in this debate, then I should like to hear hon. members on the government side say what is the best qualification. I was astonished to see the light attendance on the government side when the former minister of national defence opened this debate in the house. He has a tremendous record as a minister, a tremendous record in war, and he is one to whom everyone in this house should listen with great respect.

I was amazed yesterday, when the hon. member for Northumberland was speaking from first hand experience about the vital importance of morale in the armed forces, to notice considerable smirking on the government side. I heard one backbencher saying

"What's that got to do with it?" I submit what the hon. member for Northumberland said was extremely relevant. Seldom have I seen an ex-minister, a former soldier of the hon. member's calibre, faced with such a smug reaction. If hon. members sitting opposite take the trouble to look into the contribution made during the war by the hon. member for Northumberland, they will probably blanch. They ought to have had the good sense to listen to what he said on this subject, and they should have shown respect.

Mr. Churchill: Hear, hear.

Mrs. Wadds: Knowledgeable speakers have made reasonable speeches in this debate, but they have been met with supercilious smugness. Rarely do we see this behaviour when hon. members who are doctors rise to speak about medicine. They are not met with derision. Treating their remarks in that way would be silly. It seems silly, under these circumstances, to treat with derision the remarks of hon. members who have experience and knowledge of the subject.

I support the hon. member who has just spoken and the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek, who appealed to the minister and to the Prime Minister to reconsider this legislation which is meeting such sincere and stiff opposition.

Mr. Churchill: Hear, hear.

Mrs. Wadds: Yesterday the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton made an excellent speech in which he asked the minister questions. The minister either cannot or will not face them. Every member of the house knows that the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton does not speak lightly, that he does not often take up the time of the house. He speaks when he is gravely concerned with an issue under discussion.

I heard a smug interjection yesterday from the government side of the house to the effect that those members on this side now taking part in the debate have been told to do so by our whip. That was letting the cat out of the bag. If that sort of thing happens on the other side, I can only assure hon. members that it does not happen with us.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Dinsdale: They even get their speeches written for them.

Mrs. Wadds: They are lucky. We speak when we want to speak, and if the government will not respect our contributions of sincere criticism then I feel that the Canadian public will.

A great deal of the spirit in our centennial celebrations, much of the pride we feel in being Canadians, a pride built up over 100 years of nationhood, comes from the achievements of our armed forces. We are a thinly populated country with vast land area, but we feel akin to other countries with relatively small populations such as Finland, Norway and many others like them, which have histories of glorious military achievements.

As has been asked by other hon. members, are we to barge blindly into a position where we cannot dovetail our forces to fit our international commitments? Are our forces to be left sadly at home on Canadian soil, carrying on in their own little Canadian way? The Secretary of State for External Affairs, in supporting the Minister of National Defence, says this measure will not make any difference to our commitments; yet the testimony of military experts is that it will make a difference, a great difference. Surely that very possibility points to an uninspiring future for a country that has done so much already by way of international military co-operation.

I noticed yesterday that when hon. members mentioned General Moncel or quoted from his testimony there was no great show of joy on the faces of government members sitting on the front benches. On page 1317 of the committee proceedings Lieutenant General Moncel is reported as saying:

• (12 noon)

> It must be a progressive thing all the time, toward the most effective Canadian defence force. This is the object of the exercise; it is not unification.

This is an eminently sound, sensible and reasonable statement. Integration has been progressive and promises to continue to be acceptable as it proves itself step by step, but I submit that an attempt to impose unification on Canadians as a sort of extended integration is unfair. It has been said by the opposition in the course of the democratic process which is practised here that we should know where we are going before we take such a gigantic step, such an irretrievable step.

Yesterday the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton, asking whether the government was justified in taking such a serious step, wondered whether they had anything further to back them up than promises of success and improvement. Experts say that morale will not be improved and that costs will not decrease. But the minister chooses to make fun

of experts, using an amusing rhyme. I am sure the minister can be very entertaining on other occasions with such amusing rhymes, but I submit there is hardly a place for them in such a serious debate as this, particularly in an age in which specialization is the keystone of success in science, medicine, education and certainly in military affairs.

Ridiculing experts in any area is hardly in keeping with the kind of society in which we are living today. If the government is as sure of itself as it should be in connection with such a serious matter as this, why are not more of the senior ministers coming to the aid of the minister of defence? The Minister of Transport was not very convincing. On April 7, as reported at page 14666 of *Hansard,* he said:

> The idea of parliament prying, probing and trying to get at the advice the minister received instead of discussing the question on its merits ... does not seem to be an effective way of reaching a conclusion.

It seems to me it is important for the house to know where the minister gets his advice, if indeed he gets any advice at all.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mrs. Wadds: It seems to me it is fundamental in our approach to any legislation to know where a minister obtains his advice. Further, the Minister of Transport said we were heading straight into an unknown area. As reported at page 14667 he stated:

> The point I am making is that in so far as the progress on integration is concerned, that has been going on for three or four years and the evidence of military experts is, of course, of great relevance. However, in so far as unification is concerned it has no relevance whatever. I want to repeat that. The evidence of experts is of no relevance whatever because there are no experts. There never has been, under modern conditions at least, a unified military force.

I want to repeat certain of those words.

> The evidence of experts is of no relevance whatever because there are no experts. There never has been, under modern conditions at least, a unified force.

Later the hon. gentleman told us:

> It is a step into something which nobody has ever experienced. I suggest that generally we are apt to get the most imaginative views from young people who have a sense of adventure and not from people who fought in the last war, however gallantly.

I regret that an hon. gentleman I find so personally amiable as the Minister of Transport, and one who is considered such a great source of strength to the Liberal party, should make a statement of that sort. A sense of adventure is a delightful attribute and may well lead to imaginative views, but to imply that a sense of adventure and imaginative views replace the blood and sweat of experience in combat seems to me a trifle ludicrous. One would imagine we were discussing the qualifications for modern art rather than the realities, in deadly earnest—kill or be killed —which war brings.

The present debate reminds me of a family which is trying to urge a senior member to make a will. Nobody likes to put into words the real reason why it should be done. Nobody likes to discuss the realities of war, the killing side of it, the horrors of war. But we would be derelict in our duty if we allowed this debate to slide along on a superficial level at which men of proven courage, bravery and experience are listened to less than those of imagination.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mrs. Wadds: The Minister of Transport continued by expressing an opinion that in the last war there was very rapid promotion of young people "because it was felt that in battle young, vigorous and imaginative people were needed". The former minister of defence, my hon. friend from Calgary North, interjected "It was a question of endurance to a large extent." To which the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate answered "Maybe it was. Perhaps this is not a very good or strong argument." Mr. Chairman, the minister of defence needs stronger support than this from his cabinet colleagues if he is to convince us on this side that the government has its heart and soul behind this project.

Surely it is fair to ask the minister what he proposes to do if the opinions of the experts —experienced people, intelligent people, and certainly sincere people—prove to be right and no one wants to join this unified force. Is he prepared to let Canada's defences collapse and tell the world that we have disarmed ourselves by accident, or confusion, or misunderstanding? Or is he prepared to accept conscription? Or does he know some way of un-unifying unification? It may not be considered flattering, but it might well be considered sensible to ask a person in a leaky boat whether he knows how to swim. Has the minister any alternative apart from abandoning our defence contribution to the free world should the criticism directed at this bill prove to have been correct?

I am afraid the charming gentleman of the navy, the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.)

(Mr. Groos) will not like what I have to say now. On Tuesday of this week he expressed the opinion that too much criticism in this house might be demoralizing to the armed forces. I submit that any legislation which will not stand up to criticism will not stand up to practice.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mrs. Wadds: I do not consider myself irresponsible, and I do not consider those who have taken part in this debate so far from these benches to be irresponsible. Much as I would sincerely regret any demoralization of the armed forces for any reason, it does appear to me that this bill is worthy of further study and consideration. If the very discussion of it may cause demoralization it is obvious that we are not on very firm ground. Surely discussion and debate of good legislation improve and strengthen it. It is the responsibility of the government to prove that this legislation is good. Scoffing at opposition warnings on the ground that debate and criticism are demoralizing is hardly designed to carry out that responsibility. To expect authority to continue with integration where each step can be followed and observed is one thing. It is altogether another thing to expect authority to proceed on a course which the Minister of Transport tries to classify as an adventure by stating there are no experts with regard to it because the plan is too imaginative.

The controversy with regard to Lord Louis Mountbatten's opinions has been far reaching, but the position is now entirely clear. The daily *Colonist* of Victoria, B.C. of April 5 reported the following statement:

• (12:10 p.m.)

In the British reorganization care has been taken to preserve esprit de corps and morale and those traditions which help to maintain this in the services and fighting units.

It has been accepted that to achieve this the three services must retain their uniforms and ranks with an identifiable professional head of their service. The idea of a single uniform and rank structure was also rejected as undesirable and unnecessary.

Further on he said:

The general cut and colour of naval uniforms are internationally so well known that a sailor from any one country can readily be recognized as a sailor in any other country. Sailors the world over take great pride in this and so in their own services do soldiers and airmen. No compensating advantage could be seen in attempting to impose so unpopular a change.

The minister and the government cannot hide behind accusations of opposition obstruction and delay in this debate. There has been too much criticism outside the house, even in the Winnipeg *Free Press*, which on Tuesday, April 4 carried a lead editorial headed "Destroying Defence." Part of it reads as follows:

This revolutionary gamble and experiment is being foisted on Canada in face of the strongest possible protest by nearly every experienced admiral, general and air marshal in the country.

If this step could simply be classed as a further blunder by an accident prone government, and could be corrected when its faults became clearly apparent, the country could perhaps afford to go along for the ride.

When it is realized, however, that Mr. Hellyer is playing with an annual investment of some $1.6 billion which vitally concerns the defence structure of the nation and involves our international obligations, the magnitude of this error becomes obvious.

As the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre said, "We on this side of the house have said that we should retain the three services, work away at the integrated side and see whether we can make a success of it." The insistence on hurrying this bill through seems to us unnecessary, at least militarily though possibly not politically. The Minister of National Defence seems to be very pleased when he is referred to as a minister of the jet age. That seems to me rather close to being called a minister of the jet set. We all know the jet set go very fast but it does not follow that they are accomplishing anything of much value.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Herridge: Would the hon. member permit a question? Does the hon. member realize that regardless of the issue, her entry into this debate and her charming presence and delivery have raised the morale of members on both sides of the chamber?

Some hon Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Herridge: I see the hon. lady nods her assent.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, for reasons that will be obvious in a moment or two, I do not rise to discuss the terms of the bill now before us. Neither do I intend to make any comment on the nature of the debate or on the positions taken by the opposing sides. But I do have a suggestion to make regarding our procedure. I make it in the best of faith, and I make it now in the hope that it might be considered over the week end or perhaps for even a day or two longer than that.

If I may say so without arousing any feelings, it is now fairly clear that there will be a time established when this debate will come to an end. That may be arrived at by agreement or it may be arrived at by the procedures laid down in one of the provisional rules under which we are operating. At the moment I am not discussing the rights or wrongs of that course. I am simply suggesting that it is fairly obvious that a time limit will be set.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think it is a matter of some concern that during the time this bill is before us we should have discussion on a number of its clauses. It looks to me as though the earliest this debate could end under provisional standing order 15-A would be a week from next Tuesday, but I think it would be most unfortunate if all our time between now and then were spent on clause 2. That may happen, though there is always the possibility that the debate on clause 2 could end even without any arrangement or understanding.

But, Mr. Chairman, there are 65 clauses in the bill and two schedules. I recognize that many of them that are clauses which contain details may not need to be discussed at length, but there are some very important provisions in some of the other clauses and I think we ought to have a chance to discuss them. It would be most unfortunate if the application of rule 15-A were such that we spent all our time on clause 2 and then had to vote on all the other clauses without any discussion. This would be unfortunate in terms of the bill and unfortunate for parliament, and I can readily imagine the things that will be said if this happens. All this could be avoided if we could come to an agreement.

I am not proposing that anything should be done in any other way than by agreement. Let me put it this way. Maybe on Monday night we could agree to adjourn the debate on clause 2 and proceed to take up some of the other clauses. I am not suggesting that a vote be taken on clause 2 at that time. I am only suggesting that we adjourn the debate on it and move on to some of the other clauses which deserve to be discussed. I understand that clause 6 should be discussed at some length and a few other clauses dealing with uniforms and rank structures in the services. There are also matters in the schedules that should be discussed.

It may be argued that we should not discuss these other matters until we have decided on the principle of a unified force which is set out in clause 2, but I suggest we should not try to reach a decision on that clause by forcing a vote on it if hon. members want to discuss other clauses. Let us not get ourselves into a position where we can be called upon to make a final decision on a bill 64 clauses of which have not been discussed at all.

Again I say I am not assessing blame. I am not saying the opposition is preventing the discussion of the other clauses by discussing clause 2, and I am not suggesting the government is to blame for asking the house to consider the use of standing order 15-A. I am asking all of us to face the fact that we have a limited amount of time left—it might be seven or eight days or it might be longer—to discuss all the clauses in the bill which hon. members want to discuss. I am sure there are many other clauses that are important, and they should get a bit of an airing in the committee of the whole.

Of course I hope the application of standing order 15-A will not be too severe. As I say, even the minimum times allowed under it would keep this debate going in committee stage and on third reading until a week from Tuesday night, but it may extend longer than that. All I am asking is that we think about this over the week end and come to some agreement.

I have looked up the rules and I believe you would have difficulty, Mr. Chairman, if a motion were made to stand clause 2 without general agreement. There would be no point in having a procedural wrangle over that. But I think we could have an understanding that having spent 10 or 11 days on clause 2, without taking the vote on it at this point, we should go on to discuss the other clauses. The result of this might be that if members of the official opposition continue to stage their case on some of the other clauses they would persuade the government that the bill should be held off. Let us not use all our time on one clause. Let us take a good look at all the provisions of the bill. I hope this proposal will be considered.

• (12:20 p.m.)

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, this is a most reasonable suggestion on the part of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I must say that I am in complete agreement with it, and I would hope this idea would commend itself to members of the committee. It is in fact the same procedure which was followed in the standing committee on national defence, which worked very well there. Perhaps during the course of the day representatives

of the various parties could meet under circumstances which would enable us, later this day or at the first of the week, to continue under a procedure along those lines.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member a question. There is another suggestion which might be advanced. Over the week end would the minister consider withdrawing the bill and postponing it until the fall because, as he has told us, it really will not become operative until about five years from now.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, of course I would be glad to consider that, but as I have told my hon. friend I really believe it would be irresponsible action on my part if I were to withdraw this bill at this stage and postpone it.

Mr. Churchill: You would be praised for it and would be a man of great distinction.

Mr. Hellyer: I might be praised by the hon. gentleman, but certainly not by the officials who are charged with the responsibility of implementing the integration and unification program. It is as a result of their advice that I feel we must proceed at the present time. There are a number of questions which must be answered. Only when we know the will of parliament will we know on what basis to proceed.

I agree completely with the advice of the sincere, dedicated and experienced hon. lady who spoke a few moments ago that we should proceed at this time and let the will of parliament be known so the officials who have the responsibility of implementing this policy will be able to prepare their plans based on the will of parliament.

Mr. Churchill: Is it not a fact that in the committee General Allard told us that he would like to see the proclamation of the bill postponed for at least four months, and that until the bill is proclaimed no action can be taken with regard to the steps toward unification. That is the advice of the senior officer in the defence forces.

Mr. Hellyer: That is quite so, Mr. Chairman; it will not be proclaimed for several months after parliament approves it, if it does approve it. Even more time than that may be required; but as was clearly pointed out in the committee certain action must be taken in the department which really can be done only after the bill has received parliamentary approval and after the exact wording of the bill is known to the staff in the department. This includes a rewriting of the entire Queen's Regulations and so on. It is for that reason it is necessary to have the parliamentary decision now. The proclamation, of course, will be postponed for some months while the detailed planning directly related to the bill in so far as personnel management is concerned is worked out by the responsible staff.

Mr. Churchill: Is it not a fact that not one single act with regard to unification can be taken until the bill is proclaimed? Until the bill is proclaimed it is not the law of the land.

Mr. Hellyer: It is quite true that it is not the law of the land, but the planning which is required to implement the bill can proceed once the bill is passed and once the staff know what are the provisions of the law.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the minister, is it not a fact that General Allard said in his evidence that he thought it would be extremely damaging to morale if there should be a continuation of the uncertainty which exists at the present time. I believe he urged the committee to proceed to a decision at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Hellyer: That is correct; that is General Allard's opinion, and I concur in it. It is also the opinion of other senior officers at headquarters who are charged with the responsibility for implementing the reorganization program.

Mr. Lambert: This is putting the cart before the horse.

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Chairman, I believe we are getting slightly away from the point. The minister made an interesting statement. He said the plans have not been completed in respect of this bill concerning unification which we are discussing. Obviously if we do not know where we are going we should not have this bill in front of us. With regard to proclamation, what the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre has said is quite correct; there is no legal possibility of proceeding with any plans until we do have the bill proclaimed. For the life of me I do not see why, if the bill is going through, it should not be put through and proclaimed immediately rather than be delayed for some further decisions which perhaps the minister wishes to have included.

In other words the bill itself is a carte blanche for anything the minister should like to put forward. The fact of proclamation cannot change this in any way, shape or form. I

fail to follow his argument in respect of proclamation. I do not understand why we should hesitate. I am sure there is some planning necessary, but the intention of the minister should be placed before the house so this can be discussed when the bill is before us and when we are considering it clause by clause. We should have from the minister a clear statement concerning what he intends to do.

Mr. Hellyer: This question was raised in the standing committee on national defence and the Judge Advocate General pointed out that there are certain regulations which cannot be completed until the form of the bill is known. Let me give an example. The committee already has proposed an amendment which gives to the governor in council the responsibility to designate the names of the ranks to be used, whereas in the original draft of the bill this power was given to the minister. This means there will be a difference in the type of order which must be promulgated in order to give practical effect to this provision.

It is quite impossible for the legal staff to properly prepare the orders until they know what actually is the text of the law. The Judge Advocate General said it would be several months after the bill has been approved by parliament before we would be in a position to ask the governor in council to proclaim it.

Mr. Pugh: On that point may I say that I fail to see what effect the fact that orders will have to be issued down through the services will have on the matter of proclamation. This will in no way be affected by the fact that the bill has been passed by parliament but is unproclaimed. The proclamation of the bill in the end will not take away the uncertainty. Certainly any problems which might exist in respect of the issuing of orders down through the various services cannot have any effect on the proclamation. The bill will not be changed in any shape or form, nor will any new wording be introduced in the bill. After the bill is passed, if it is passed, there will be no changes made in the bill itself. The final proclamation of the bill will give it full effect and force under the law. If the proclamation is held up I think this will leave in the minds of the people a doubt concerning what the minister intends to do.

Mr. Hellyer: My hon. friend seems to miss the point. A number of changes were made to the text of the law during the hearings of the committee on national defence, and these changes have been recommended to the House of Commons and this committee. It is possible that during the course of the deliberations in this committee there might be other amendments. I cannot say whether there will or will not be. It is quite possible, however, that we might find that other technical changes are desirable in the interests of implementing the general proposal. If that should happen this would alter the regulations which must be prepared based on the law. Consequently I believe it is a perfectly valid proposition that the staff cannot provide the draft regulations until they know precisely what the law looks like.

• (12:30 p.m.)

Mr. Pugh: Far from my missing the point, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that what the minister has just said of course bears out exactly what I have put forward. Nothing in this bill can be changed in any way, shape or form after it has been passed by this house. Any amendments which may be put forward by the government or accepted by the government as proposed by the opposition cannot be made after the bill has passed this house. These changes must be made during our clause by clause consideration. I suggest the regulations will be made in accordance with the bill as passed.

The suggestion that proclamation be withheld leaves me uneasy in my mind. I have an underlying uneasiness that the minister proposes to hold up proclamation because he is finally afraid to implement the purposes of this bill. Maybe he has received some advice from the cabinet that we should not go ahead with these measures, in which case we are now wasting our time. We should know now that when this bill is passed it will go immediately to that other place, where I hope it will be given long, serious and sober thought. Perhaps they will throw it out.

We should have proclamation at the earliest possible time following passage of the bill. We do not want any hidden idea that the minister is getting advice from down the line somewhere regarding possible changes. Regulations can only be made according to the bill as passed by this house, and the bill as passed by this house will be the bill finally proclaimed. Why should we wait for months?

I read over General Allard's evidence, and assure you that he said it would take some time before the bill would be proclaimed and that when he was good and ready he would tell the minister to proclaim it. That is in the evidence and I heard him say it. I wondered

about it at the time. It seems to me that withholding proclamation after passing the bill for any purpose whatever will raise the speculation that something else will be slipped in, in some way or another.

I am very clear as to what the minister has said, but surely we cannot hold off proclamation after passing the bill. To do so would be completely and utterly wrong and would leave a feeling in the minds of all members of the house that there is something devious going on. The minister gave one example of why proclamation could be withheld, but surely that related merely to a departmental matter. How can they go ahead and implement these measures if the bill is not promulgated? These people know it will be promulgated unless the government is defeated in the meantime. That might change the whole pattern.

In any event the armed forces will be left in doubt about the whole matter until proclamation. Whether that takes four months or four years does not make much difference if these measures are to be implemented on a piecemeal basis, but this will leave an uneasiness in the minds of many people, and this uneasiness will find its way to service personnel. This in turn will have an effect on the morale of our servicemen. Surely the minister must realize that.

Mr. Hellyer: We shall keep in mind the advice of the hon. gentleman to the effect the bill should be proclaimed as expeditiously as reasonably possible after passage by parliament.

Mr. Churchill: It should be withdrawn now.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): After listening to what the minister has said about delaying proclamation I cannot help but say that this sounds like someone getting married six months after a child has been born. I do not need to tell you what kind of a child that is in my opinion.

Mr. Pugh: They do not proclaim it very loudly at that time.

Mr. Hellyer: It is like getting a licence before getting married.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): I have not spoken so far on this bill although I have intended to do so for some months. So far as I am personally concerned this is the time to speak. Whether the proposal suggested by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre should be considered over the week end—and that is another matter—it is at this time I feel I should speak on the bill. If the hon. member's proposal was accepted we would to a certain extent be anticipating the prerogative of Mr. Speaker to allow two days for the proposal of amendments under the new procedures, but I think the suggestion is worthy of consideration.

Many hon. members have said they had not intended to speak during this debate but have done so because of the arrogance of the minister and the lack of information. I have always felt that the part of this bill which abolishes the navy is shocking. For many months I have felt that I must say something in this regard. The traditions and the separate identity of the navy are very important. On many occasions I have risen in my place and said that I for one have been alarmed at the lack of attention given to the sea and its importance to this country which perhaps has the longest coast line in the world. This is a nation of landlubbers. Instead of being proud of the traditions of the sea and bringing up our young people accordingly, we forget about it.

By passing this bill we will completely wipe out the navy. That is a retrograde step, and as one who has been kicking around the waterfront for many years, and who was privileged to sail from the rugged shores of Canada and safely return, I am alarmed. I think this step will set us back many years.

The tradition of the navy is very interesting. I wonder what will happen to all those posters that one recalls in a nostalgic way which suggested to our youth "Join the navy and see the world"? I suppose the old slogan that a sailor has a girl in every port will no longer be of any value. I do not know what the girls will do or whether they are concerned, but that has always been part of the adventure of joining the navy. That idea will be completely forgotten as part of our Canadian way of life. I have very carefully read the testimony and the speeches pertaining to the navy, and I find they have been mostly one-sided. No answers were given in respect of the pride of separate identity. Our youth will no longer have the opportunity of feeling that pride.

If one needed an excuse to take part in this debate the intervention by the Minister of Transport last Friday is excuse enough. The hon. member for Grenville-Dundas has referred to one or two quotations from the speech of the Minister of Transport. I am comforted by the fact that in her excellent

address she used them to even greater advantage than I might have done, Mr. Chairman. I was amazed to sit in my place and listen to the Minister of Transport refer, as he always does, to what went on in the minds of the members of the cabinet and other members on the government side regarding this abolition bill. Why a minister from Newfoundland should speak in such gloating terms about doing away with the navy is beyond my comprehension. Perhaps that is the reason he was sent up north this week.

The minister has had many troubles in his department with respect to navigation on the St. Lawrence. The Registrar General was in the chamber a moment ago following the debate. I would have liked to hear him express his opinions on this matter. We all know the reason for not having Canadian navigation on the St. Lawrence river. It is because we do not have qualified seamen here. Seamen of this type are not trained in Canada. We have to go to the United Kingdom for most of our pilots. Our young fellows do not follow the sea.

• (12:40 p.m.)

Many measures have been taken by the Department of Transport to try to interest our youth in this career. We have a coast guard training school. Its members are in naval uniform. We are trying to build up a pride of service there. If this bill goes through where will Canada stand as far as our navy is concerned? We will have coast guard officers and ferry boat captains. Won't that be nice when we meet the nations of the world at naval meetings? I recall nostalgically the large convoy meetings that were held in Halifax and Norfolk during the last war, when the various ships and navies came into port. It was a sight to see them all in their naval uniforms receiving orders for the convoys that were the lifeblood of the troops and the people in Europe. Will it not be ridiculous if we have another war and hundreds of naval officers are gathered in a room planning the convoys and the Canadians are sitting there in their jolly green jumpers? It is too ridiculous, in my opinion, to even talk about.

The remarks of hon. members opposite, and particularly those of the Minister of Transport, show what little consideration was given in cabinet to this matter. I searched the record vainly for answers to the questions we have asked. I searched for answers to the questions we have raised about naval tradition, particularly in the remarks of the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.), a distinguished naval officer. We have asked why morale is

reduced, recruiting so difficult, and our young people are leaving the service. The hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) and the Minister of Transport dragged in everything they could about the swingers, Marshall McLuhan and other things.

I have mentioned the naval record of the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.), and I wish to pay tribute to the admirals who courageously came forward and were criticized by many hon. members for stating their opinions. I have read the testimony of Admirals Landymore and Rayner. Everybody in Canada, regardless of the outcome of this debate, owes them a debt of gratitude for putting their case forward.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): I can say this from a very unprejudiced standpoint, because I am one person in this chamber who was as far removed from admirals as anybody could possibly have been during the last war. In fact my only contact with an admiral was in a certain port where I helped carry a case of rum ashore from our merchant navy ship for some rear admiral.

Mr. Churchill: Was the case full when it was delivered?

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): I suppose that is another tradition that will be lost. I imagine the minister will wipe out that tradition, too, and will try to prevent anybody who goes to sea from drinking rum.

Mr. Hellyer: The case for the admiral or the tot for the crew?

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): I pay tribute to these admirals for expressing their views in a straightforward way. I have looked through the record of this debate for answers from the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.), the chairman of the committee, the Minister of Transport and others who have spoken on that side of the house, to the questions that have been raised. One remark by the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) struck me as needing further explanation, though I appreciate that he did not put it forward in too serious a way. He said that if the navy on the east coast was not able to do the job, then the west coast could take over. This burns me up. There are many good sailors on the east and west coasts and they were interchangeable during the war, but Halifax was the only city in Canada that really felt the brunt of the war. Those in Halifax knew the battle of the Atlantic. They knew what it was to lose sons, fathers and brothers.

I can pay tribute to Halifax because I am not from that city. We in Saint John rival Halifax, but that was the only Canadian city to really feel the effects of the war. I think this is why tradition dies hard down there, and we should take note of their feelings in this matter. I say to the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) that the people in this area have experienced the hardships of war and we should pay attention to their feelings. Not only will they be hard hit when the navy is abolished, but it will cut into their whole way of life and decrease to a sad extent the interest of those who go to sea.

I wish to make a personal remark here because many of us who were in the services during the second world war—I do not believe for one minute in trading war records—did not end up doing the jobs we wanted to do. The second world war was very different from the first in this respect. In the second world war we dreamed of being Spitfire pilots and leading commando raids, but this was not possible for all of us. This was the situation of about 90 per cent of those who served in the second world war. In the first world war you fought in trenches, and that was it; it was simple. You might not have lasted long, but there it was.

The second world war was global. We had different responsibilities, and many of us were frustrated by what we were doing and were perhaps not happy about it. I for one have always felt that although many Canadians made just as great a contribution as anyone else, they would have been happier with a little more glory and glamour. It could be the case that the minister, in becoming mixed up in this business, is carrying over a frustration from some of the things that did not turn out the way he wanted in so far as his own personal career was concerned; and I say that without any animosity.

I have read the record of this debate to try to find the reason behind this proposal. I have tried to find where the unification idea came from. The other day somebody told me that when he was at a defence college they used to throw this out as an exercise when you first arrived. They said "Go and write an article on unification", as though it was a big joke and something very hypothetical. Is this where it came from? Did some junior officer at defence college write a thesis on unification, and was it picked up? Did the idea come from this unknown wing commander who hovers around this chamber on cloud nine? Who conceived this idea? We do not know where it came from.

We have not even heard from anybody who supports it. There must be some retired officer in this country who could come forward and support it. I have looked for such support and for the answers to the questions we have raised. I have looked to the navy for support for this proposal. I read the debate on the contention put forward by Admiral Rayner, and I compliment him for putting it forward. I was amazed to find this answer given by Admiral Rayner, as reported at page 2022 of the minutes of proceedings and evidence No. 31 of the committee, and I presume it is true because it was not challenged. This is an insight into the thinking of the minister:

> Mr. Rayner: I think the uncertainty is caused in large measure by changes in plans. To give you an example of what I mean, in the spring of 1964—in April—the Minister of National Defence went to Esquimalt and talked to the sailors there. He was questioned on interchangeability.
>
> He explained that he did not see why an army cook could not cook just as well at sea as he could ashore; and similarly, with a radar technician, he did not see why any air force radar technician could not serve just as well at sea in a ship as he could on an R.C.A.F. station.

• (12:50 p.m.)

Everyone knows that a cook aboard a ship is important when sailors have to be at sea for three months or more. I admit that one could recruit a cook from the shore and put him on a ship, but he would not last very long, and that is why cooks have been dumped overboard late at night. Another question was put to Admiral Rayner concerning the uniform. In answer he quoted the minister as follows:

> Well, take the case of the *Bonaventure*, for example. When you have soldiers and airmen and sailors all on the *Bonaventure* and have them all falling in in these different uniforms—

Does the minister mean he is going to put the three services on the decks of the *Bonaventure*, if we ever do get the bloody ship fixed, and have them running around there? What is going on in the mind of the minister is fantastic. I suppose this is the reason he wants the three services in the same uniform.

The navy is a very special service. It is a service which demands high quality and high standards. It is the one above other services which has a definite role to play. Yet the navy is the first to get the axe. Those of us who went to sea—and I for one have never felt that the sea got me—have recognized that one must have special attributes to join the navy.

Admiral Landymore, in his brief on the navy's place in unification dated February 1966, pointed out in admirable fashion that, first of all, a young man going to sea must be a tradesman as well as a sailor. I do not know which qualification he puts first; they are interchangeable. A sailor has one particular job to do aboard a ship, but he has to learn many other duties. I know this is why we have had difficulties in building up a merchant navy in Canada. We are a very affluent country and our sailors are reluctant to undertake the hardships at sea without receiving wages comparable to those of their fellow workers on land. This makes it more difficult to interest men in a merchant seaman's career.

Admiral Landymore in his brief remarked on the extra hardships imposed on sailors because of their long absences from home. In this regard they are unlike other members of the service. This is particularly true in peacetime when they are away from their families, and that is an important point in today's modern society. Sometimes they are away for long periods of time. For this reason among others there is a lower re-engagement rate for those in the navy. The navy has a hard time to hold them in the service.

The third point Admiral Landymore made, and which I think is of great significance, refers to the separate identity and esprit de corps which are particularly necessary aboard a ship. The best sailors are those who possess this spirit. The same applies to a football team, and we dress a football team in a special uniform so as to build up the necessary esprit de corps. The leaders of the teams are those who have the most spirit and who take the teams and their colours seriously. Yet it is the best men, the ones who want the traditions of the silent service to be maintained, who will be the first to go under the plan proposed by the minister. They will be disappointed and will leave the service.

On page 4 of his brief Admiral Landymore said:

> The man we want is one who under no circumstances will let his ship down, who is proud of his uniform, who does his job to the best of his ability regardless of how long it takes him to do it, and who is ready to die if need be, to prove he is better than his enemies.

In closing I ask again the question, who is the power behind this unification program? Where did the idea come from? Did it come from the unknown wing commander? What is his experience? We know the experience of the minister and I have suggested, I hope not unfairly, that perhaps what motivated the minister was a touch of frustration during the second world war. Is the minister saying that he and this unknown wing commander have more knowledge than the 80 officers who were retired or have resigned? This is the conclusion one must reach. We did not hear an answer from the Minister of Transport, nor did we hear an answer from the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.), however distinguished a war record he may have.

My final plea is to ask the minister not to rush this program of unification. The minister was in the house, as I was, when the defence production bill was being debated. I am not harking back to the pipe line issue, which is another story, but the minister will recall the defence production legislation brought forward by the late Mr. Howe, who asked for blanket authority. Some of us took an interest in this, particularly the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. Why did Mr. St. Laurent, the prime minister of the day, send the late Mr. Howe on a fishing trip during which time he changed some of the key clauses in the bill?

This might be a way out; but no, this is an action of an arrogant government. Introducing a common uniform will not bring about an economy. There is no rhyme nor reason in the loss of identity of the services. I like the comparison of this government with its prime minister to a crew, adrift 40 miles out at sea, and the prime minister saying "Untie the ship". I think this is an excellent naval example describing what is happening here.

The Chairman: Order, please. It being one o'clock, and pursuant to an order of the house made on Thursday April 6, this sitting stands suspended for one hour. The committee will resume at two o'clock.

SITTING SUSPENDED

SITTING RESUMED

The committee resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Mr. Chairman, I believe I have a minute or two left. I want to put on the record one of the reasons for my intervention in this debate. Before I do so, I want to tell the minister that my remarks about landlubber cooks in the navy should not be misinterpreted. My colleagues wish me to say that they hope anything I said will not affect recruiting of cooks for the navy in the future.

I have a copy of a telegram sent to the Prime Minister by the Naval Officers Association of New Brunswick and I should like to read it into the record:

> The Naval Officers Association of New Brunswick at annual meeting in Saint John April 7, 1967 unanimously agree that while we wholeheartedly approve of integration at the command level, for logistic support, in administration and of medical services, we abhor the thought of total unification of the armed forces.
>
> We feel that the arguments put forward opposing unification as expressed before the House of Commons defence committee far outweigh the ideals as put forward by the defence minister. We concur and fully endorse the recent statement of Lord Louis Mountbatten and urgently request you and your ministers to take appropriate steps to ensure that the three services retain their individual identities which we sincerely believe is vitally essential to the morale of our armed forces.
>
> Naval Officers Association of New Brunswick

This telegram speaks for itself, Mr. Chairman. I hope the minister will take note of this telegram from men who probably know a lot more about this problem than the minister and I. I have made my plea and I hope the minister will take full cognizance of it. He has made exceptions already in the case of the Scottish regiments which can retain their kilts and in the case of the French through his offer to retain the Royal 22nd Regiment.

Mr. Hellyer: I am sure my hon. friend would not want to create an impression by that remark which he might have created inadvertently. The exception in so far as the regimental system is concerned is a commitment that I made three years ago and has nothing to do with English speaking or French speaking people or the Royal 22nd specifically.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): I thank the minister for his refinement of that statement. The fact, is, however, that concessions have been made to certain groups. As one who has always thought, with some justification, that we have to interest our young people in the great sea traditions of this nation, I humbly ask the minister now to at least give the sailors their distinctive uniforms.

Mr. Loiselle: When the previous speaker commenced his remarks, Mr. Chairman, he said he was intervening in this debate because of the arrogance of the minister. I am intervening in the debate for the same reason but because of the arrogance of the members of the opposition. They are doing their utmost to delay the passage of this bill, and that is my reason for taking part in the debate.

[*Translation*]

• (2:10 p.m.)

Mr. Chairman, as Canada is becoming increasingly aware of the role it can play on the international scene, it will be able to perform that role even more effectively.

Indeed, our country is undergoing deep changes at present and thanks to its dynamism and its vitality, it is now reflecting in foreign countries a favourable and influential image.

Canadians are proud to note the increasingly important position their country is occupying within the United Nations, and they are also proud when they realize that Canada is providing developing countries not only with financial assistance, but also all kinds of assistance in every field, with the help of its experts, which gives our country a sense of leadership and dynamism.

Bill No. C-243, which we are still studying today, deals with the proposed unification of the Canadian armed forces. Therefore, this intention on the part of Canada is no secret. Some people, afraid of the decision we are about to make in this respect, are fighting it desperately. They are against the new plan. However, I must tell them that a number of experts in this field have pointed out to us in various ways the importance of unification and of certain legislative and national values implied in the concept.

I should like to make some comments on Personnel and Careers in the Canadian armed forces. First of all, I should like to read a statement made by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer) in answer to certain assertions made by some of the witnesses who appeared before the committee on national defence. They claimed that integration and unification would turn the members of our armed forces into jacks of all trades. Then on December 7, 1966 the minister said:

> The combat units will retain their identity, and their specialized functions and training. It is important to state—

—continues the Minister of National Defence—

> —that it is not and never has been any part of the planning associated with unification to convert our servicemen to "jacks-of-all-trades". An infantry soldier will not be asked to do the job of a sailor in a fighting ship; a sailor will not be asked to fight in an infantry platoon; and a fighter pilot will not be required to drive a tank.

I agree with the minister whole-heartedly. Besides, is it not true that those who put this argument forward seem to ignore the following fact: All the members of a defence force

must acquire a certain basic training and discipline, although each service must play its proper role.

I must also point out that, in considering this matter more closely, I based my opinion on the very evidence given by qualified people responsible for setting up and carrying out the said Personnel and Careers plan. It is all there in black and white and references are available for those who might have some doubts.

As announced last fall, the major interest of career men as far as prospective promotions are concerned is based on the new structures. These measures, however, constitute a serious problem in the sense that they bring about the dearth of subjects, that is, there were 346 subjects and there are now only 97. The chief of personnel, Air Marshal Reyno testifying before the national defence committee on February 9 said as reported on page 597 of the proceedings:

I should add that this reduction has been achieved with remarkably few complaints, and no loss of efficiency, and will in time produce considerable economy through consolidation of training.

The many trades involving few people have been merged into 97 trades involving larger numbers. The restrictive rank structure of the smaller group has been eliminated by the personnel concerned having the opportunity to compete for promotion in the larger group. In doing this we have eliminated a number of minor trades which were unattractive as career prospects.

Mr. Chairman, this is the opinion of an expert who is currently member of the general staff and who would be responsible for the success of integration and unification.

This new structure required an increase of 14 per cent in pay and this has been the starting point of the first revision in pay in 20 years. And it is that review, postponed for such a long time, which undoubtedly put the positions of the members of the armed forces on the same level as civilian positions in industry. Of course, that was only the beginning of the readjustment. Several other things, beneficial to servicemen's families, as, for instance, certain allowances, etc. clearly indicate all the efforts made to protect the rights of these people and their families. Some persons asserted that all those steps could have been taken without resorting to unification. But I should like to point out that the program is still incomplete. It cannot be denied that it was that reorganization which revealed all those shortcomings and it was that progressive spirit, put in concrete form by unification, which brought forth the solution of those difficulties which were due to incompleteness.

[Mr. Loiselle.]

After reading once again Marshal Reyno's brief, we notice that he deals accurately with the conditions and qualifications necessary to have armed forces made up of men interested in a promising career. And he sees in them individuals able to adjust to new conditions.

Moreover, that reorganization attracts individuals able to adjust to these new conditions. Reclassification will add to the flexibility of the personnel. It will be an organization able to compete with industry in the matter of manpower, because its leaders will be able to initiate its members in various jobs so that they in turn, can become leaders, able to take over.

We can but approve the tremendous amount of work that has been done and applied by the new organization.

Air Marshal Reyno summarized his testimony by saying, as reported on page 605 of proceedings No. 16, justifying every opinion expressed before the national defence committee—and this confirms that those responsible for carrying out unification are aware of their problems—

Finally, I would like to say that we are extremely conscious that personnel constitute our single greatest asset and that is worth repeating and also that we would fail in our task if we did not ensure that the complete management system would respond to the needs of the commanders as users of the manpower in both peace and war.

I would point out again that the development of our structure and the management organization is the result of continuous consultation with our field commanders and senior managers and I am confident that the system I have outlined will meet the requirement.

Mr. Chairman, if I quote some sentences, some excerpts from our experts currently responsible for the application of such integration and unification, it is to counterbalance, as I said at the beginning, the other outside experts who claim that unification and integration will not bring about the hoped for results.

If we understand the main objective of the personnel and careers program within a unified defence force, we must recognize, in view of the overall plan, that we can no longer delay unification which will achieve good results, both economically and administratively. I am sure that those who oppose it, for patriotic reasons which must, however, be admired, will adapt themselves and will substitute to the traditional customs the necessities of the role Canada must play in the council of nations.

Even Air Marshal Sharp, vice commander of defence command, favours the new organization of the personnel and careers program. In his evidence before the defence committee, he singled out seven reasons which justify the move. Those reasons can be found on page 460 of the minutes of proceedings and evidence for February 7, 1967, and here is the table set up by Mr. Sharp:

1. An occupation which is clearly worthwhile.
2. Work which challenges the capabilities of the individual.
3. Work which employs up-to-date methods and equipment.
4. Work in an atmosphere or environment which accepts the change necessary to keep up with advances in science; an environment which is recognized as a leader in the field.
5. Advancement based on ability, and at a reasonable rate.
6. Reasonable financial and other compensations.
7. Recognition by the public and friends that the individual's work is demanding.

And, by the way to prove the measure of success which was achieved, he added:

• (2:20 p.m.)

Full implementation of the policy contained in the white paper will go a long way to providing these necessary conditions.

The important thing in considering this matter, and I hope everyone has now realized it, is that there is no question at all of turning members of the armed forces into jacks of all trades, as was suggested by some witnesses before the committee. I mentioned the fact at the beginning of my remarks when I referred to this statement of the minister in his speech to the house on December 7 last. I am also gratified to note that staff officers have repeated this assurance during the sittings of the defence committee.

I am positive, Mr. Chairman, that we have recognized, up to now, that any person who joins the armed forces has great and new opportunities to make quite a promising career. Those same recruits will have the advantage, with that new organization, to go ahead in a force which will facilitate their promotion according to their ability and their potential and not simply on seniority. The military candidate has a greater realization of the special interest taken by the Department of National Defence in his possibilities and his welfare, contrary to what some have attempted to make us believe. In fact, that interest has already been shown by the new structures, a salary increase, an allowance increase and the undertaking of a planned career. Therefore, he will rightly be proud to represent Canada when putting on the new proposed uniform and he will be happy to wear it.

The integration and unification project is not new; for many years, prominent people, civilians as well as military men, have considered it. Within the Canadian forces, and even at the Liberal national convention in January 1958, when the Liberal party was in opposition, the project was revived and this can be seen from the minutes of that convention as shown on page 223 of the proceedings.

Since the coming into power of the Liberal party in 1963, it has been the first task to which the Minister of National Defence has set himself. As early as March 1964, the white paper on defence was published and since then integration has been emphasized, the unification stage being the next problem which the defence staff will tackle.

Since the publication of that white paper, that is three years ago, the matter has been constantly raised in the House of Commons and it has made the headlines not only in the press, but also on television and radio. Finally, all sources of information have stopped reporting the views of experts and so-called experts on the matter.

For the past three years, the standing committee on defence has been sitting and hearing witnesses, not to mention that certain politicians kept debating the matter and that the news media did not fail to talk about it.

We can very frankly say that the opponents of the principle of the bill were given ample opportunities to present their views.

The defence committee, which sat from February 7 until March 21, held 55 meetings and heard more than 30 witnesses. As a member of this committee, I can tell the members of this house that the same questions were duly put to each witness. In short, I believe that we have debated this subject long enough for the past three years, that the house has now reached the last stage of discussion on this bill, and that the opposition would be acting in bad faith if it attempted once again to make the headlines as we have known it to do during the flag debate.

In all that time, opposition members have had the privilege, and they used it, to criticize the project. You will agree with me that, in three years, everything that could be said was said long ago. But there is a constant repetition of what has already been said.

As a party in opposition, they have done their duty to the people, and therefore a decision must be made. Whether they accept the

principle or vote against the legislation is their privilege. They must go one way or the other, and not indulge in endless debate.

I fully realize, Mr. Chairman, that I am not an expert on military matters and yet, as I read the proceedings of the defence committee—of which I am a member—what struck me was the appropriateness of the action taken for the realization and success of the amalgamation of our three armed forces into a single Canadian force.

If we want to define the word "unification" and make its meaning known, I wonder why we are taking so long to reach a decision on that matter. Let us think of the very aim of that meaning and we have in fact unification. That very meaning of the combat forces differs not in their aims and objectives but rather because of their means and tactics, in short because of their instruments.

Moreover, in view of the vastness of the country in which the three defence services operate, would not unification help to smooth out the difficulties which arise due to the lack of communications between headquarters and the field services?

Other countries, which are not faced with such a widespread territory, have not felt the same problem. After weighting all the points raised here, I think that a decision must be reached for unification.

Before concluding my observations, Mr. Chairman, may I be allowed to quote, in summary, the concept of the commander in chief of the Canadian forces, General Allard, at the end of his brief submitted to the committee on national defence. Here is the opinion of the commander in chief of the Canadian forces, whose task it will be to bring into being such a unification, in which he believes whole-heartedly, as can be seen on page 1770 of the minutes and proceedings No. 27. Here is what he said, and I quote:

> In summary, then, gentlemen, the situation is this: The idea of a single force, in a single, distinctively Canadian uniform, working, living, training, and—most important—thinking together as one entity is an exciting and challenging idea. After all it is designed to meet the problems of a modern world—a scientific world—which is growing away beyond the barriers of the past at a speed that cannot stand the slow pace of yesterday. For all this, you know that we do not intend to proceed in haste—I said it was a starting point—but rather in a carefully planned manner which will extend over a number of years. All that is required now is the authority to do so.

Mr. Chairman, before resuming my seat, I appeal for the last time to the hon. members opposing Bill No. C-243 to grant the general, the members of our staff, this permission, this right to pursue the unification of our forces and if, by any chance, it should prove unsuccessful, which I do not believe, the opposition members would then be free to attack the government and at that time, they would be acting in good faith.

[Mr. Loiselle.]

[*English*]

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Chairman, I believe it is customary for anybody embarking on a discussion of matters military to try to establish his credentials. In my case I have none. I am certainly a layman, not an expert. However, I confess that as a civilian I volunteered my services to the army and served therein, volunteered my services to the R.C.A.F. and served therein, and got out as fast as I could when the war was over. I have served in the Royal Canadian Air Force and the Royal Air Force, and under an American general, British officers and Canadian officers. I believe my experiences with senior officers have been the same as 99 per cent of the troops —most unhappy ones. Like many serving personnel I could never tell for certain whether I was going to be courtmartialled or praised. So with this limited background I have naturally refrained from debating this subject.

On the other hand, it is true that I did serve in a theatre of war where it was very hard to distinguish the services. Even though I was nominally in the Royal Canadian Air Force, at the time I wore a green uniform in the jungles of Burma I found it was just as smelly, dirty and dilapidated looking as the battledress I wore in the army and the dress uniform I sometimes wore in the air force. I do not think that is the key issue, and if I pose today as one giving advice to the minister it is as one who is trying to find an answer from the point of view of a layman trying to make the right decision.

• (2:30 p.m.)

This bill has a finality about it that makes it imperative that we give it more than the casual type of attention that we give to bills that can be amended from year to year as more experience is gained. I have been watching this debate. I think the position of the people of Canada was well put last autumn in a *Globe and Mail* editorial dated November 7 which said:

> There must be a most thorough public discussion of where the Canadian forces reorganization act is leading us. Mr. Hellyer must be made to show the urgent and valid reasons for undertaking the changes he has proposed or forced to admit that there are none.

That puts the matter into a simple sentence. Has this information been made available to the House of Commons and to the public?

One of the subjects that was debated at length in the defence committee and the committee of the whole was the morale of the armed forces. Was recruiting falling off, was recruiting holding steady? I have looked at the evidence on both sides and so far as I am concerned it is very difficult to decide. When you look at one set of figures it looks like there has been a serious falling off in the totals. Yet the minister and his staff have done their best to show that there has not been a falling off. But this misses the point I am coming to. On the question of recruiting there is no clear evidence.

The question of morale has been dealt with by men who have had experience in all branches of the services and they have emphasized that if we are going to have a defence force morale is the key to it. Canadians are a type of people much different from the British. We are certainly much different from the Americans. We tend to lack the discipline of the many centuries of military service which the English have. We tend to lack, do lack, and in fact are rather proud that we lack the statistical approach, the computer approach to manpower in our services that the Americans seem to have. We are different. I suggest that one cannot ignore the very sincere and heartfelt observations made by men in this house with much vaster military experience than I have, men who certainly climbed to higher ranks than I was able to achieve. They know the necessity of morale. I cannot deal with it. All I know is that the people do not know who has won the debate as to recruiting.

The second question which the layman is asking all across Canada is, will this bill save him, the taxpayer of Canada, money so that he can put that money into things desperately wanted by the Canadian people? I would say that in the beginning, eight months ago, the vast majority of laymen across the country were, like myself, in support of unification because they believed that it would save money. On the surface unification into one force instead of having three or more forces seemed to be the answer to a desperate need of our people.

The majority of our people do not object to the taxes which are necessary to maintain our military posture but they do wonder whether they are getting the maximum results for their money when there are so many other things they want just as desperately. On this second issue, the saving of money, I have read the evidence on both sides and on the figures it looks like we are not saving money. The minister answers by saying that if we take the real value of money today we are saving or are roughly holding our own. But once again that is not clear to the public and so there is a certain amount of confusion.

In the last two or three days another issue has arisen, and this is the question of parliament itself. Ordinarily in our concept of government when we deal with a matter that requires expert advice we use the technique of the committee to draw from the experts answers to the questions which are in our minds.

The vast majority of the evidence given to the defence committee indicated that we should go slow, and take three to five years to decide on the question of unification. The military experts say, "Give us time to put integration into effect." I am assuming that we are all in favour of integration. If we believe in the parliamentary system we must consider the advice of these experts to the effect that we should take time on this very small item which is so close to the emotions and the hearts of the serving personnel, because to them matters such as the uniform and one service are desperately serious, something which I find it hard to understand. To a layman these are small points, but all the experts are asking is that the minister go slow.

Therefore I was very pleased today to detect what I thought was evidence of a trend toward moderation. We heard the minister say he would be willing to listen to proposals made on this side of the chamber for some sort of understanding over the week end. Therefore my next remarks are going to be directed toward some form of compromise proposal that will not only permit parliament to work effectively but will also move toward a more rational and responsible type of action.

Speaking now of the field in which I have some knowledge and dealing with the perspective of this bill and the over-all responsibilities of government, what do I see? First of all, military policy is not an end in itself. It is simply the operational arm of a policy of a government. The policies of the government in matters foreign and in matters economic must be clear to us in the house so that we may understand that in the bill which deals

with the operational arm, the military, designed to carry out one component part of government policies, there is coherence and there is logic.

At the present time and going back for many years Canada, not just under this government alone, has had no clearly delineated foreign policy. No government has directed its attention to what role this country, with 20 million people now and unlimited resources, is going to play in the future defence not only of this continent but in peacemaking all over the world and in space as well. We lack a clearly defined foreign policy which would enable us to know what type of military posture we must assume in order to carry out in our sphere of activity the foreign policy of our country.

● (2:40 p.m.)

To be more specific, how can parliament decide whether this bill is the correct and only course we should follow when we have had in the committee evidence to the effect that the unified force concept does not meet all the responsibilities which have been partially accepted by governments of the past and the present? For example, the United Nations is an organization which we have supported and still support. It was originally set up to include a United Nations force. That never came into being because of the veto power in the Security Council. In the last two or three years there have been proposals that smaller nations of some strength, which are not leaders in the major power struggle between the large nations, should have forces which could act in the policing role if the United Nations so requests. This is a concept which I believe members of all parties support. According to the evidence this type of unified force might be able to meet that function of a military posture.

Second, there is NATO. Is there any member of this house or any opinion leader in this country who does not know that the whole purpose and method of operation of NATO must be redefined? The need to redefine NATO both in the military and economic spheres has been clear for many years. The failure on the part of the members of NATO to define clearly for the next 10 or 15 years the purpose of NATO, in view of the new technology in the military field, makes it almost impossible for members of this house to make a learned and responsible decision in respect of this bill. We cannot do this until we know what our responsibilities in NATO will be.

[Mr. Hamilton.]

The evidence given by the experts who appeared before the committee on national defence was that a unified force would not meet our present responsibilities to NATO. The fact that we do not have a 10 or 15 year projection of what our various responsibilities will be under NATO certainly adds weight to the view expressed by the experts that we should not rush into the unification concept and then take three to five years in bringing about a result which could be final and fatal.

Third, under NORAD we have responsibility under a treaty with the United States for the defence of the North American continent. Surely any person who has looked into the situation in respect of NORAD knows that this organization must be redefined in view of the new weapons which have come into technical use in the past few years. Once again we would be able to perform our function in this house in a much more responsible manner if we had a clearcut statement concerning the role of NORAD not only in the ballistic and antiballistic field but also in respect of the seacoast and the defence of North America.

The fourth point, which deeply concerns the members from the maritimes, is the question of the anti-submarine role allocated to Canada in the North Atlantic. Is this role to be discarded? We do not know. We are told it is still one of our responsibilities. Yet the experts tell us that under the unified force concept we cannot carry out this role. This is the type of evidence we have before us. Once again, instead of giving hints that we are going to withdraw and reduce our strength on the sea I think any responsible government, before asking us to rush into unification which could be so fateful, should give us a clearcut statement on this point.

Finally, and most important, is the matter of the defence of Canada itself. I believe there is a general hope that war never will come to the shores of the western continents of South and North America. However, I believe it is our responsibility to make plans to be able to defend our continent by land, by sea and by air. What is the capacity, what is the effectiveness of a unified force in Canada when working with a military force to the south and sharing the responsibility of carrying out this most vital of all the defence postures which have to be assumed in peacetime by Canada?

I believe the evidence here is most disturbing. It would seem to indicate that the

unification concept will not work in any modern concept of a joint defence of Canada which means, in truth, a joint defence of the continent. Therefore, since we do not know how this will be done under the unification concept, what is my proposal?

I suggested that I thought I had detected an air of moderation on both sides of the house earlier in the debate today. One idea which recommends itself to me is the proposal of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. He put forward the simple proposal that we adjourn this debate and then bring the matter up again at the next session when a little more would be known about the plans of the defence department. I would like to modify this proposal, if I may, for a slightly different reason than was advanced by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

I believe there is general agreement in Canada that all the provisions of this bill must be debated with some responsibility by the members of this house. I suggest that a precedent has been set in this parliament during this session. We had before us a very difficult bill which was presented to this house last September concerning the national transportation commission. It had been introduced originally in 1964 and was so unacceptable that the government withdrew it. In 1966 they brought in a new bill on which they had worked for two years. It was a much better bill. Even though it was a much better bill, in the standing committee and in the committee of the whole house it was amended almost 80 times. On that occasion we had the Minister of Transport working with those of us in the opposition not only on the floor of the house but in the committee, outside the house, and in corridor sessions. Some of our amendments were accepted without debate and others were fought by the minister. Parliament then was at its best when members of all parties worked together to achieve, in respect of a matter which had tremendous implications for the transportation system of Canada, the best bill we could provide.

The key to the success in respect of that bill was the fact that the minister knew there were two or three items which were extremely controversial, just as we have two or three items in the 61 clauses of the bill we are now debating which are deeply controversial. For the sake of common sense and logic I would ask the minister to consider over the week end letting these two or three controversial clauses stand.

Mr. Hellyer: Which ones?

Mr. Hamilton: I am not an authority on this bill but I would certainly suggest that clauses 2 and 6 should be put over. However, I would ask that this matter be discussed with spokesmen on this side of the house because I am not an authority on the bill. I am sure the chairman of the defence committee will be glad to discuss it with the minister. If we could move into a consideration of other clauses of this bill in the way the people of this country expect I think we would clear up some of the controversial points that are bothering us. It is my hope that the minister will accept my main proposal in good faith. Several weeks ago we received a pleasant surprise. An article appeared on April 4 in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* headed "Hellyer Says Bill Statement Of Intent", "Instant Unification Is Ruled Out". In the body of the article the following is stated:

• (2:50 p.m.)

Approval of the bill to unify the forces will not mean instant amalgamation of the navy, the army and the air force, Defence Minister Paul Hellyer assured the commons yesterday.

"It will be a statement of intention that the ultimate goal is a single service", he explained. "This must be known so that planning can proceed on an orderly basis."

I took from that statement there was an understanding in the minister's mind that it would take some time to implement this measure and therefore there would not be immediate unification. The minister confirms that understanding now by nodding his head.

Preceding that article another article appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* on March 29 in respect of what the Prime Minister stated. This article states in part:

Prime Minister may exercise his influence to delay the implementation of the defence unification bill after it is passed.

Later in the article the following is stated:

—an effort on his part to see that defence minister Hellyer does not attempt to implement the unification legislation right away.

That article appeared about two and a half weeks ago and it gave a breath of hope that some statesmanship would emerge in this debate. I hope the minister will accept the suggestion that members on this side of the house are quite sincere in their concern about this matter and the people generally are concerned because they have yet to receive satisfactory answers.

We do not wish to hold up discussion on the clauses of this bill and I think we should

leave the controversial ones for later and consider the others. We should not ram the whole bill through at this time. The controversial clauses, perhaps 2, 6, and 61, which is the proclamation clause, should be deferred at this time and left to be dealt with at the next session. If the minister could bring back the drafted regulations at that time we would know what we were buying, know his plans in detail, and at that time we would be happier to deal with them.

It may be that the military experts are right that we should leave out one or two clauses of this bill and not deal with their purposes for a couple of years. However, if we knew the mechanics for unification we could then consider the body of the bill and move forward. In this way we could leave the controversial clauses until next session. In this way we could indicate to the country our desire to move forward on this bill but that we were not yet convinced of any immediate need for unification. The majority of the experts hold this view.

I am not an expert but I cannot see how a decision to put our forces into a single force and a single uniform would prevent integration. In this way I am sure we would show statesmanship on the part of this house and particularly on the part of the minister and the Prime Minister. This would be welcomed by the people of Canada and it would give the opposition a chance to show its willingness to co-operate.

Let me conclude by saying I think we are aiming at the wrong target in this debate when we aim at the minister. He has been somewhat inflexible, but I think the real target should be the lack of a foreign policy and a clear definition of what the government wishes the military to accomplish. Surely that is the root of the minister's difficulties. If he has been a little hard to get along with as an individual I suspect it is because he has been attempting to carry out an instruction he felt he was given. Now that we have received further information from the experts it would be wise on our part to put a little pressure on the Secretary of State for External Affairs to give us a clear definition on behalf of the government regarding the direction of our external affairs policy for the next 15 years. We could then define what we think our role in NATO and NORAD should be and what we should do about the anti-submarine role we are supposed to be playing. Certainly we have a right to know these things.

[Mr. Hamilton.]

What are we going to do in respect of the defence of Canada and the continent? We should have a clearcut delineation in respect of this function. We might then be able to decide what to do about this bill. As I understand the evidence of the experts, a unified force will not help us meet our commitments to NATO and NORAD and certainly not to the defence of Canada. For that reason we have a right to ask the Prime Minister of our country to give that leadership prime ministers are expected to give at times of difficulties such as we are now experiencing.

My colleague, the hon. member for Saint John-Albert, reminded us this morning of the defence production bill and that Mr. Howe had lost touch with reality in that it was introduced in peacetime in 1955 rather than in a time of war as in 1945. At that time Mr. St. Laurent watched the developments and realized that the house was approaching an impasse. He took the necessary and available steps, exercised the art of getting along, and asked Mr. Howe to disappear for a few days until arrangements with the opposition to accept an amended bill could be made. In other words, he properly exercised the functions of a Prime Minister.

If the minister has been forced to accept a rigid position, and we have seen this hurt him so far as public relations in this house and across the country are concerned, perhaps the Prime Minister could move in and accept the responsibility of making those little adjustments required to make possible the efficient working of this house. Canada would be well served if we had that type of statesmanship from the Prime Minister at this time.

I know enough about government policy to realize that the government cannot come out with policies in respect of NATO and NORAD overnight, but we could have some clear definition or indication of the direction in which we think our military should move. I hope the minister will consider this suggestion over the week end. After consultation between members on all sides perhaps we could deal with the non-controversial clauses of the bill and then come to some conclusion about what to do with the controversial clauses in light of what the experts have said.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Chairman, I hope the suggestions of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle will commend themselves to the minister and that there will be some compromise in our approach to this bill. In this way we could consider the bill in a more

sane and sensible manner without becoming boxed into irreconcilable positions.

In my opinion the press does a disservice to this institution when it talks about this debate dragging on for nine days. After all, this bill relates very fundamentally to our defence structure. Surely it is not unreasonable to debate for nine, 10 or 20 days something that has been in existence in this country for a hundred years. We have had many longer debates in this house since I have been a member on less important matters than the reorganization of our defence forces. This bill proposes to change the entire structure of our defence forces which have been tested and tried during two world wars and the Korean war. Surely this should be considered seriously, particularly when one remembers that old Liberals of certain fame have crossed party lines by suggesting that the minister should take the pause that refreshes and look at this whole plan again.

• (3:00 p.m.)

If this debate drags on for nine days or longer, members on this side of the house are prepared to face whatever penalty or reward follows at the next election. The debate does not make startling news for the members of the press gallery. There is no scandal, no sensation, no sex. It is a debate on the very substantial topic of defence and what we are to do in this area. If unification goes through, I suggest that within five or 10 years we will have another debate in the house on this question.

Perhaps the minister should have taken the bull by the horns and we should be debating whether Canada should have any defence stance or posture. Perhaps that would be a debate the minister would like to carry on, because the ultimate conclusion of the path we are now on—we have not reached the dead end yet but we are certainly quite a way down the road—leads to a position where Canada cannot contribute anything constructive to the defences of the free world. The important question that is being asked by Canadians is, how are we to contribute to the free world with our population of 20 million and the giant to the south of us with a population of 200 million or more?

The press are doing us a real disservice when they criticize members with no military experience, of whom I am one, for participating in this debate. Hon. members are confined by the rules of debate and have spoken less than the Minister of National Defence or other ministers, the three musketeers on that side of the house, who have spoken. These members of the cabinet can speak a little longer than we on the opposition side. However, I have no qualms about participating in and making a contribution to the debate. In the last few days the debate has not gained the headlines that other topics are given in the press. I believe we are debating a matter of substance and that hon. members opposite have misjudged public opinion and the opinion of hon. members of this party who have contributed with sincerity and purpose to the debate.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I feel sorry for the minister sitting there in solitude, in a sort of stubborn isolation, supported by the 26 other members of the cabinet. The other day there was a cabinet reorganization. A couple of very bright, virile, intelligent Canadians were appointed to the cabinet. They will contribute much to this land but they have not contributed to this debate. I can understand the minister, in view of his present position, finding some solace in and relying on lyrics and poetry to help while the hours away so he will have something with which to occupy himself. He is not going to listen to what we have to say and therefore has to compose lyrics or poetry. I am not sure of his family status but in my opinion he cannot have read children's tales and those lyrics which we read in our childhood. He cannot have read the folklore that we as children used to read. I say that he cannot have read these things in view of the debate we have had in the house. The minister certainly cannot have read to his children the tale of Lady Godiva on the horse that I mentioned once before.

Hon. members opposite have taken great pride in the fact that they are blazing new trails, that the world is looking at them in splendid isolation. Lady Godiva was looked at and peered at and she was somewhat embarrassed and, I would suggest, somewhat exposed as we are going to be exposed if the plans of the minister do not succeed in detail, principle and purpose as he hopes. Lady Godiva perhaps had more on the ball because at least the horse on which she rode knew where it was going whereas frankly we are not too sure exactly where the minister is going.

This minister cannot have read "Goldilocks and the Three Bears" to his children because in the new, rewritten, revised and unrepentant edition of "Goldilocks and the Three Bears" it is "Goldilocks and the One Bear." Who cares about three? "The Pied Piper of Hamelin" must cause the Minister of

National Defence some concern, because if he is not successful with regard to this measure he must ponder the fate of the many people coming behind him to the tune of the flute and falling in the "drink."

We are worried about the navy. We do not have the ships for the navy to carry out its task effectively. That must cause the minister some concern, let alone the fact that the story of the turtle and the hare and the barnacle on the shell of the turtle shows that much steadier and more worth-while progress is achieved than in the case of the flea on the behind of the rabbit. These stories illustrate that steady progress is much better in the long run than the pace exhibited by this new race of Liberals. If we look at the record, without going much further on the philosophical topic of Aesop's Fables, or Hellyer's tunes and tales, I think we should wonder where we are going in respect of this proposal. Frankly, I have not contributed to any war effort because I was too young to serve. I am not, therefore, speaking from any war experience. My only experience is that of a great many Canadians in that I was a cadet.

It has been interesting to me since this debate started months ago—not in the last nine or ten days only—to learn that the sea cadets, the air cadets and the army cadets want to know just what is going on and what is the purpose of having a separate identity for the cadets if we are not going to have a separate identity for the forces to which they eventually aspire. This has caused a great deal of confusion in the ranks of the cadets across the country. It is one question that could be easily answered, I suppose it might be said, if the cadets read the minister's statements in the house, the press releases emanating from his office and the remarks of his "Lee ward" friends because the cadets would certainly get clarification on some of these confusing points.

One reason for my entering this debate, regardless of some interest I have in it because in my riding there are defence bases, is the apparent hypocrisy in the whole attitude toward efficiency and economy if our forces are unified.

Right here in parliament we have two legislative assemblies, the Senate and the House of Commons. We have separate protective staffs for the Senate and the House of Commons, we have a separate messenger service for the Senate and the House of Commons, we have separate cleaning staffs, those ladies who clean our offices. We even have separate barber shops for those of us who are fortunate enough to have any hair to cut. If there is efficiency and economy in the concept of unification, let us have for the first time—there have been in the past so many people who have just preached the gospel—ministers who are prepared to put into effect all the changes they say they would like to make. One hon. member recently elevated to a portfolio, and a friend of mine off the floor although I have to disagree with him in this chamber, goes around making speeches and soliciting support for nefarious purposes. These people who go around the country recommending changes here and there should put their theories before cabinet and see that changes are made in government so that we may have a much more efficient system. They are not doing anything in a constructive way by just making speeches. They should see that these changes are brought about.

The minister says that the program of unification will result in efficiency and economy in our armed forces. Yet we are split right down the middle of this building because we have separate services in both houses. I believe that the cleaning ladies even order different wax with which to polish the floors and tiles of the Senate and the House of Commons.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Nowlan: Yes, I will permit a question. Whether I can answer it is another matter.

Mr. Knowles: Is the hon. member advocating that if this bill is put through by the government another bill should be introduced to abolish the Senate? If he is, that is a good argument for it.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Chairman, I am a member of a party that has a vicarious interest in the Senate which perhaps distinguishes me from the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I am not debating the merits or demerits of the abolition of the Senate; I am debating the proposition of the Minister of National Defence, the Prime Minister and others in the party on that side of the chamber with regard to unification and its economy and efficiency. I am suggesting that the ministers opposite should look at our own house and instead of several ministers travelling across the country recommending tremendous reforms of parliament and everywhere else, they should see that the reforms they advocate are put into

effect. In other words, they should put into deeds some of the words they are speaking. The greatest hypocrisy in this respect is the fact that the efficiency and economy of the Senate and the House of Commons are impaired because the functions in respect of each are divided as though they were east and west and would never meet. When one considers that even the wax purchased by the Senate is different from the wax purchased by the House of Commons and that the two houses even have separate post offices, then one realizes that efficiency and economy right here in the House of Commons could surely be improved under the joint direction of the chiefs of staff of the two speakers. Instead we proceed in our own merry way. Perhaps there are some hidden advantages in this practice of which I am not aware and perhaps I am not sufficiently initiated. However, what I cannot understand is that the minister, who has a lot of good qualities, is engaged in this sheer hypocrisy of announcing greater efficiency and economy in the services when right here in parliament we allow such inefficiency to exist. I think it is time for this jet age minister—

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, surely the hon. gentleman would give me credit for the following facts. The armed forces are by law within my administrative responsibility and, having discussed this proposal for a number of years, I am doing now exactly what he has suggested, attempting to implement it, to end the talking and get on with the job. In so far as this house and the Senate are concerned, they come within the jurisdiction of parliament itself. I have no more voice and no more responsibility concerning these matters than has the hon. member. I agree with him that there is room for improvements, particularly with regard to the rules of this house.

Mr. Nowlan: I am glad the minister has intervened. I will not belabour the point further. However, as we proceed with the issue of integration and unification I believe I should mention a point in which I am particularly interested. It concerns interchange or mobility. What is to stop us from applying interchange or mobility with regard to ministers of the crown? Who is to say whether the most efficient and economic way of running the government would not be to interchange clerks in the different departments of the government? A clerk in the Department of National Health and Welfare could fill a vacancy in the Department of National Revenue. In view of the amount of money which goes in and out of the Department of National Revenue, there are certainly many holes there which could be filled.

I see the Postmaster General is present in the house today. Credit can be claimed for the fact that words expressed on this side of the house have brought forth so many ministers today. There are exactly two here at the moment. I think the minister as well as the opposition can claim credit for the fact that so many ministers are present today. Who is to say, following the philosophy of the minister concerning interchange or mobility, that clerks, stenographers and in fact whole secretariats could not be interchanged from one department to another when vacancies occur? According to the computers this would be the most efficient and economical way of filling vacancies. Is this the next step in government management? Perhaps this question should be asked of the Minister of National Revenue.

But the same principle should apply to the government as to the forces, and this is certainly not the way to run the armed services. Perhaps this is why these examples are ludicrous. In spite of my limited knowledge, which I have gained through association with various armed forces personnel, I do not believe that the armed forces can be run in the same way as General Motors is. If the government is going to operate on approximately the same principles as General Motors does, then let us apply an interchange of personnel and trade employees back and forth.

The minister answered this point in a way when he spoke about being in charge of defence and about the responsibilities of the House of Commons. Frankly I must say I have tried to rationalize his arguments through the use of arguments which have been put forward on this side of the house. Yesterday one of the young members on the other side of the house made a speech. I believe it was the hon. member for Renfrew North. He spoke about his youth and about the fact that he had not been in the forces, as is true in my case. He gave examples going as far back as the Napoleonic wars and he referred to Hannibal's forces travelling across the Alps on elephants. I will not go that far back to criticize the minister's program. It is sufficient to look at the record of what the minister has said. Without getting too involved, we have only to look at what has happened in the last two or three years to find out whether there is a foundation or basis for unification and by examining how successful the minister has been in the steps

he has taken. All we can see is that the steps which the minister has taken can be compared with those taken by an infant who takes one step along an uncharted road full of perils and pitfalls and ends up flat on his face.

Let us consider the compulsory retirements. I will not go into this matter too deeply because many experts have talked about it. The compulsory retirements have had a most unsettling effect on the armed forces at a time when integration was supposed to stabilize and unite them. For instance, we had the case of the 500 trained pilots. According to General Foulkes' estimate, the training of each of these pilots cost this nation $50,000 and the total cost of training the 500 pilots amounted to $250 million. Yet they were dismissed arbitrarily. Would it not have been better to have retired older pilots and given them gratuities so as to make way for younger men? I am advised that the jet pilots who serve in the armed services can expect to fly for eight to ten years before being retired to a desk job. This was certainly not a very constructive step on which we could congratulate the minister.

Then we witnessed the reflex action of the minister and his advisers who tried to counteract the drain of pilots in the air force by increasing their pay. As a result other air crew members were angered and the minister had to revise the whole pay structure. It is questionable how successful the re-engagement bonus has been. The expenditures of the Department of National Defence have gone up by $125 million. According to the return tabled on October 12, 1966, in answer to a question put by the hon. member for Halifax, there were 79 premature retirements of officers of the rank of commodore and above. This figure is given at page 8561 of *Hansard*. If one totals the years which those men would have spent in the service of this country one finds that 59 years of experience have been lost. This has not been a very efficient action by the minister and I cannot see any economy resulting from it.

I should like to mention an interesting fact which I do not believe has appeared in the press lately. I wonder how many people realize that the turnover of what are termed fogbound generals, brainless colonels and other top armed service personnel has resulted in a decrease of only seven officers. This was the fantastic turnover of which we have heard so much. There were 79 retirements between January 1, 1965 and August 30, 1966, 59 of whom were prematurely retired for various reasons. The more the defence committee met the more disagreement there was with the policy of the Minister of National Defence. In December of 1965 there were 119 senior officers in the rank of commodore and above. As of February 28, 1967, there were 112 officers in the rank of commodore or above. How can the minister speak of economy and efficiency when this supposedly tremendous turnover has resulted in the loss of only seven officers? All the other retired officers have had to be replaced. The positions of these men who have given tremendous service to this country in two world wars have had to be filled. I was amazed when I first heard of this fact. How can one believe the minister's argument that his program will bring about greater economy and efficiency?

• (3:20 p.m.)

There is another area about which I should like to talk and it is a little parochial. One can talk grandly about strategy and tactics. I do not know what the tactics or over-all philosophy or policy of this country should be. I have some ideas and obviously the minister has some ideas. However, there is something not too many people realize, and I want to put this to the minister, in connection with the turnover. We have heard the minister stand up in the house and deny that there has been any decrease in enrolment. He has said that the enrolment curve has flattened out and the position has become stabilized.

I want to tell the minister that I have had letters from many serving officers, not colonels or commodores but flight lieutenants and petty officers. I have four or five of them in my hand now. Within the last two weeks these people have been told that they cannot get out of the service. There is no longer the problem of transferring within the services because you do not have services now. You now transfer from one environment to another. We are not a warlike country now, we are a peace keeping country. I think it was Moncel or Fleury who said that in his day, according to his terminology, peace keeping meant preventing war or fighting a war.

Today, as I said before, we do not have services or we will not have if this bill is passed. We have environments and interchange within environments. I should like the minister to stand up and deny the fact that there has been a freeze on the release of officers who under normal circumstances would be qualified to obtain their release from the service so they could go to whatever vocation or occupation they would like to

follow. I will not read the names of these people because they are still serving officers. I have a letter from the wife of one of them dated March 29, 1967 in connection with his enrolment. She writes that he was told the policy would allow him release on request three years after graduation. This is not a man who has been commissioned under the R.O.T.P. plan, whose education was financed by the government and who now wants to get out early. Every one of these letters is from a man who has served his time, in all cases over three years.

There is a certain regulation—I do not know the numbers of these regulations—to the effect that in normal cases six months' notice is sufficient to allow a release.

An hon. Member: That is what the minister told us.

Mr. Nowlan: I can believe that because the hon. member always makes good sense. These men are pilots and they want to get out. They entered the service under certain conditions, namely, that they could get out on six months' notice. The wife of one of them writes she has been advised that her husband has to complete two more years of service. He has been serving for three years and has a commitment to a private firm which, of course, is jeopardized. This man is not one of those at the top; he is right in the ranks.

Another pilot writes under date of March 29, 1967 to the effect that last week officers had their release dates cancelled. Another member of the air force says that service policy resulted in a statement to the effect that all graduate pilots holding permanent commission will be retained in the service until the completion of five years of qualified pilot service. I am suggesting that at the time these pilots entered the service this policy was not in existence and it has resulted in discrimination. This man wants to go back to law school.

I should like to ask the minister to tell us, either now or at the end of my remarks, if there has been a change in policy with respect to the length of time these men will be retained in the service and what is being done about it. I should like this statement so that people who may want to join a unified service, if there are any and I hope there are, will not walk into this situation blindly where people who are not colonels or commodores are being retained in the forces.

If I were a young applicant for the forces I would not want to be trained by any of these officers. Two of them are not in my constituency but are in another area in the west where training is given. If these men really want to get out, I would not want to be trained by them because they might become a handicap. I have other remarks to make but this was one detail to which I wanted to refer, without generality or platitude, to illustrate the way in which the present unification policy is directly affecting these men. I am told there are many more like them. This all has to do with the turnover.

Mr. Hellyer: If the hon. gentleman would like me to do so, I would answer this point now. I may say that there has been some consideration of this matter by the staff. The same question was raised earlier in the debate by the hon. member for Lapointe. I hope to be able to make a statement on the question on Monday.

Mr. Nowlan: I thank the minister for those remarks. I know that these gentlemen and others as well will certainly appreciate the minister's statement because they have made business commitments which are now in jeopardy. I did not hear the hon. member for Lapointe but I intended to raise this question many days ago. However, I thought this was perhaps the proper time to raise it. I am glad the minister is going to make a statement on Monday.

All these things, Mr. Chairman, cause concern. When one looks at the over-all picture one realizes that, no matter how well-intentioned the minister may be or how much backing or lack of backing he may have, there is no doubt that Canada is going against the current. The hon. member for Queens summed it up well yesterday when he said it is not a question of being a trail blazer or leader. How can you lead when no one is behind you? We are off in the pasture so far as military philosophy is concerned with this unified force.

I believe the hon. member for Qu'Appelle was quite correct when he said the minister deserved some credit for tackling this problem. He has focused attention on defence but undoubtedly defence is intertwined with foreign affairs. With all respect to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, I think the position of the Minister of National Defence has been made untenable because of the fuzzy or foggy approach of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In Britain reference is made to a foggy bottom or perhaps it is in connection with United States foreign affairs that the term "foggy bottom" is used. If there is a

foggy bottom in connection with foreign affairs we certainly have it with our present minister who gives the most convoluted answers to simple questions. We recognize that the job of the Minister of National Defence is difficult when the foreign affairs position is so foggy. I believe this has been the real problem with which the minister has had to cope, but of course he cannot speak about that.

I should like to deal with another area during the time I have left, and it relates to something very close to home. I should like to reduce the general talk about the policy of unification to human terms. It is very easy to sit in a gallery and write an article asking why this or why that. I have not taken a partisan, provocative interest in defence policy in the last few months regardless of the fact that I might have received the stimulus from the minister to do so.

I have several bases in my riding, one of which is the naval base, H.M.C.S. *Cornwallis*, as the minister knows. The minister, as well as the minister from my province, have come down there and said that statements about this base are unfounded or irresponsible rumours. There is one way to clarify a rumour and that is to have a statement from the minister. The base at *Cornwallis* was commissioned in 1942 and it has been a training base. Training is part of the program if we are going to have forces. At the moment there are 400 personnel at the base which is the second largest single employer in my riding. There are 400 military personnel, 500 full-time civilians and 800 trainees. There are over 2,640 dependants of these people who are involved with the base. There are over 4,300 people directly involved in the operation of *Cornwallis*, not including farmers or fishermen who are naturally tied up with it. About 90 per cent of these people live right in the area within a 20-mile radius.

• (3:30 p.m.)

It has been estimated that one person out of every four in our area either works at or is supported by a person working at H.M.C.S. *Cornwallis*. All these people will be adversely affected by any program of consolidation. I realize that we must have progress. If we are to push buttons, and if that is progress, then we must accept it. Nevertheless bases must be maintained. My constituents cannot see the logic in removing this base from their area and placing it in another part of Canada with greater natural resources. They cannot see the logic of removing it to the prairies or to the rocky mountains or to another part of our vast country.

[Mr. Nowlan.]

Our history has been one of providing service for the services. That is how we have gained our livelihood. As I say, we have not the resources of other parts of Canada with which to earn a livelihood. We are also close to the sea. No matter what one calls this program, be it unification, integration or anything else—some of our people have strong names for it—closing this base and removing it to another part of the country does not make sense, especially when one considers that it is useful for training those who go to sea.

Many of our people have built their lives around the base. Over 80 per cent of the people in the immediately surrounding area have been employed there for over 11 years. Three persons out of four live in their own homes, homes bought mostly by veterans with the help of the Veterans' Land Act. Should the base close, what alternative source of employment will our people find? How will they make payments on their homes? Many of the people employed are not professionals but would be classified as semi-skilled or unskilled labourers. They may not find alternative sources of employment.

The Chairman: Order, please. I must interrupt the hon. member to advise him that his allotted time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

The Chairman: Has the hon. member unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Nowlan: I thank the committee. I shall try to consolidate my remarks more successfully than the minister is consolidating his bases. We have many bases in the east and undoubtedly some of them will be affected by any consolidation program. As I said previously, we must have progress. On the other hand, we find it illogical to close down a base on the seashore, the largest establishment of its kind in the Commonwealth, when its facilities are needed for training. Though the evidence of Admiral Rayner may have provoked some hon. members opposite, he did say that if people are to go to sea they must be trained on the sea. For the initial six or eight weeks sailors may be trained inland but eventually they have to learn to live with the sea.

I had intended reading some letters received from 300 of my 900-odd constituents at that base but I shall not do so. The letters speak in provoked terms about the effects of closing this base.

I hope the air of moderation which the hon. member for Qu'Appelle optimistically detected in the chamber will prevail. I hope the minister will not act as a builder who has constructed something but in so doing has forgotten the rights of parliament and constructed an edifice against the wishes of parliament. We must be positive in our thinking. I hope the minister will not follow the philosophy of another minister who thought he could act in a manner contrary of the wishes of parliament. I hope the minister does not fall into that trap.

Mr. Southam: Mr. Chairman, it had not been my original intention to participate in the debate on Bill C-243, an act to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof; and my remarks will be relatively brief.

Unfortunately I was too young to enter the services in the first war and too old to join in the second world war. As a result I felt that consideration of the proposals of the Minister of National Defence and his advisers to amend the National Defence Act should be left to those members of Her Majesty's loyal opposition who have had actual military experience and who have served so faithfully and, I must say, so effectively on the defence committee over the past few months.

I should pause here to say that we backbenchers owe those committee members on our side of the house a deep debt of gratitude and, yes, the people of Canada owe them a deep debt of gratitude for their careful examination of the witnesses and exhaustive study of the testimony which has been evidenced many times in the house in recent days by the calibre of speeches. After listening to these contributions and studying the committee reports, I felt impelled to speak. I had no alternative to adding my voice to the widespread cry of alarm that Canadians across this land are expressing from day to day as they finally realize what the Minister of National Defence and the Liberal party are bent on doing to Canada's defence forces.

Following the more expert technical contributions made by our members who have served in Her Majesty's forces and on the defence committee, the speeches made by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition on Tuesday and by the hon. members for Victoria-Carleton, Northumberland, and Rosthern yesterday must surely sound a serious warning to the Minister of National Defence, the Prime Minister and others across the way that the present policy espoused in Bill C-243, especially that segment dealing with the principle of unification, is entirely wrong. Many observers and responsible writers outside parliament have come to the same conclusion.

I now wish to quote from an editorial which appeared in the Winnipeg *Free Press* on Wednesday, April 4, a newspaper not entirely favourable to the policies espoused by our party. The heading is in strong language, "Destroying Defence", and the editorial reads in part as follows:

> It is beyond comprehension that Mr. Hellyer, by insisting on total unification, should ask parliament now to endorse a completely new defence structure, entirely foreign to both British and U.S. defence organizations. Unification, and elimination of service identities, despite Mr. Hellyer's statements to the contrary, have been openly rejected by Britain after much study—as declared in the white paper of 1963. A check with Washington would also reveal that the U.S. has no intention of unifying its combat units. To the contrary, the present purpose is to build up the proud reputations and esprit de corps of individual fighting units, whether it be the "Green Berets", the Marines or the First Cavalry Regiment. For Canada to launch into a radical experiment which will make our defence organization incompatible with U.S. and British organization constitutes the most drastic step ever taken with the defences of this country. It could, in large measure, destroy our existing defence structure.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Here is another excerpt, this time from an article which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* under the heading "An Unseemly Rush To What?" I will quote the salient points for the sake of this debate. Citing Air Vice Marshal Miller, the article states:

> He said that he saw no significant financial or military advantage in unification as compared with integration."

Another expert, Admiral Louis Mountbatten, expressed his views on integration and unification in an article which appeared in the *Colonist* on April 5. The question was brought up by an hon. member who is well known in the house, the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.), and the admiral's views are stated as follows:

> In the British reorganization care has been taken to preserve esprit de corps and morale and those traditions which help to maintain this in the services and fighting units.
>
> It has been accepted that to achieve this the three services must retain their uniforms and ranks with an identifiable professional head of their service. The idea of a single uniform and rank

structure was also rejected as undesirable and unnecessary.

There is one other comment which I believe adds weight to my argument. It is one of the points raised by the Tri-Service Identities Organization.

It seems remarkable that the critics of the reorganization have been variously categorized as emotional, unprogressive, unreasonable, disloyal, obstructionist, destructive, politically motivated, or without responsibility. Do none of the extensive body of Canadians who hold opinions contrary to those of the Minister of Defence do so by reason of knowledge, capability, experience, conviction, concern or sincerity? Surely the calibre of some of the witnesses who have appeared before the defence committee dictates a high degree of credibility for their views and in no way justifies any discounting of their evidence and opinions.

The memorandum goes on to say:

Overwhelming support for the reorganization program does not exist amongst Canadians generally. Thus the latest Gallup poll showed less than 50 per cent of Canadians support it. Observing that this poll was taken before the defence committee started its hearings, and before so much cogent evidence was presented by so many knowledgeable persons against the plans and policies as presently disclosed would certainly permit the conclusion that even fewer Canadians support the programme now than six weeks ago.

One could continue to read weighty evidence for hours on end in support of the contention that the Minister of National Defence would be well advised to go slow on this issue. However, it is on the basis of the many expressions of concern which I heard from the ordinary man in the street while visiting my riding during the Easter recess that I turn to the next part of what I have to say. These conversations made me appreciate that Canadians everywhere are becoming deeply concerned about the direction in which the minister is taking us. They are additional reasons for my asking the minister to turn back before it is too late. I realize it would be tough medicine for him personally but it would help to vindicate him in the eyes of the nation and atone for some of his serious misdemeanours such as tampering with evidence, charging high-ranking officers with disloyalty and using what many have referred to as the big lie technique employed so effectively by one of the world's most hated leaders of a foreign power not so many years ago.

Canadians thought at first that the government's policy on defence was bold and daring and that it would save them millions of dollars. This impression was, of course, created by the minister's own public relations effort and resulted from the emphasis laid on the integration of our services. However, when

the minister began the infiltration process by using the word "unification" from time to time, interchanging it with the word "integration" and even using the term "amalgamation", people in general and even the commanding officers in the forces became completely confused. Many are still confounded and confused, as previous speakers in this debate have so clearly illustrated in the course of their remarks. Now, however, the people of Canada as well as those in other parts of the world are beginning to ask questions. The ordinary man wants to know whether Canada has any bona fide external affairs policy. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle mentioned this point a few moments ago, as did the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings. External affairs policy as enunciated by the Secretary of State for External Affairs has been so fuzzy and woolly that none of us understand it and Canadians do not appreciate what it is.

Does Canada have an adequate and proper defence policy? Defence and external affairs are, of course, so closely related that we must have a good idea of both before we can be sure about either. This has been said by many previous speakers who are more qualified than I am to debate this problem. Nevertheless it is pertinent. The average man is beginning to ask what our defence policy is and what our foreign policy is to be. This subject alone could lead us into a lengthy debate.

The third question which is often put to me is: Now that the 1967-68 estimates are out and defence spending has risen by $120 million, where is the saving which the minister suggested we would make? Out of our total budget we are spending between 20 and 25 per cent on defence. Since the total is 15 per cent above that of last year, some $1,600 million is involved. The taxpayer is naturally interested in the direction our defence policy is to take.

A fourth question, and one which has been put to me many times, is: In the light of the low morale of our services, will it be necessary to bring in conscription to keep them up to strength? What about the Liberal members and the Creditistes from Quebec? What is their reaction to this question?

The fifth question I have been asked is: What is to become of our commitments to NATO, NORAD and the United Nations? This again is an important question tied in with Canada's external affairs policy. How can we make a decision on this bill until we decide

where we stand as far as our NATO and NORAD commitments are concerned?

Another important question which has been raised over and over again is: Did anybody estimate the cost in millions of dollars to the taxpayer represented by the loss of some 75 or 80 of Canada's most highly qualified military officers in the three services who felt impelled to step into retirement prematurely because they could not stomach the minister's policy of unification? Here is a question serious enough to warrant a wide-ranging debate. It is hard to determine the size of the investment represented by the training of these men, so many of whom have stepped out of the picture. How can they be replaced, and what would be the cost to the taxpayer?

Another question I have heard is: Can the great loss of these military officers with their vast reserve of practical experience be adequately replaced by the appointment of others who have never had the same experience or proper baptism in the line of battle? I would remind the committee of the old axiom that experience is the best teacher. These younger officers are naturally full of vim and vigour, but without this experience how can they properly provide for the defence of Canada and for the fulfillment of our commitments to other countries?

• (3:50 p.m.)

Next: Will the cutback in the number of ships and navy personnel mean that our neighbours to the south will have to move in along our shores to defend us and that as a consequence Canada will lose yet another segment of her sovereignty? Today we are worrying about our economic sovereignty. Will our military and political sovereignty be our next worry? This is an important question to Canadians. Why should Canada, which established such an honourable reputation with her fighting forces in two world wars, be the first country in the world to toy or experiment with such a questionable policy as unification when all the evidence is stacked against it? If the policy of unification of our armed forces is so good, why have not senior ministers of the crown, including the Prime Minister, supported the Minister of National Defence in this debate and at least made it appear they believe in this policy? Instead we have had silence, smirking grins and catcalls.

Another question that has been asked over and over and over again, and one that must be answered, is, where did the idea of unification come from in the first place? The hon. member for Saint John-Albert emphasized this in his speech this morning. Where did this idea come from? Who is behind it, and why? These and many other questions are deeply worrying Canadians everywhere today.

The minister has created a military mirage, an Alice in Wonderland military fantasy, a boomerang. He has loosed a wind and will reap a whirlwind. I implore him to turn back before it is too late. In my honest opinion unification cannot work, will not work, and is only an exercise in futility.

As the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton pointed out yesterday, it is not our responsibility to prove the minister wrong; it is his responsibility to prove he is right. As the hon. member for Wellington-Huron suggested yesterday in his speech, I would also like to suggest that the Prime Minister allow a free vote on this legislation so that members will not have to follow party lines. Such a vote would be a truly democratic expression of opinion and the quickest and most logical way to settle this most controversial issue. If the minister does not need the advice of Her Majesty's loyal opposition and amend this bill to make it a reasonable and rational piece of legislation, I will have no alternative but to vote against it.

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Chairman, I am convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the unification bill must not go through. There is sufficient evidence to show it would create great and long-lasting harm to Canada's armed forces. I am equally convinced that integration as we now have it under our present laws is quite sufficient in the light of the objectives which our armed forces must be prepared to attain, whether in defence, peace keeping or whatever other role may be necessary in accord with our foreign affairs policy.

I am not participating in this debate without having first considered the evidence of the witnesses who appeared before the defence committee. I was not a member of that committee but I had a good record of attendance there and I listened not only to the witnesses in favour of the proposal but to those who were against it. This has helped me make up my own mind. There is a preponderance of evidence on one side to create a doubt in my mind as to the validity of the bill which the minister has presented.

This debate is not new. Those who say it has been going on for nine days must realize it is the culmination of two to three years

hard work by the defence forces to bring about something new in Canada's defence image, force-wise. We had a debate on second reading of the bill. We had committee meetings recently and now we are debating the matter in committee of the whole house. I feel this bill is of such importance to Canada that we should forget the political aspect and re-examine it in the light of the knowledge we have gained.

The suggestion was made this afternoon by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle that the minister might have been put on the spot and told: Go ahead; you have got to do this. He suggested that the minister had quite a cross to bear because of that. I do not believe so. The minister may have used his authority in the cabinet. It may be that it was a decision of the cabinet to go ahead with this bill but in any event, giving the minister the benefit of the doubt, as Minister of National Defence he has been most delinquent in his duty because he should have told the cabinet that this whole unification plan was not feasible.

There is sufficient evidence on very many points to raise serious doubt in the minds of all thinking people right across Canada. I shall enumerate these points on which we have secured evidence in the defence committee and from elsewhere. First, there is the very word unification itself, its definition, and the public relations image of the minister with respect to it. There have been continuous efforts to maintain the minister's shining, bright, forceful image, all those wonderful qualities the minister would like to have and to retain after this debate is concluded. Second, there are the statements by senior officers that unification was not the subject of discussion in depth. Third, there is the minister's lack of understanding of service abilities and traditions. Fourth, there are the voluntary resignations of senior officers and, fifth, the forced resignations of senior officers. Sixth, there was the Landymore incident, that horrible incident and, much more horrible, the minister's subsequent apology. Seventh, there was the denial of evidence in committee prior to second reading. We asked for committee hearings before second reading so that we might hear further evidence but we were forced to vote on the bill in principle without being allowed that. Eighth, there are the uncertainties and the effect on morale, which have been mentioned so forcefully by many hon. members. Ninth, there is the role of Canada's armed forces as against Canada's foreign policy commitments.

[Mr. Pugh.]

I have always wondered about the term "unification". I wondered even more when we heard the minister in the defence committee stand up and say he wished he had never heard of the term "unification". When he said that, there was a sort of gasp from Liberal members of the committee. Whenever they were asked about the meaning of unification all they would say was that it is a glorious thing.

The most telling part of this debate on the tern "unification" came when the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) was speaking. He, incidentally, was chairman of the defence committee and he said, as recorded at page 14774 of *Hansard* for April 11:

> My personal definition or view, which incidentally is the same today as when I started considering the matter many months ago, is that when we speak of unification we are talking about taking integration as far as it is practical to go.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Then he says that instead of using the word unification—the minister's word—he is going to use the expression integration-unification. I have heard a lot of rough words in this chamber and there are some I could use now. It seems to me that that is the most telling argument against unification. I started out by saying that I thought under present circumstances integration is all that is necessary for the good of our armed forces and for any role which they might happen to be called upon to play.

Another thing which attracted my attention in committee was the fact that the little trained seals in the Liberal party, without any ifs, ands or buts got up and spoke of the United States Marine Corps. They wondered why we could not have unification like they have in the United States with their marine corps. This shows a complete lack of knowledge. If anyone thinks that the marine corps is the total of the United States forces, then he is mistaken. They have an army and an air force. The point is that it takes each part all down the line to form the whole.

No one can tell me that in Canada we can do it in any other way. Let us take the word unification. The hon. member for Victoria, (B.C.) used the expression integration-unification. No member of that committee, no member of this house, no senior officer, not even any Liberal, has said that he does not believe in integration and does not believe that it is a good thing for our armed forces. We know it is. It is not new. It started many years ago. Integration is something which we all know must be carried out. But to do what the hon.

member for Victoria (B.C.), suggests we should do, carry integration as far as we can and then call it unification, is not good enough, because we have had no definition whatsoever of the term.

The white paper, of course, set out the aims and objects of unification. These were good: a more effective and more efficient defence at less cost. There is, however, not one nickel's worth of evidence in this house or in the committee which would indicate that the minister's proposed force would be any more effective. In fact, as I read and listened to the evidence of Air Chief Marshal Miller I could not help but be struck by the answer he gave to the hon. member for Calgary South when he was queried about the effectiveness. His answer left in my mind, and I am sure in the minds of many members of the committee, the thought that probably by implementing the minister's new idea we might have a less effective force.

Let us take the reference to a more efficient force. There is no evidence of that. Then we have the suggestion that the cost would be less. We have heard all the evidence on that and we know that it is costing more. So I am a little suspicious of the minister in that regard. This has given rise to grave doubts in my mind and in the minds of members of the press throughout this country. Someone said, the press has suggested that we are spending a long time on this. I do not think we are. From my reading of editorials all across Canada it would seem the opinion is that we are not spending too much time. There seems to be a suggestion that we should hammer at this thing and not let it go through, because there is a reasonable doubt as to its value.

Let us consider the senior officers who held high positions in the Canadian Armed Forces. The minister has shown a careless disregard for their advice. He has not paid any attention whatsoever to their advice. I am glad to see the minister leave the chamber now because he looked as though he had had enough. I am not surprised, because when I listened to what he had to say last Tuesday I thought what he said about the senior officers was one of the worst insults I have ever heard flung at the armed forces by anybody. He said that the senior officers were prone to become fixed in their views. He suggested that because they had grown up in one service they would favour that service over any other. Were he in the chamber at this moment I would ask him a direct question, but perhaps be will read this and answer it later. What about Air Chief Marshal Miller who was chief of staff? He was one of our great men and was appointed by the present Minister of National Defence.

The information I have been able to obtain is to the effect that Air Chief Marshal Miller, who was trained and brought up in the air force, when acting as chief bent over backwards in favour of the other two armed services. There is no question about that. If the minister has one tittle of evidence to bring forward in that regard, I hope he will do so. He has, however, insulted the senior officers. He says that they are service trained, came up through one service, and that if they do think they think wrong. Those are not his exact words, but the implication is there. If you read his speech I am sure you will not obtain any other inference from it.

As I said, we have a series of doubts. That is one more doubt in my mind and I am sure it would be a doubt in the minds of members opposite if they would read the editorials. Now there is an even graver doubt. We have senior officers who voluntarily retired. I should like to emphasize this. These senior officers have voluntarily retired because they could not put up any longer with the backhanded unification which was going on. The evidence of the senior officers is that unification would not work. I am not basing this statement on what I have read in the press. These officers were subjected to cross examination recently in the committee, and that was their evidence.

What about the senior officers who did not leave voluntarily, but were fired. Any officer who did not give a "yes man" answer when he was asked for his opinion about unification was forcibly thrown out; he was retired prior to his proper retirement time. This is a disgrace; it is something which never should have happened in our Canadian armed forces, but it did happen. Here we have senior officers, who were either kicked out of the forces or retired voluntarily, who were in the armed forces at the time of the moulding of integration. Men like that are not replaced too easily.

I hear Liberal members moaning and groaning. It does my heart good. It is not necessary for me to mention the name of Mountbatten, but I will; and I will mention other countries which have exceedingly good armed forces.

• (4:10 p.m.)

What is the attitude of those countries of the world that have studied this proposal for unification? They have all emphatically

turned it down. Mountbatten was very forcibly against this proposal. The minister thought he would be in favour of it but he got a rude jolt the other day as a result of an editorial in this regard.

In the minister's treatment of Admiral Landymore, we have witnessed one of the most terrible and shameful things to have ever taken place in Canadian military history.

An hon. Member: Hah.

Mr. Pugh: I heard a Liberal say "Hah". I wish you had been there to hear the minister apologize.

An hon. Member: I was there.

Mr. Pugh: I am glad you were there because you must have heard all about the charge regarding the 18 months of continuing disloyalty of Admiral Landymore. When the minister was asked to indicate how Admiral Landymore had been disloyal for 18 months he said that we could not pin him down. He could not tell us what the disloyalty was. Even the chairman of the committee, the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, suggested there was no evidence whatsoever in this regard. Therefore you need not bother to tut-tut on that side of the house. The chairman of the committee said this, as reported at page 1754 of the evidence of the committee:

> While I certainly can find no evidence of disloyalty in anything that has been revealed here this morning, I think it is probably fair to say that if I were looking for a man to help me support the idea of unification, the name of Admiral Landymore would probably come slow to mind.

At page 1755 of that same volume the minister made this statement in apology:

> Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I accept completely Admiral Landymore's statement that he was at no time disloyal. I believe that it is absolutely correct, that there was never at any time any disloyalty intended to his service or his country. This does not mean that I condone all of his actions, during the period in question, because I could not.

I suggest this represents a shameful chapter in the history of our Canadian Armed Forces. It is no wonder that the minister was annoyed at Admiral Landymore. We all know about the tampering with the evidence. We all wanted more evidence from other witnesses before giving approval to this bill in principle on second reading. The minister was afraid to hear that evidence before second reading because, had we heard the evidence at that time, I am sure this bill would never have been given second reading.

In view of the lack of evidence to support the charge that Admiral Landymore was disloyal for 18 months, I keep asking myself the $64 question: Why was Admiral Landymore fired? He was fired because he refused to be a "yes man" for the minister. There is no doubt about that. Incidentally, I should like to point out that Admiral Landymore received a pat on the back by General Simonds, who is no mean slouch as a military expert in this country. That gentleman said that Admiral Landymore not only had the right to make inquiries, but the absolute duty to report the results to his senior officers.

In this regard I heard the minister make one of the most laughable statements I have heard made in a committee of this house. He criticized this man, used the word disloyalty, and then admitted before the committee that he had never looked at the reports Admiral Landymore had made to his senior officers. I was flabbergasted when I heard that statement. The minister levelled charges on the basis of fictitious evidence. He then apologized and that was supposed to end the matter. Surely that is a terrible way to treat such a man.

Every serving officer must be satisfied with the state of morale of his command. General Simonds testified on this point, suggesting that good morale was probably more important than equipment. Anyone who knows anything about military action will realize that without morale and the ability to stand fast a force will not be successful, regardless of whether or not it has the best equipment in the world. Surely that has been proven by all the great battles of the world. That will be the situation a thousand years from now.

Let me now refer to the evidence of Lieutenant General F. J. Fleury. He said he found a lack of security in headquarters. Junior officers apparently knew more about what was going on in the minister's mind than he did. Let me repeat what the general said. He said that other lesser lights knew more or said they knew more about what was in the mind of the minister than he did. He said that he found security information, as he knew it, practically non-existent. He said the whole headquarters reminded him of a giant sieve.

This man found he could no longer accept things as they were, and resigned. This situation in respect of the lack of security prompts me to ask where the minister got his information about what was taking place in the services. He apparently did not get his information from the senior officers. Where did the

information come from in respect of the minister's charge that Admiral Landymore was disloyal? Perhaps this whole thing is nothing more than a public relations effort. In any event, this whole story creates grave doubts in my mind about the value of unification. I suggest the minister should have the common sense to either withdraw this bill or amend it.

A committee of this house was denied the right to hear additional evidence before the bill was accepted in principle. When we were discussing this matter I made a speech, as a result of what the Associate Minister of National Defence had said. He indicated that he had had some sleepless nights over the questions surrounding unification. I respect that man, because I think he is reasonable. He had some doubts in his mind and he felt he should find some answers. He went to the senior officers and asked questions.

The thing that bothers me about this whole matter is that we were not allowed to obtain the answers to our doubts and questions regarding the same things which apparently bothered the associate minister, and bothered him to a point where he took it upon himself to find the answers.

• (4:20 p.m.)

We do not have to accept the hearsay given to us by the Associate Minister of National Defence that everything is rosy. His idea of "rosy" and mine are entirely different. I have no hesitation in saying that having listened to the evidence of all those very, very eminent men who appeared before the committee, there is left in my mind no doubt—and I do not think there is any doubt left in the minds of the people of Canada—that there is a very reasonable suggestion that unification is nothing but an airy-fairy word and is a concept which, if we are to understand the evidence presented to the committee, cannot possibly be put into effect in its final form, as the minister would like, until after about five years of integration. It is said that it will take this long to put unification into effect because of the work involved with staffs, equipment, and so on. We have been told that this program cannot be put into effect quickly, that it cannot be done at headquarters, materiel command, and so on, because these things cannot be changed quickly.

Next, Mr. Chairman, I wish to deal with the role of Canada's armed forces vis-à-vis Canada's foreign policy and commitments. In fact this is one of the most important points in this whole defence debate. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle and others have dealt with this question during the last few days. We have heard it discussed from all sides of the house. I wonder whether there might not be some truth in the assertion that the Liberal government has not really made up its mind about what our role is to be in this area. Are we going to be a brush fire outfit, a peace offering to the United Nations? Are we going to prevent little wars starting? Are we going to police areas in which there is likely to be trouble? I do not know the answers to these questions, but I am very much concerned about this aspect of the matter.

If our whole effort is to be directed toward peacekeeping, I believe we will leave ourselves open to becoming very, very quickly embroiled in a larger conflict. The United States went into Viet Nam with not too many troops. They now have 400,000 troops over there and are hopelessly embroiled in the conflict; they cannot withdraw. It is all very well to say that in a peace keeping role we will be able to go into these areas and act as policemen, but these things are not that simple.

There is another point where I think the people of Canada are very interested in the concept of a peace keeping force. It costs a great deal of money to maintain peace keeping forces. Our troops are abroad acting on behalf of the United Nations. Who pays the shot? The United Nations does not pay the shot; it is the Canadian people who pay. Every dollar spent on maintaining and equipping our troops abroad is paid by Canada. Peacekeeping is quite an expensive operation.

As I listened the other day to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the other Paul, I was wondering—I have never been able to learn this, and I do not suppose anybody has; I do not think the minister himself knows—just where we are headed in our external affairs policy and in respect of the commitments we have been so proud to make to NORAD, NATO and the United Nations.

I conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying that in this area of defence and unification far too many things are suspect. Most of the evidence heard by the committee indicates that there is a very serious doubt in the minds of men whom throughout the years we have learned to respect. There is doubt in the minds of those in the armed forces. There is doubt in the minds of many officers who have not spoken out. Perhaps they have not spoken out for good reason, because if they spoke out they would jeopardize their careers. The sum

total of the evidence presented to the committee has raised a serious doubt in my mind, and I know it has raised a serious doubt in the minds of people for whom I speak, and others all across Canada. It has also raised a serious doubt in the minds of a great many newspaper editors.

The doubt raised is of such a serious nature that if this question were dealt with in a court of law the judge would say, "You cannot possibly do this." I have serious suspicions and doubts about this proposal. The preponderance of the evidence has been such that it has raised a great deal of doubt. We believe that unification is not necessary. Integration, if carried forward properly, will do each and every thing that the minister has stated he requires under unification, with the exception of those little green uniforms and one or two other items. I believe that the minister should impress upon the cabinet, or the cabinet should impress upon him, the advisability of reconsideration of this whole question before the government allows it to come to a vote in the house.

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Chairman, I enter the debate at this time with absolutely no apologies and with a definite interest in mind. As a matter of fact, after reading the terms and clauses of this bill, being familiar with the debate and reading the evidence presented to the committee, I fail to see how anyone who at heart is interested in the future and the defence of this country, or who is speaking on behalf of the constituency he represents in this house, can refrain from participating in the debate. I hope to approach the problem with which we in the house are faced with all due sincerity and a sense of responsibility, and I hope I can logically and factually place on the record, on behalf of those people I have the honour to represent, the feelings in regard to this unification bill.

When this proposition was first advanced —I think its aims and objects were very well presented—and it was said that an undertaking of this kind by the government would safeguard the defence of Canada, would uphold and magnify the military prestige we have won through the years, would give us the most modern and up-to-date fighting force in the world and at the same time save a tremendous amount of money—I think it was said that the saving would be $100 million per annum—I, and I think the people in my constituency, thought that those aims and objects were very admirable indeed, and that this was perhaps what had been needed for a great many years as far as our armed services were concerned.

Therefore, in all fairness, at that time in my area of Ontario I think there was a great deal of support for this undertaking which the government was proposing. It is true that there were individuals with military experience, veterans of two world wars, students of military tactics, men who have been connected in different ways with the armed services, who were a little sceptical and questioned this proposal, because the Minister of National Defence who is actively promoting and guiding this new concept had not in previous months been too consistent in his views.

• (4:30 p.m.)

I do not propose to dredge up all the activities which led to this view. I will simply state that when the present Minister of National Defence was in opposition he was of two minds as to whether or not Canada should have atomic weapons, when he first opposed it and then favoured it, and then when he became minister showed hesitation in equipping our planes overseas with the very atomic weapons which he said were absolutely necessary for a proper operation, and which were a definite commitment made by the previous government, he delayed the implementation of this proposal. Naturally there was some doubt regarding the validity of the claims which the government had made. Nevertheless I will say in all fairness that the majority of the people in Canada, especially those who are not experts in military matters and who only wish their interests to be safeguarded, went along with the proposal which the government made to the Canadian people. In looking back I believe the Minister of National Defence made a cardinal mistake when he refused to answer completely and frankly the questions put forward by the opposition. There is no doubt that he had his own personal reasons for taking this attitude, but it soon became apparent from the questions asked on this side of the house that a growing doubt arose that the aims and objectives of the new proposed measure would be attained.

In fact, grave doubts began to creep in concerning the very wisdom of the action proposed by the minister. As is always the case with any major legislation facing this country, there is much speculation in the press, and many editorials concerning this legislation appear in the newspapers. It became apparent here and there that second thought was being given to this problem by

some newspaper analysts, men who had considerable experience in politics and who had the opportunity to visit the various theatres of war during active engagement. These men began to point out the various weaknesses which were beginning to appear in the administration of our armed services. Most members of the house and people across this nation began to realize that not only was this new legislation going to be brought before parliament but that the minister had already taken the first steps in implementing it before presenting it to the house in its entirety.

Naturally the questions from this side of the house increased in intensity. Once again the minister in his wisdom took an evasive course and refused to give us the detailed information which we sought so earnestly. This lack of response from the minister intensified the growing doubt across the nation as to the absolute wisdom of this course of action. Later the question of the drop in morale in the armed services was discussed on the floor of the house, among the personnel in the armed services, in the press, on radio and television. It was charged that a tremendous drop in the morale of the armed services had taken place, that men were becoming very dissatisfied with their jobs in the armed services, and that they were asking to be relieved of their duties. Yet the Minister of National Defence gave us assurances at that time that morale was never better, that all this was mere speculation and that the rumours had no foundation. As a matter of fact hundreds of our R.C.A.F. personnel left the Royal Canadian Air Force at that time; many officers left the armed services. As we have heard in this debate, officers of the highest rank retired a great deal sooner than was anticipated. Still, the minister maintained that all was well.

I think that at that time the people of Canada were prepared to accept the minister's statement that all was well. Certainly the public relations branch of the Department of National Defence was sending out across the country hundreds of thousands of words in support of the minister's proposal. I have great sympathy for the news analysts and political commentators who were bombarded daily with this deluge from the office of the Minister of National Defence. I do not think it helped his cause, indeed it hindered it because the very men who were receiving this deluge of one-sided opinion became increasingly suspicious that if such action was necessary then indeed all was not as portrayed.

It is at this time that the eyes of the ordinary citizens were opened because when leave was granted to servicemen they greeted their relatives and friends, whose interest in this issue was aroused through the various means of communication, with their accounts of and opinions concerning unification. It is my opinion that it was at that time that the ordinary citizens of this country became convinced that the constant protestations by the minister and by his department with regard to the morale in the services were absolutely incorrect and that the assurances given in the house that all ranks, particularly the lower ranks in our armed services, supported unification completely were a hollow mockery, because it soon became apparent that such was not the fact. This is why we scanned eagerly the reports at the end of the year to find out how much the enlistment in the armed services increased.

• (4:40 p.m.)

We find the story has been put on the record, Mr. Chairman, that in spite of the pay increase, in spite of the re-enlistment bonus and everything else, enlistments did not increase but decreased. So, Mr. Chairman, we have this—

Mr. Hellyer: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman. This statement is not correct because enlistments did increase over the previous year, and they were higher than the two previous years. I am sure the hon. member would not want to leave that mistaken fact on the record.

Mr. Danforth: I am prepared to accept the allegation of the minister at this time, that this statement is incorrect. However, Mr. Chairman, when the various service personnel come home and assure the people that there are tremendous numbers of units that are undermanned, that we have not enough sailors to serve on our vessels, that we have not enough aircraft to defend this country, it is a hollow thing indeed for the minister to say that all is well. This will not serve to satisfy the people who feel they have first hand knowledge.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as a result of a feeling that all was not well across Canada, when this bill was presented to the house the opposition seriously requested the government to consider sending the bill to committee before the second reading stage, in order that evidence could be heard on the principle of the bill before this country was committed to

accepting it. When this request was not accepted by the government, it added to our suspicion that something was indeed wrong. Since we are not qualified military experts, and since we began to get this idea, that all was not well in Canada, each of us started a search in his own fashion for pertinent information.

What about all these great savings in money that were to take place? We have had put on the record by speaker after speaker facts to prove that not only was there not a saving of $100 million, as there was alleged to be as a result of this action, but expenditures have increased by $125 million or $160 million. I think, in all fairness to the minister, I can recall his putting forth the proposition that had money been worth today what it was when he brought forward his original proposition there would not have been any increase in expenditures. However, when you get down to the facts, Mr. Chairman, we find that not only have we not saved this $100 million, but expenditures have increased by $160 million. If my arithmetic is correct this gives us $260 million or a quarter of a billion dollars by which expenditures have increased.

Mr. Hellyer: Your arithmetic is not very good.

Mr. Danforth: How about all this new equipment? We were going to have the finest equipment in the world. Since I am not a military expert, I was interested in the fact we were told we were going to have some of the new types of equipment; we were going to have an armed service which would be the envy of the world. I think the minister did receive favourable comment as the proponent of the jet age, the man who was going to give us everything modern.

We know the story of the attempt to develop the hydrofoil; the disastrous fire and the delay in assessing the damage. Then there was the indecision about whether or not to proceed. There was delay in the purchase of new air equipment and controversy followed. We are in a predicament because we do not know where we are going. To the ordinary layman it seems we are in a period of absolute confusion. I listened to a chap the other night and I thought he advanced a proposition which covered the position of this government. He said it seems they cannot formulate an opinion at this time where they are going because they not only do not know where they are now, but they do not have the faintest idea where they have been.

Speaking on behalf of ordinary Canadians, I should like seriously to ask this government and this minister to consider the people of this country, to consider the future of this country. Instead of trying to give the impression that the bill before this house is complete so far as research is concerned, they should allow the House of Commons to work as an important component of parliament. I suggest the minister should listen to the opposition in all seriousness, so that working together in a new session we can bring about, by combined effort, a bill that will indeed work in the best interests of Canadians. As was pointed out by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, this was accomplished in connection with the transport legislation, another important item of business.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, the desire to do what is best for Canada does not lie solely within the government. We in the opposition, all parties in opposition, are sincerely concerned about the defence of this country. We are going to have to share equally the responsibility for any major mistakes that are made in connection with our future defence. So, Mr. Chairman, this is a sincere plea on my part for the minister and the Prime Minister to rise to the occasion and put country ahead of partisan politics for the benefit of Canada.

Mr. Kennedy: I see there are only a few minutes left, Mr. Chairman, and I regret this because I have been waiting for some time to take part in this important debate. I can say frankly that as time goes on the debate becomes more interesting. There has been a lot of information divulged and good thoughts have been brought forth. This makes me feel more convinced that we should not proceed with this measure.

• (4:50 p.m.)

My conclusions derive partly from about 30 years of military connection in full time and part time service, ending on the fields of Normandy. In that regard one of my friends once made the humourous quip that my military career might have been longer if I had been able to get closer to the grass roots. I thought I was as close as I could get to the grass roots. If at that moment I had been two inches closer I should not have bought the package.

I know the evidence of the defence committee, on which I did not serve, was overwhelmingly against the major change contemplated in the bill. People generally I expect are against change. The older we become the

more we tend to resist change. The officers who testified had had expert experience, with a lifetime of loyalty and service to the country. Most of them had gone through many experiences. One cannot conceive that they would base their thinking on something that is out of of date. Rather, they were concerned that the right step be taken.

I recall during the war that a proposal was made for officers to be formed into a corps, out of which they would go to various units needing replacements. It was proposed, for instance, that officers with artillery training, with engineering training and so on would be sent to various units to fill vacancies caused by promotion. Had this idea been implemented it would have been disastrous. The step we are about to take, with this bill, is much more serious than that, and needs to be even more carefully considered. We are not considering this measure as a general staff, but as representatives of our nation. We must first think of defence.

Though we are at peace many problems must be faced. Many of those who served in the forces during the war would have nothing to do with the forces after the war. When war came they gladly enlisted and accepted hardships because of the emergency which existed. They hoped that by playing their part they might in some measure shorten the war, and they served without grumbling too much. That is a contribution one cannot expect in peacetime.

I do not think the Canadian people support this major change in the armed forces. It is hard to change traditions, and anything that changes a tradition should be considered carefully. It is said that young people do not care about tradition; I doubt it. I think they should care, and I think they do. When I undertook military training as a young man I did so voluntarily. Reserve units in our area were looking for young people to train, to give them experience as soldiers. There was no remuneration in those days. You packed your lunch on Sunday, walked six miles, trained all day and walked back. You were not remunerated but you felt you had done something for your country, that you were taking your responsibilities seriously as a young man.

I do not think that this government, a minority government, a government without a particular mandate from the people, had the right to take a step as big as is contemplated in this bill. I do not recall support for this measure being solicited during the last general election. This country cannot maintain forces on a war footing because our resources will not permit it.

I see you looking sideways at me, Mr. Chairman. May I call it five o'clock.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Richard): I assure the hon. member that I had not lost interest in his speech.

Progress reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The house will now proceed to consideration of private members business listed on today's order paper, namely public and private bills.

Mr. Jim McNulty (Lincoln): Mr. Speaker, may we, by unanimous consent, stand public Bills Nos. 1 to 14 inclusive on the order paper and proceed with public Bill C-52, in the name of the hon. member for Kootenay West.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the house give unanimous consent to allowing orders 1 to 14 to stand, and taking up for consideration the second reading of order No. 15?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

NATIONAL DISASTERS

PROVISION OF FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO MEET LOSSES

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-52, to provide for the Establishment of the Canada Disaster Fund.

He said: I am sure that as I begin my remarks in connection with this bill every member of this house is thinking of the disaster which recently occurred in Fernie. As we discuss this measure and the need for legislation to meet the consequences of such disasters as these from a national point of view, I am sure the sympathy of all hon. members goes out to the miners and their families who have suffered so greatly as a result of this mining disaster.

For years the federal government has made contributions to various disaster funds across Canada because in some cases the losses involved obligations beyond the resources of the municipality concerned, and in others they were beyond the capacity of the provincial government in question. I think it is right that these contributions should be made. Not only is financial assistance provided but an

indication is given to those who have suffered that their need is recognized all across Canada.

I wish to give full credit for these contributions to the governments which were in office at the time, as well as to members of the armed forces and civil defence units which have been called in on numerous occasions, for example in connection with works to confine flooding in Manitoba, and in British Columbia on the Columbia and Fraser rivers.

After discussing this question with a number of organizations and groups across Canada I am of the opinion that we should set up what I would term a national disaster fund. The bill before us is entitled "An Act to Provide for the Establishment of a Canada Disaster Fund". I suggest that in view of a later development it might be better at a later point in procedure to amend the measure so that it may be referred to as an act to set up a national disaster fund. I will deal with this point shortly. I found after consulting with organizations in my constituency, elsewhere in British Columbia and in Toronto that it was considered by them to be a good idea for this parliament to establish a national disaster fund, and this is why I have introduced a bill to that end.

The purpose of the measure is to meet the problem of deciding at what point a province becomes incapable of dealing with disaster losses effectively, and to determine when a disaster becomes national in scope. The bill sets up a fund to which contributions can be made in advance by federal and provincial governments and by individuals, companies and institutions. The board of trustees each year determines in advance in respect of each province the provincial financial tolerance point above which losses are considered to be national in scope. Should a disaster occur in that province, the board contributes to the province out of the fund in respect of the losses above the tolerance point.

This, in brief, is the general purpose and objective of the present bill. On discussing this matter I find there is general support in the house for what it seeks to do. I recall that on the last occasion it was before the house the cabinet of the day gave some consideration to its subject matter. Since I introduced Bill No. C-52 I have received the following letter and I intend to place it on record for the information of hon. members, and in fairness to the organization concerned.

[Mr. Herridge.]

This is a letter from Mr. A. Ross Little, Secretary-Treasurer of the Canadian Disaster Relief Fund Incorporated, and it is addressed to me. It reads as follows:

> We wish to call to attention the close similarity of the names and objects of this fund and of the fund which you are proposing by seeking the enactment of Bill C-17. We feel quite strongly that there should not be a second fund called "The Canada Disaster Fund" as people might think they are dealing with one fund when in fact they are dealing with another.
>
> We would be most appreciative if you would consider proposing some other name which would avoid such confusion.
>
> I enclose herewith a copy of our act of incorporation and a copy of the press release which was issued when our last annual statement was filed with the Secretary of State and which will give you some idea of the uses to which the fund has been put.
>
> We trust you will agree that it would be in the interests of both our fund and your proposed fund that confusion in regard to the names should be avoided if at all possible.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I suggest my bill could be amended at a later date in order that this fund might be called the national disaster fund.

In dealing with this question I wrote a letter to the former minister of finance, the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Gordon). I intend to place this letter on the record for the information of hon. members who may wish to follow the developments which have taken place since this bill was introduced.

> Dear Mr. Gordon:
>
> No doubt you have noted that I have introduced a private bill to provide for a national disaster fund. I have had it drafted so as to escape the Speaker ruling it out of order because it involves the expenditure of public funds. In view of the present uncertainty of the provincial, federal and municipal Governments as to their responsibility, I do think it would provide an opportunity for some discussion of this immediate question.
>
> I would appreciate any information which you could let me have with respect to the disaster funds to which the federal government has contributed during the past ten years. I would also like to know the names of the trustees, if possible, and the amount of the unexpended balances in each case.
>
> Thanking you for any information which you can render an unsophisticated countryman who has ventured into a field of legislation that would, I presume, come within your responsibility and jurisdiction, and I trust your later beneficence.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> Herbert W. Herridge

Hon. members will notice my reference to drafting this bill "so as to escape the Speaker ruling it out of order". I had to be very careful in that respect. I went to great lengths and consulted several members of the legal fraternity as to the best way of doing this in

order to avoid the Chair's ruling the bill out of order on the grounds that it involved the expenditure of public funds.

In reply to that letter, the hon. gentleman went to considerable trouble to obtain the information I needed and I will quote his reply in order that members may appreciate the circumstances which exist at the present time, and more fully realize the weight of my argument.

Dear Mr. Herridge:

I must apologise for the delay in answering your letter of April 21st in which you asked for information about disaster funds to which the federal government has contributed during the past ten years.

• (5:10 p.m.)

The information given below has been taken from departmental records and I hope it will serve your purpose. I should mention however, that with one exception disaster funds have been administered by some government or agency other than the federal government and consequently our records show only information about the federal contributions rather than the disaster funds themselves. The exception is the Mackenzie District flooding in 1963; most of the disaster relief funds in this case were provided and administered by the federal government.

This is the information:

1954—Hurricane Hazel.

An amount of $1 million was appropriated in supplementary estimates 1954-55 payable to the government of the province of Ontario. $330,258 was in fact paid during the fiscal year while the unexpended balance of $669,742 was re-voted in 1955-56; of this latter amount, $434,379 was paid.

In summary then, $1 million was appropriated, $764,638 was paid to Ontario as a federal contribution towards the disaster relief fund, and there was an unexpended balance of $235,363.

1955—Saskatchewan and Manitoba floods.

In the supplementary estimates of 1956-57, an amount of $120,000 was provided for payment jointly to the governments of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba for disaster relief. The actual payment amounted to $49,549 leaving an unexpended balance of $70,451 which duly lapsed.

1956—Springhill Mine Disaster.

This was a very similar disaster to the one which happened recently at Fernie.

The federal contribution was $25,000 and was paid from funds appropriated in 1956-57 supplementary estimates directly to the Springhill Mine Disaster Relief Fund. There was no unexpended balance.

There rarely is when you come to deal with a mine disaster.

1958—Springhill mine disaster.

On this occasion an amount of $100,000 was appropriated in 1958-59 supplementary estimates and the full amount was paid directly to the Springhill Mine Disaster Relief Fund.

1959—New Brunswick fishermen's disaster.

A payment of $50,000 was made directly to the New Brunswick Fishermen's Disaster Relief Fund—this was the amount provided in supplementary estimates 1959-60.

1961—New Brunswick floods.

$50,000 was made available in supplementary estimates of 1961-62 and was paid to the New Brunswick Disaster Relief Fund.

1963—Mackenzie District floods, N.W.T.

Supplementary estimates (A), 1963-64 of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources provided an amount of $1,500,000 for financial assistance in respect of losses incurred during these floods, in accordance with terms and conditions approved by the Treasury Board. Payments against individual claims amounted to $805,471 during the fiscal year leaving an unexpended balance of $694,529. Further assistance was voted the following year in an amount of $400,000 which included contributions towards the relocation of housing and the development of a new subdivision. Payments to date out of this provision total $237,558—I am told that the accounts for the fiscal year have not yet been closed.

The Council of the Northwest Territories appropriated $100,000 from territorial funds for flood relief and rehabilitation. This money, together with the federal contribution, was disbursed by the chief treasury officer of Northern Affairs who was also acting in the same capacity for the territorial government. With the approval of the Treasury Board, on the recommendation of the territories council, compensation was based on a graduated scale for various categories of appraised damage—100 per cent of the damage to residential real property, 80 per cent of the damage to all personal effects, 70 per cent of damage to commercial stock in trade, and 80 per cent of damage to business real property and equipment.

Apart from the funds provided by the federal and territorial governments, contributions for flood relief were also made by private citizens. I regret, however, that we have no information on file about these funds which I understand were administered by a local flood relief committee. Possibly the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories could give you some information about the activities of this committee if you wish to pursue the matter further.

1964—Port Alberni floods.

A payment of $250,000 was made to the Alberni Valley and West Coast Disaster Fund as provided by 1964-65 supplementary estimates.

Yours sincerely,
W. L. Gordon.

I place that information on the record because I think it will be of interest later on when this subject receives further consideration. I know this matter was discussed within the cabinet this time, and I know there was considerable support for the principle of this bill. I was interested to read in the May 19, 1966, issue of *The Manitoba Co-operator* the following item:

Disaster Legislation May be Introduced in Ottawa.

The Federal government is considering introducing legislation to cover all types of disasters rather than deal with each one as it arises, Prime Minister Lester Pearson told the house last week.

He said the situation has been under consideration for some time and it is hoped that progress in parliamentary business will enable the government to deal with this matter before long.

In the Manitoba flood situation this year the federal government, following the policy set in the 1950 crisis, provided 75 per cent of the flood fighting costs.

I do not know what the government's intentions are at present. I realize, Mr. Speaker, we have got a full agenda in front of us before this session is prorogued. However, I do trust that this legislation will receive consideration by the government before it introduces its legislation for the coming year. I know there is a great deal of support for this legislation, and once again I suggest that if the government introduces legislation to meet this situation it should recognize the fact that there is this other fund incorporated, known as the Canada Disaster Relief Fund, and introduce any federal legislation as a national disaster fund.

Since the introduction of the bill I have been discussing this matter with some members of the cabinet and with other persons, and I do hope before too long we will see the government take action to introduce legislation along the lines I have suggested in this bill, so that the parliament of Canada will have a rational and, shall I say, logical basis for meeting the needs that occur in any disaster in any part of Canada, in association with the provincial government concerned and the municipality particularly affected.

• (5:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Clermont (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on Bill No. C-52, an act to provide for the establishment of the Canada Disaster Fund. I note that the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge) introduced a similar bill in 1965, which received first reading as Bill No. C-17 on April 8, 1965.

It is often said that the times in which we live are characterized by the rapid development of science and technology. Our times are also characterized, on the human plane, by the interdependence of peoples which is exemplified by their solidarity in times of disaster.

Thus, when part of the coast of Ceylon was devastated by a tidal wave a few years ago, the Canadian people, through the Canadian Red Cross, helped the fishermen deprived of their livelihood by that disaster.

The Canadians also gave assistance to India, stricken by starvation, and more recently to Chile, where earthquakes had made many victims and caused a great deal of harm to part of the population.

Such mutual aid at the international level made it possible for a great many victims of disasters throughout the world to benefit from assistance which their respective governments could not afford.

Transposing the situation to the national level, it can be said that the same applies to Canada. Indeed, in the case of disasters, floods, hurricanes and other calamities, causing considerable material losses, the local public powers are primarily responsible for the organization of assistance. Thus, municipal and provincial authorities have the power to operate directly in such a field.

Since the world war, Mr. Speaker, the federal government has granted assistance in the case of certain disasters. The hon. member for Kootenay West mentioned a few of those. Allow me to point out others: the Fraser river, in 1948, the federal contribution was $14,700,000; the Red river, in 1950, $16,000,000; the fires in Rimouski and Cabano, in 1950, $2,800,000; the Sarnia tornado, in 1953, $137,462; the Hazel hurricane in 1954, $764,638; the Saskatchewan floods, in 1955, $32,000; in 1966, on the occasion of the Red river flood in Manitoba, the assistance granted by the federal government in this respect is not definitely known, but if we take as a basis the cost estimates for the province of Manitoba in this regard, the total assistance of the central government came to $11,550,000, of which $9,600,000 will be used to fight the flood, to restore highways, bridges and waterways and to offset damages to houses, farms and small enterprises.

I think it is understood that the rest will be mainly earmarked for the building of permanent dikes.

Bill No. C-52, now under study, is intended to lead the public authorities to take another step toward granting adequate help to the victims of a disaster. Although the principle of this bill is most praiseworthy from the humanitarian point of view, the fact remains that it brings up a constitutional problem which deserves a very careful and detailed consideration, as any matter of such an importance.

Thus far, the government has participated in emergency programs only on the special request of the provinces concerned.

The right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) briefly indicated the course to be followed in such a case when answering a question asked in this house on April 29, 1966

concerning requests for help from areas devastated by a storm on Lake Erie. This is what he said then:

> This matter was called to our attention yesterday by a member of the house as well as by letters from members representing the area concerned... In respect of matters of this kind any approach for assistance should come through the provincial government.

Several days later, on May 5, he stated that he was fully aware of the problem and added that the government had been considering it for some time and that he hoped soon to be able to deal with this matter in a different way, and not pragmatically as it had been the practice in the past. Indeed, no plan for federal participation to those rescue operations has yet been evolved, so that support by the central government has always been in the form of an ad hoc measure, consecutive to a provincial request to this effect.

The federal government recognizes, Mr. Speaker, the problem posed by the establishment of an appropriate compensation plan for victims of peacetime disasters and it realizes that past action, in such circumstances, may not always have been satisfactory from all points of view.

For this reason, the Minister of Industry and Defence Production (Mr. Drury) was authorized last year to initiate an interdepartmental study of these problems. That authorization gave rise to the setting up of an interdepartmental committee, and the Emergency Measures Organization was entrusted with the task of ensuring its continuation.

The merit of Bill No. C-52 would be to create a fund to which the federal and provincial governments could contribute as well as private individuals, institutions and companies. A board of directors would have to evaluate beforehand each year the maximum amount which each provincial government would have to contribute. If losses exceeded that amount, they would be considered to be on a national scale and that is when the board of directors would step in to take from the fund all the money needed to provide compensation for losses in the province concerned.

Such a measure would result in providing all Canadian provinces with equal opportunities, so to speak, in case of public disasters, caused by an act of God, or and in cases of absolute necessity.

The purpose of this bill is therefore to co-ordinate the national effort so as to repair the damage sustained in any area of Canada, in cases where the province concerned could not cope with the situation alone.

But as has just been pointed out, the wording of this bill raises a constitutional problem which may give rise to some protests on the part of certain provinces. As a matter of fact, federal participation in such activities could be denounced as an infringement by the federal government in a field considered as coming under provincial jurisdiction.

Moreover, before undertaking such a plan, I think it would be advisable and wise to study thoroughly the cases in which the federal government has been called upon to assist the victims of disasters in various regions of the country. It must be considered that Canada is an extremely large country where all sorts of disasters may strike: floods, forest fires, land-slides, etc.

If we refer to the crown liability act, we realize that it does not extensively involve the responsibility of the federal government and thus it seems that Bill No. C-52 would not be in agreement with the general economics of the above-mentioned legislation since the bill would considerably increase the responsibility of the federal government.

In the field of relief to victims of disasters, the federal government of the United States took, a few years ago, a number of adequate steps to ensure efficient action from the states as well as from the central government. In accordance with the 1950 "Disaster Act", the president may, at the request of a state, declare that a disaster is such that it requires federal government intervention.

Therefore, the president empowers the federal government to grant the proper assistance to the state involved. A federal law provides, on the other hand, for a federal relief fund for people who are victims of flood, under the "Flood Insurance Act" of 1956.

Another federal legislation provides for the organization of civil defence to help the states repair essential public works, such as roads, bridges and buildings, for instance.

Mr. Speaker, there is still quite a bit to be done by the interdepartmental committee; it is already obvious that a large number of difficult questions still have to be solved, most of which are not dealt with in Bill No. C-52, as for instance:

(a) The definition of allowable expenses, more particularly how to deal with insured and insurable losses, public and private losses, maximum and minimum amounts, etc.;

(b) Should the federal government, or rather Canadian taxpayers, pay contributions for comparatively small disasters and, if not, what is the limit and how is it arrived at?

(c) Furthermore, would it not be preferable, particularly in the case of commercial establishments, to consider a disaster insurance scheme?

(d) Also, what relationship is there between a general proposition to help the disaster victims in peace time and the current programs on certain types of disasters as, for instance, the crop insurance plan and others?

But before such measures can be translated into legislation, inherent constitutional problems should be discussed and resolved at a federal-provincial conference.

• (5:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Joseph P. O'Keefe (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, not too long ago on an occasion when I spoke in this place the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge) applauded me. I was very grateful for that applause, if a little bit surprised. I was not surprised at the conclusion of my speech when the same hon. member on a question of privilege asked that his applause be rescinded because I did not agree with him. This afternoon I hope that hon. member will not have reason to do the same thing. On this occasion I am almost totally in agreement with him, or at least with the principle of his bill.

There are many meanings of the word disaster. Webster's second edition says that the word disaster is of astrological origin, hence an ill portent. It also states it means a sudden and extraordinary misfortune or a calamity; an unforeseen and ruinous mischance or misadventure such as a shipwreck. I am sure you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that we from Newfoundland know plenty about shipwrecks. It is also suggested that the word means the failure of a great enterprise. We also know something about that situation. The hon. member for St. John's East represents that little Bell Island. I think it was Mary Queen of Scots who once said—perhaps the historians will correct me if I am wrong—that when she died the word Calais would be found written on her heart. When this hon. member passes on and someone takes the trouble to look he will find written the word "Wabana", the Indian name for Bell Island.

Webster's third international dictionary defines disaster as to bring harm upon, to injure or to ruin. The Oxford English dictionary suggests that great poets and writers have used the word disaster in many different connotations. The famous writer Macaulay stated:

> Faithlessness was the chief cause of his disasters, and is the chief stain on his memory.

Milton's reference was:

> —From behind the moon in dim eclipse, disastrous twilight sheds on half the nations.

You will all remember Goldsmith who said in his delightful if poignant "Deserted Village":

> Full well, the boding tremblers learn'd to trace the day's disasters in his morning face.

Be that as it may, most of us in our own lifetime have often had tragic reason to know just what disaster means. Before I proceed may I pay full and sincere tribute to that wonderful company of men and women banded together under the Red Cross. Of course there are many other organizations and individuals, many of whom if not most are completely voluntary. The good these people do simply cannot be weighed in words. Even they cannot know the good they do; just as one unremembered act of kindness by an individual lives.

The effects of disasters have been little studied and are difficult to summarize. It is especially difficult in the present state of knowledge on the subject to differentiate accurately between the effects of a sudden catastrophe and a long drawn out disaster. Often when a large area is affected there ensues a period of social and economic instability. This is often characterized by fluctuating prices, shift of class lines and movement of population.

The shock of sudden disaster often produces unusual or extreme types of human behaviour. On the one hand acts of kindness, of help, of assistance, and plain good neighbourliness and charity are called forth. On the other hand there are often exhibitions of unusual greed and of publicity seekers. We are inexorably involved with and responsible for each other.

For nearly 500 years our province has been bothered by the disasters of history. More often than not disasters are caused by men, not by God or by nature, although we have had our share of those. Bell Island, another area in my own district within a few miles of St. John's, is a battery of impending disaster.

We have had only 18 years of Confederation, not 100 like most of you, yet Newfoundland will not be lacking in enthusiastic

celebration of our centennial. We, like Abou Ben Adhem, may still lead all the rest.

The bill presented by my hon. friend opposite, Bill C-52, would set up a national disaster fund with a board of trustees to determine in advance a point for each province over which disasters would be considered national in scope. Contributions to the fund could be made in advance by federal and provincial governments, and by individuals, companies and institutions. Disaster is defined in the bill as:

> —an inevitable accident or an act of God resulting in losses to persons within a province where such losses exceed in total an amount fixed annually by the trustees in respect of a disaster within that province.

I do not necessarily agree with that definition. I have several questions I wish to ask although there may not be time to ask them all. Could the amount of federal contribution to a disaster be influenced by the size and wealth of the province in which the disaster occurred? In other words, should the federal response to a $1 million disaster in Ontario be the same as the response to the same $1 million disaster in Prince Edward Island, or indeed Newfoundland?

Implicit in the proposal is the relative weakness of any province, particularly the have-not provinces. Although Newfoundland is now a have-not province I am sure that within my lifetime it will become a have province. This proposal would regularize the function of disaster relief in the cases that are not clearly national emergencies, but outside the ability of the province to control. At the present time there are no regular channels or plans and each emergency is met in ad hoc fashion. For example, during the Red River flood in Manitoba, federal aid was worked out through the medium of defence capabilities—the emergency measures organization. One could conceive of some level at which a disaster would be large enough to endanger defence preparedness, even under unification.

In the United States, as a result of the federal disaster act of 1950, the national government can provide disaster aid to states in the most effective way by co-ordinating, through the federal civil defence administration, the activities of all pertinent federal authorities.

The point of view of the Canadian government on the matter of disaster relief was clarified on May 5, 1966, by the Prime Minister in the following statement:

• (5:40 p.m.)

> We in the government have been giving consideration to this situation for some time, and I hope the progress of parliamentary business will enable us, before long, to deal with this matter of disasters, on a somewhat different basis than the pragmatic way in which we have been approaching it over the years.

Certain general aspects of any effective approach to the problem comprise the broad review of the physical characteristics and the human and physical consequences of natural disaster; the nature and scope of government efforts that must be far reaching, complex and co-ordinated in the handling of voluntary relief. The kinds of accidents to which Canada is prone are widespread and no one should approach this issue without a detailed knowledge of such historic disasters as wartime St. Lawrence shipwrecks, a tragic fire in Newfoundland, a tornado that blew down much of Regina, a hurricane that hit Toronto, an avalanche in Alberta, a coal mine disaster in Nova Scotia, a flood in Winnipeg, tragic bushfires in the north and in my own province of Newfoundland, and a bridge collapse in Vancouver.

The essence of the matter is that there is no actuarial basis for such events and normal insurance techniques will not apply. Related to this is the fact that Canada is one of the most accident prone countries in the world, and all the demographic aspects of this problem must be taken into consideration. The effect of Bill C-52 would be to regularize the function of disaster relief in those cases not clearly national emergencies, that is, that would impair defence capabilities—but which are clearly beyond the ability of the province to cope with. The board proposed would set a limit in dollars for each province, which would be a measure of that province's ability to cope. This fund would cover all amounts above these limits.

At present there are apparently no regular channels or plans for federal relief and each request for disaster relief is met in ad hoc fashion. Several recent examples have been reported in *Hansard* debates. One case was the Red river flood of 1966, in which federal aid was carried out through the medium of federal defence capabilities, the E.M.O.

The proposed fund is all-inclusive. In the United States there is a federal insurance plan for flood relief only. Another plan is tied in with the federal civil defence organization to assist states to restore essential public

works, that is, roads, bridges, waterworks, building, etc. Under the disaster act the president, on a request by a state governor, may decide to declare a "major disaster" and so authorize this form of federal assistance. The main problem for such proposals in Canada is a constitutional one. Disaster relief is under provincial jurisdiction. I know the problem Bill C-52 is proposing to meet has accordingly been referred by the Prime Minister to the federal-provincial conference for discussion. Whether or not discussion has actually taken place is a matter for conjecture.

The Minister of Industry (Mr. Drury) stated on October 22, 1964, that informal consultation was being carried out with the United States on the question of peacetime disasters and the role played by a federal civil emergency organization. He said:

> Specific recommendations can be expected to emerge from these discussions.

I am in complete agreement with the necessity of providing relief in the case of disasters. I do not suppose there is a province in Canada that has had so many disasters as my own. Perhaps they have not been big, national disasters, but every disaster, if it affects a human being, affects all of us. You, sir, and I know of the many nights when the door was kept ajar while the storm raged outside. I believe our friend, Ned Pratt, who is a Newfoundlander—he was born in Newfoundland—and who should be, if he is not, poet laureate of Canada, stated it perfectly when he wrote:

> It took the sea a thousand years,
> A thousand years to trace,
> The granite features of this cliff,
> In crag and scarp and base.
> It took the sea an hour one night,
> An hour of storm to trace,
> The sculpture of these granite seams,
> Upon a woman's face.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support the principle of this bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy LeBlanc (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to give my views concerning this Bill No. C-52.

It is evident that everybody should agree that the principle of this bill is based on the most ancient and the most natural humanitarian laws.

In my area, and even in my riding, since the beginning of the century, we have suffered several disasters and conflagrations.

I remember the stories told by older people regarding the shipwreck of the *Empress of Ireland* in 1914, at Sainte-Luce, near Rimouski and Pointe-au-Père.

I also remember very well the fire that destroyed at least a third of the town of Rimouski, where I live, on May 6, 1950. One third of the city was destroyed and the damages amounted to several million dollars. I remember that we got help from the Red Cross, the army, and that a special fund was created thanks to people of goodwill. Insurance companies helped us also. Besides, I think that the C.M.H.C. let us use all the advantages it can offer by way of building and home reconstruction, so that we could rebuild our city. That is why Rimouski was able to remain one of the most important cities on the south shore of the St. Lawrence, in eastern Quebec.

At the same time, on the same day, I believe, another town in our area, located in the constituency of our colleague the hon. member for Rivière-du-Loup-Témiscouata (Mr. Gendron), the town of Cabano, was almost completely destroyed by fire.

Those two fires caused damages amounting to $12,023,400. Insurance policies covered damages up to $2,545,000 and we suffered a loss of $9,478,000. On the other hand, we benefited from all the help I have already mentioned.

Along the Rimouski river there was also another disaster, another calamity: a mountain of mud and clay slid into the Rimouski river; this landslide destroyed several farmers' establishments, changed the course of the river and buried machinery valued at several thousand dollars owned by contractors who were doing work in the vicinity.

The hon. members who spoke before me mentioned many other disasters which happened here in Canada. In addition to those disasters, I think that it is advisable to remember also the collapse of the Quebec bridge about which a lot was written at the beginning of the century, and which caused some casualties and a great deal of damage. That accident occurred on August 28, 1908, with 75 dead. When the Duplessis bridge collapsed, on January 31, 1951, it was also a conflagration if we consider the damage and the four casualties.

Upon consideration of those disasters as well as those mentioned by the hon. members who spoke before me: the fire in St. John's (Newfoundland) which caused several casualties, in 1942; the tornado which destroyed 500 buildings in Regina, in 1912; the hurricane

Hazel, in 1954; the avalanche in Alberta, which completely destroyed a town and killed 66 people; several disasters in coal mines in Nova Scotia; floods in Manitoba; the forest fires of 1911 and 1922; the Porcupine fire in 1911, and the Haileybury fire, in 1922. It is obvious that we cannot disagree with the principle of this bill.

• (5:50 p.m.)

However, upon reading the bill, I think that three major points must be considered, and all our colleagues in this house, I am sure, have already examined them.

First of all, as someone said a while ago, in the past the federal government did not delay in meeting the requests of the provinces in such cases. Often, federal assistance even preceded the requests. Moreover, a federal minister has been assigned to correct the effects of those disasters.

Mention was also made a while ago of the amounts the federal government paid to alleviate the distress in those circumstances.

I have a few figures here which I want to mention rapidly: the Fraser river disaster of 1948: contribution, $14,700,000;— may I mention that all these disasters occurred since world war II—the Red river disaster, in 1950, $16 million; Rimouski and Cabano, in 1950, federal contribution, $2,800,000; the Sarnia tornado in 1953, the federal contribution was $137,462,000; hurricane Hazel, $764,638; the flood in Saskatchewan, in 1955, $32,000; other floods in 1955, in Manitoba, $18,000; the Springhill disaster in Nova Scotia in 1956, $25,000; another disaster, at the same location, in 1958, $100,000; the New Brunswick fishermen disaster in 1959, $50,000; certain floods in New Brunswick, in 1961, $50,000; and other floods in Port Alberni, $250,000. This makes a total of $34,927,000.

The second point which is important and on which it is essential to call attention—it is almost a corollary of the first one—is that the federal government recognizes a real need to establish a statute to correct the effects of disasters. On the other hand, as I said a while ago, the Minister of Industry and Minister of Defence Production (Mr. Drury) was given authority to direct interdepartmental studies on these problems with a view to setting up a commission.

Third, in order to draft an adequate bill providing compensation when a disaster occurs, many difficulties and complications must be considered. For instance, it would be advisable to set up an acceptable scale of costs. It would be a good idea also to some disasters which are not big enough to require the help of the federal government.

The size or importance of a province's territory or wealth should also be considered. For instance, should a disaster resulting in a loss of $1 million in Ontario or Quebec be considered on the same basis as a similar disaster in Prince Edward Island?

It would also be necessary to enter into certain agreements regarding the participation of the provinces, because even if the federal government were to pass a legislation to that effect, the provinces would be required, under the constitution, to continue their participation to such programs.

On the other hand, the part played by insurance companies in the past and still to be played in the future must also be taken into consideration. In addition, there are certain details to be spelled out.

In summary, it is those small details which lead me to believe that the bill in its present wording is perhaps being presented in too simple a form to succeed in correcting a complex situation and in solving difficult problems.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hour for the consideration of private members business is expired.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Rapp: Mr. Speaker, what will be the business for next Monday?

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Speaker, I expect the item of business with which we have been dealing today will be called on Monday.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, April 17, 1967

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL

INCLUSION OF SPEECH AS APPENDIX TO OFFICIAL REPORT

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of the house and in accordance with custom I move, seconded by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker):

That the speech of His Excellency the Governor General, the Right Honourable Roland Michener, Q.C., together with the address of welcome made by the Prime Minister in the Senate chamber on April 17, 1967, be printed as an appendix to the official report of debates of the House of Commons, and form part of the permanent record of this parliament.

Motion agreed to.

[*Editor's note: For text of speeches referred to above, see appendix.*]

HONOURS AND AWARDS

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ESTABLISHMENT OF SYSTEM IN CANADA

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce to the house the establishment of a system of honours and awards for Canada. Practically every sovereign country has such a system which it uses as a means of recognizing merit or gallantry, or distinguished public service. I believe that recognition of this kind can strengthen national pride and the appreciation of national service.

There has been no system of Canadian honours and awards. The Canada Medal was instituted in 1943 as a possible way of filling this gap, but it has never been awarded and is now being replaced. Because Canada has lacked an official system a number of unofficial or semi-official honours and awards have developed over the years. In addition, the professions and the universities have methods of bestowing recognition upon persons they desire to honour.

The government considers that there is a need in Canada for some official Canadian method of recognizing outstanding merit and public service in many different fields. The centennial of confederation would seem to be a logical time to introduce such a system. Any such system of course, Mr. Speaker, must be distinctly Canadian and include no titles nor confer any special privileges, hereditary or otherwise.

It is my pleasure to announce that on the recommendation of the government Her Majesty has approved the issue of letters patent constituting the Order of Canada. The constitution of the Order provides for the creation of Companions of the Order. Fifty may be appointed in this centennial year and not more than 25 in any year thereafter, but the maximum shall never exceed 150. The principal Companion of the Order, the Chancellor, will be the Governor General. Nominations for the award will not be made by the government but directly to the Governor General by an advisory council composed as follows: the Chief Justice of Canada, chairman; the Clerk of the Privy Council; the Under Secretary of State; the Chairman of the Canada Council; the President of the Royal Society of Canada; the President of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. Companions will be selected on the basis of "merit, especially service to Canada or to humanity at large".

• (2:40 p.m.)

The constitution of the Order of Canada also provides for the recognition of acts of outstanding valour. To this end it specifies that there will be a Medal of Courage which may be awarded to a person who "performs an act of conspicuous courage in circumstances of great danger". There will of course be no fixed maximum number of awards in this category.

The constitution also provides for a Medal of Service, to be awarded but for different categories of meritorious service than that for Companions and in somewhat larger numbers. Not more than 50 Medals of Service will be given in 1967 or in any year thereafter.

Any person or organization is invited at any time to suggest names of persons whom they consider worthy of receiving any of these awards. These nominations, which should include particulars of the merits and

accomplishments of the person nominated, should be submitted directly to the secretary to the Governor General, at Government House in Ottawa, who will act as secretary to the advisory council and who alone will make the recommendations.

The government believes that these three awards, the Companion of the Order of Canada, the Medal of Courage and the Medal of Service, will help to fill a need in our national life and will enable proper recognition to be given by Canada to its own citizens and to others. By the method of recommendation, careful selection based strictly upon merit for two of the awards and upon conspicuous courage for the other and strict limits on the number of recipients, it is intended to maintain the quality of these awards at the highest possible level.

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to table copies of the two orders in council involved, including the text of the letters patent and the constitution of the Order.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a matter such as this I would have hoped the Prime Minister would have given notice. Had he done so, it would have been possible to discuss this question in a manner in keeping with the step which is being taken.

All of us realize that in 1919 Hon. W. F. Nickle of Kingston introduced a resolution in the House of Commons to the effect that honours should not be awarded. That motion received fairly general support and remained in effect through the years until Mr. Bennett became prime minister of Canada. During Mr. Bennett's period of office a number of knighthoods were awarded.

Certainly this is a break which must cause deep concern to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill), because after all he is the testamentary successor to Right Hon. Mackenzie King. Mr. King did not like decorations, prefixes or suffixes. The only person who has a close link with the past in this regard—a close link with that prime minister —is the Minister of Transport. The Prime Minister of course also has a close relationship, having been under secretary of state for external affairs while Mr. King occupied the position of prime minister.

As I recall it, Mr. King had been given a C.M.G. in 1908, Companion of the Order of St. Michael and St. George. So opposed was he to anything in the nature of awards that I understand he had one of the high commissioners of Canada approach His Majesty the King to ask for permission not to have to wear the C.M.G. ribbon. He would have been shocked to have been compelled to wear the decoration. It was so totally removed from his ideas of democracy. My information is that the King answered the request by saying that Mr. King might wear the medal wherever he chose. In any event Mr. King did not wear the decoration.

Then in 1948, following notice that he intended to retire which he gave at a press dinner in that year—in those days announcements of that kind were made at press dinners—Mr. King remained prime minister after Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent was appointed his successor as leader of the Liberal party.

I do not know what happened to Mr. King's feelings on the subject of decorations, but something abnormal occurred. He went over to London and saw the King. He felt that Canada had never been properly honoured for services rendered by Canadians during the second world war, and my information is that membership as a Companion of Honour was to be made available. Apparently Mr. King did not feel that was high enough an honour.

The Order of Merit is restricted, I think, to some 26 members; I am speaking entirely from memory because I did not receive notice of the intention of the Prime Minister to make this announcement, but as a result of a fortuitous occurrence, the death of a member of that order, Mr. King received the Order of Merit.

He then visited the Queen of the Netherlands and pointed out the services that Canada had given to the people of the Netherlands. There he picked up another decoration; I think it was the Order of Orange-Nassau. I can imagine his feelings, loaded down with two decorations on the one trip. He was used to the situation by then and went to Belgium, where in passing he picked up the order of Leopold. Time marches on. He went to Paris where he became a chevalier of the Legion of Honour. For one trip that was par for any honours course.

I mention this because, as the then member for Prince Albert, he was made honorary president of the Prince Albert Agricultural Society. If you visit Laurier House you will see the five honours all in a row, and I must say that Prince Albert was honoured by having its award included among the decorations. Even the C.M.G. was resurrected.

It is well to remember that in 1792 during the famous debate in the British House of Commons, in which Pitt the Younger, Edmund Burke, Charles Sheridan and Fox participated, this whole question was considered. During discussion whether appointments to the legislative councils of Upper and Lower Canada should be hereditary, the attitude of Burke was, as I recall it, if they were made hereditary the preservation of Canada would be assured.

• (2:50 p.m.)

None of the history books seem to reveal what happened in 1943. The diary of Mr. King is singularly silent on this question. He rushed over to the United Kingdom, he saw the King, he asked for the creation of the Canada Medal. There was a great rush; it had to be done at once. Five copies were struck. Today they have become numismatic curios, and where they are we do not know. Now we are to have the Order of Canada. I have noticed the precautions that are going to be taken to ensure that this award will be of the highest order. There has been some suggestion that appointments to the other place under this government would not have been made if there had been an advisory council.

I say, sir, that one of the unusual circumstances connected with our development has been that following Mackenzie King's lengthy period of service as prime minister with those who followed him holding similar views, we are now in 1967 to have the Order of Canada. I hope this does not mean that decorations for valour by Her Majesty the Queen will be done away with; otherwise it can only be said that this is another of these advances, so highly regarded by members of this government, whereby every vestige of our relationship with the United Kingdom is being swept aside. The latest example is in that caricature that is going to go out to the children of Canada, in the form of a medallion, bearing on its front what is described as the coat of arms of Canada. It resembles the coat of arms about as much as I do Hercules.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I am sure all hon. members will agree that it is a pity the right hon. Leader of the Opposition did not have earlier notice of this announcement—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Not one minute.

Mr. Lewis: —because if without notice he could enthral us with a history of things no doubt relevant to the announcement by the Prime Minister, I can imagine what he might have done if he had been given notice.

I want to say on behalf of our party that we greet the announcement of a Canadian order and the fact that it is Canadian. I am sure I need not remind any hon. gentleman that there are in every society thousands and thousands of men and women who in their daily lives do a great deal for our community and never become recognized no matter what kind of order exists. I am sure all those who will receive companionhood under this proposed order will remember that theirs is the recognized contribution, but there are always thousands whose contribution is as great and as important who cannot be recognized.

We in this party are also very happy that the government has taken the precaution to make sure that appointments to the order will be made in such a way as to leave out any possibility or suspicion of political interference. Perhaps the same attitude and the same process will be applied to a good many other appointments in our society, which I think would do Canada a great deal of good.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, we join with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), as well as with the spokesman of the New Democratic Party, to congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) on the establishment of the Order of Canada, whereby deserving Canadians will be created Companions of that Order and medals for valour and meritorious service will be eventually awarded to a total of 150 persons, 50 of whom in this centennial year of confederation.

Mr. Speaker, everybody agrees that we are living in a sovereign contry and that it was very important, even urgent, to have in Canada an organization designed to recognize the good services of Canadians who have made an outstanding contribution to the common good and to the unity of Canada, as a sovereign country.

We, therefore, thank the Prime Minister and the members of the cabinet for having created the Order of Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, without seeking it for themselves many Canadians wonder just what did happen to the Canada Medals that were struck and just what was the purpose of the government as far as that particular medal was concerned.

We join in welcoming the announcement regarding the establishment of the Order of Canada. I think we have to remember that ingratitude is one of the greatest sins of our day, and I believe it is good for us as a nation to recognize the great contribution that is being made and will be made by many of our fellow citizens. It will be a recognition of their contribution and a recognition of our appreciation for what they have done.

We also appreciate the fact that some safeguards have been established to keep this from becoming another matter for political patronage. The establishment of this advisory council will, I am sure, do much to preserve this particular recognition as something that is really worth while and something that has vital meaning. Therefore we trust that in the future as these recognitions are given to various individuals they will be an acknowledgement of the fact that they have made a contribution for which all Canada is appreciative.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

NUMBERS OF SEALS KILLED

Question No. 2,796—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

What is the number of seals estimated by the Department of Fisheries on the Atlantic coast and in the St. Lawrence basin which, in addition to young Harp seals, were killed in each of the years 1964, 1965, 1966 and 1967 to date?

Hon. H.-J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): 1964, 96,217; 1965, 50,985; 1966, 83,619; 1967, season still in progress and figures incomplete.

ALBERTA—TRANSFER OF PROPERTY FOR NATIONAL PARK

Question No. 2,808—**Mr. Herridge:**

Have there been any discussions between the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Premier Manning of Alberta or any of their officials, with respect to the possible transfer of an area of Wood Buffalo park to the provincial government in return for an appropriate area of provincial land to be used as a national park?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Yes. Federal and provincial parks officials have looked at one area in Alberta and negotiations at the ministerial level are expected in the near future.

[Mr. Patterson.]

*C.B.C. AUTHORITY FOR DISTRIBUTION OF COLOUR TELEVISION SETS

Question No. 2,850—**Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South):**

Where is the legal authority for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to make presentations of coloured t.v. sets to any person, and in any event to persons, whatever their public position may be, who are not connected with the C.B.C.?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the corporation's legal authority is the Broadcasting Act and decisions are made in accordance with this legislation. Colour television sets are not presented to individuals as gifts. They are assigned or loaned to positions or offices and remain the property of the corporation.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

REQUEST FOR ERASURE OF CRIMINAL RECORDS AFTER GOOD CONDUCT PERIOD

On the orders on the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in view of events in the last 24 hours, to which I am not going to allude, will the government introduce as a centennial project before this session ends, a measure to provide that any persons convicted of a crime the result of which was incarceration in a jail or penitentiary, may after a period of years, say from five to ten years of good conduct, have that record erased so the stigma which otherwise results will be removed?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I think I will ask the Solicitor General to deal with this question, if my right hon. friend does not mind, since he has discussed it.

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that the officials of my department are now in the midst of preparing a memorandum for my office and for submission to my colleagues in the cabinet. In addition I have requested that a private bill proposed by the hon. member for Welland be sent to the committee on justice and legal affairs. This subject matter is now under consideration by the committee and I am awaiting their report.

Mr. Diefenbaker: May I suggest to the minister that time is of the essence in this connection, and that procrastination is no excuse. Everybody knows, or almost everybody realizes, the injustice of the present position. Surely in view of the events of the last two days this parliament should act now.

Mr. Pennell: Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that there has been no procrastination. It might be of interest to the right hon. gentleman to know that I have given public support to the principle he has enunciated in the house. I have outlined in public one general approach that might be taken to this question. It is therefore clear that it is uppermost in my mind, and I am actively considering it.

HUMAN RIGHTS

REPORTED RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN REQUESTS TO MANPOWER OFFICES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. David Lewis (York South): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Has the minister received a confidential report from the Jewish labour committee alleging that some officials in some manpower offices have accepted requests involving racial and other discrimination? Will the minister indicate to the house whether he has had time to study the report, and what steps he is taking to deal with the situation revealed in it?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): I have not seen any report as yet, but it may be in the department. I just read the news report in the *Globe and Mail* this morning, and I am very concerned about that. The only thing I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that the instructions to the district offices are very strict on that point. I do not say they are followed; perhaps the report of the council is correct, and I am looking into the problem and as soon as I have read the report I will make inquiries. Then I can answer the hon. gentleman.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): When the minister is looking into this matter will he investigate whether the officials of the Ontario human rights commission, the Ontario government agency dealing with this problem, brought this matter to the attention of the officials of his department in Ontario a year ago, and why action was not taken then?

Mr. Marchand: I am not aware of that, Mr. Speaker. I can inquire into the allegation and reply at the same time I give a general report.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When the minister is looking into this matter, will he ascertain whether the instructions of the former national employment service regarding this practice were cancelled when the subject was transferred to his department?

Mr. Marchand: No, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. gentleman is interested I can read what the instructions are. The instructions to all our representatives in the manpower centres are as follows:

> No applicant seeking work will be discriminated against by reason of his or her racial origin, religious belief or political affiliation. There will be no discrimination for any of the reasons stated, and upon proof of any such unfair practice, the officer found guilty will be liable to discipline.

These are the formal instructions that have been given. I cannot tell you this afternoon that they have been followed, but we have this report and I am ready to ascertain to what extent these instructions are followed.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Would the hon. gentleman give us the date of the instructions?

Mr. Lewis: Following what the minister has just read, would he consider issuing further instructions to his officers to the effect that they should refuse to deal with any request coming from an employer which attempts to set down a discriminatory choice?

Mr. Marchand: I can assure the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to renew the instructions and insist that they be followed. This is something in which I personally believe very deeply. I will do all I can to prevent what is alleged in the newspaper to have happened. Hon. members can be sure I am going to check into it and see that instructions are followed.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask a supplementary question. On what date were these instructions given to the various offices across the country?

Mr. Marchand: I do not have the date here, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Diefenbaker: How recently?

Mr. Marchand: I cannot tell you the date. I can tell you tomorrow. I know these instructions are in the manual manpower centre which is distributed to all the Canada manpower offices in the country. I am going to look into the matter and I will ascertain the date, but I do not have it here.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST FOR HIGHER PRICE FOR INDUSTRIAL MILK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture.

During his recent meeting with the dairy producers, did the minister state that his department was ready to reconsider the request for a price of $5.10 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk, as long as the total amount of $120 million available to the department is not exceeded?

Mr. Speaker: I do not think that the question, as put by the hon. member, is acceptable.

Mr. Caouette: At ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES—PROPOSED COMMON MARKET

On the orders of the day:

Hon. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs having to do with the decision taken at a meeting of the Organization of American States at Punta del Este to establish a common market among the countries of South America. Can the minister give the house any information as to the possible effect of this decision on Canadian trade with South American countries, and in particular what steps the government is taking by way of representation to ensure that this development will represent an enlargement of opportunities for Canadian trade in South America rather than the development of another trading bloc from which we might be excluded?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): At the recent conference of the heads of state of the Organization of American States, the Canadian ambassador in the Argentine acted as observer for the Canadian government. The proposal at this meeting to establish a common market is to reach a certain stage of acceptance by 1970 and to become fully effective by 1985, so this does open up an opportunity for a full examination of what the advantages would be for Canadian participation. The government, now that this matter has been formalized in this way, will of course be giving consideration to this and other proposals through the appropriate departments.

Mr. Fulton: May I ask a supplementary question. In the light of this development and its implications for Canada, may we expect an early initiative to be taken by the government to ensure Canadian adherence to the Organization of American States, a step which was firmly advocated by the Secretary of State for External Affairs when he was on this side of the house?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The last observation, of course, is correct.

Mr. Fulton: Is the conclusion correct, that we may expect early initiative to be taken by the government?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): My hon. friend, as an experienced parliamentarian, knows that when the government decides policy it is announced in the usual way.

Mr. Fulton: My question is, has the government got a policy?

VIET NAM—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON SUPPLY OF WAR MATERIALS TO U.S.

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): I wish to address a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs which arises as a result of the severe criticism now being levelled at the government because of its defence sharing program with the United States, through which Canada is supplying war materials to the United States to be used in Viet Nam.

Will the minister for external affairs very shortly consider issuing a clear and concise statement regarding this matter, so there is no conflict between our defence sharing program with the United States and the supply of war materials through the United States to Viet Nam?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, conciseness is, of course, a relative term. I call my hon. friend's attention to the statement that was made in this house by the Prime Minister on January 18, which I think would meet all the criteria of my hon. friend's concept of conciseness.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

FEDERAL EFFORTS TO ATTRACT DOCTORS FROM OUTSIDE CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare, but in his absence I will address it to his parliamentary secretary. In view of the severe strain on the emergency departments of hospitals throughout Canada, which is increasing by 10 per cent every year, and in view of the acute shortage of general practitioners across Canada, would the minister indicate whether the federal government has taken any steps to attract doctors from outside Canada to help fill this gap?

Mrs. Margaret Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I will be very happy to bring this to the minister's attention.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

ALLEGED DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ENGLISH SPEAKING MEMBERS OF SECURITY STAFF

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct a most important question to the government house leader. Will the house leader explain to the house the reasons for the increasing discrimination against employees who speak only English, culminating in the recent order that irrespective of seniority only those members of the security staff who are bilingual shall henceforth be stationed at the main entrance to the House of Commons and Senate?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's question relates to House of Commons personnel and should be directed to the Speaker.

Mr. Winch: On a point of order, sir, I understand that a member could never address a direct question to the Speaker on matters of this kind.

Mr. Speaker: Any question can be directed to the Speaker in writing.

[*Translation*]

TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR POLICY STATEMENT RESPECTING LEVEL CROSSINGS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport, whom I admire very much.

Another railway tragedy, which took the lives of four people yesterday in Ville Laval, is to be deplored. Here is my question to the minister: In view of the fact that the era of turbo-trains and ultra-fast trains is about to begin, is a policy being developed concerning grade crossings in order to deal with this contingency?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not believe that this contingency is so near that the question can be put now.

[*English*]

TRANSPORTATION

INQUIRY AS TO REPORT ON MARITIME STUDY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Now that the government's two year freeze on maritime transportation rates has been reduced to 19 or 20 months, would the minister advise the house when we might expect the special study into maritime transportation?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Soon, sir.

Mr. Forrestall: A supplementary question. Might I ask the minister whether by "soon" he means in this present session of parliament?

Mr. Pickersgill: Soon, sir, is a relative term.

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

QUEBEC—PROTEST RESPECTING PROPOSED REDUCTION OF SERVICE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport.

Following a resolution passed unanimously, the Quebec legislature asked the C.N.R. last week to continue its passenger service between Quebec city and La Malbaie.

Does the Minister of Transport intend to make representations to the C.N.R. authorities to get them to withdraw their application to the Board of Transport Commissioners to abolish their passenger service between Quebec city and La Malbaie?

Mr. Speaker: The question should be put on the order paper.

Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix): At ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REQUEST FOR APOLOGY FOR REPORTED INSULTS TO PEOPLE OF GERMAN DESCENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Secretary of State, but as I notice she is temporarily out of her seat perhaps I could direct it to the Prime Minister.

In view of the pending legislation by the government concerning group libel, would the Prime Minister request the president of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to make an apology to the people of German descent in the area of Kitchener, Ontario. I ask this question in view of a radio program broadcast at 10.30 last Thursday evening on the national network of the C.B.C. which suggested that the persons referred to in the program were disloyal to Canada, were anti-semitic and were nazis. These people have been in Canada for many generations and the inferences in this program were quite unwarranted. I hope this matter will be taken up by the C.B.C.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to forward my hon. friend's question to the authorities of the C.B.C.

[*Translation*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

INQUIRY AS TO STEPS TO RELIEVE UNEMPLOYMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address my question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

In view of the fact that the latest reports on unemployment indicate that in Quebec unemployment has increased by several thousands, is the minister in a position to say whether his department intends to take special measures to check this constant increase in unemployment in Quebec.

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the department is taking general measures against seasonal unemployment applicable to the province of Quebec as well as to the other provinces. If the hon. member for Lapointe wants truly specific measures for the province of Quebec, he could possibly move to the Quebec Legislative Assembly and there present his requests where they would be appropriate and in accordance with his principles and the problems which he is raising.

Mr. Grégoire: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that I would be agreeable to the suggestion of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, would the minister tell us whether he would agree, in addition to transferring me to Quebec, to transfer to Quebec the taxes paid by Quebec to Ottawa?

[*English*]

NOVA SCOTIA—REPORTED PROTESTS RESPECTING TRADES TRAINING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, may I pose my question to the minister of manpower and ask him whether he would reply today to the question I posed to him on Thursday, regarding a communication which was forwarded to him through the unemployed workers' association at Sydney, expressing dissatisfaction with the selection of applicants for training?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, having come straight from my office I wonder whether the hon. member would mind if I answered his question tomorrow.

LABOUR RELATIONS

MARITIME UNIONS TRUSTEES—REFERENCE OF REPORT TO HOUSE COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Labour. Now that the report of the board of trustees of the maritime transportation unions has been received, would the minister consider referring this report to the standing committee on labour and employment so the committee can call the board of trustees before it when the report is being considered?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the minister will not only consider the suggestion, but will be very pleased to get in touch with the chairman of the board of maritime trustees and discuss the situation with him, and then will take the matter up with the chairman of the committee in question.

[*Translation*]

GRAIN

QUEBEC—ANNOUNCEMENT OF LEASE OF ELEVATOR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Transport. Could he tell the house whether the government has authorized the leasing of grain elevators in Quebec and, if so, have steps been taken to guarantee the supply of domestic grain?

[*English*]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the government has authorized the National Harbours Board to lease the grain elevator at Quebec. The conditions of the lease include the fullest protection it is legally possible to give for traffic in domestic grain and for those who are engaged in that traffic.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Will the Minister of Transport also consider the possibility of using Quebec grain elevators or putting grain into them during the winter, when shipping is possible on the St. Lawrence river?

Mr. Speaker: I do not think that the supplementary question is urgent.

[*English*]

OIL

ST. PIERRE-MIQUELON—CONFLICTING CLAIMS TO OFFSHORE EXPLORATION RIGHTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): In view of the fact that offshore oil rights have been awarded by the federal government to British American Oil in an area south of the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon, while United States companies have acquired rights in the same area from Newfoundland and France has granted exploration rights in the same area to a company owned by the French government, what plans have been made by the minister to settle the conflicting claims to offshore exploration rights in this area?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): As the hon. member knows, there have been discussions between the French and Canadian governments concerning this matter. These discussions are continuing, and when we are in a position to make a report on their progress I shall be pleased to advise the house.

Mr. Crouse: A supplementary question to the Minister of Transport. At the present time it is my understanding that offshore drilling rigs are being established off the east coast. Will licences for the supply ships serving these offshore rigs be granted only to ships of Canadian registry?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I do not think that question can possibly be answered without legal research, and I do not feel able to give a legal opinion offhand to the house.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON PROPOSED CHANGES IN ROLE OF ARMED FORCES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether he will clarify the future role of Canada's armed forces prior to his departure overseas. Does the minister approve of the war-making and armed intervention mission proposed for Canada's armed forces by the Minister of National Defence and the vice chief of defence staff under the disguised title of peace restoring?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member and the minister might like to take this up when we move into committee shortly to consider the subject which is before the committee.

Mr. Churchill: The house will be deprived of most valuable advice during the next few days because the minister will be away. He failed to clear up this matter when he had the opportunity to speak. Surely, then, we should have the information now.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I wonder whether the minister will be away that long.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: Under the threat of closure we shall not have the opportunity to hear from the minister on this point, and perhaps if he would clear it up closure would not be applied to the House of Commons by the government.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I think it would be a good idea for the hon. member to come with me.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Inquiries of the Ministry

CANADA MEDAL

SUGGESTED POSTHUMOUS AWARD TO LATE GOVERNOR GENERAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): May I direct a question to the Prime Minister which I hope will be found non-controversial. Will the Prime Minister, as head of the government, give consideration to the official issuance of the one and only Canada Medal, from its inauguration to its discontinuance, posthumously to the late governor general, General Vanier?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): That is a very interesting suggestion indeed, and I will be glad to take it under consideration.

DRUGS

REPORTED PRICE INCREASE FOLLOWING SALES TAX REMOVAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): I had a question I wanted to ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In his absence Your Honour might allow the parliamentary secretary to take it as notice. Has the minister received, as I have, complaints about increases in drug prices which it is claimed could nullify the promised benefit of the removal of the sales tax?

Mrs. Margaret Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): I have checked this matter with the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Incidentally, he is convening a federal-provincial conference at the moment. The answer to the hon. member's question is no.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

STEVEN TRUSCOTT—INQUIRY AS TO FINDINGS OF SUPREME COURT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Solicitor General. Can the minister tell us whether there has yet been any indication from the Supreme Court of Canada as to the date on which the findings in the case of Steven Truscott will be reported to the government?

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): I am not able to be of any help to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker. I have no advance information.

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUEST FOR MATERNITY PROTECTION FOR FEMALE WORKERS

On the orders of the day:

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): I have a question for the Minister of Labour. In view of the findings of the women's bureau of the Department of Labour that women workers in Canada lack maternity protection—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): —will the government take steps to provide the legislative measures necessary—oh, he is not to do it single handed—to secure this protection for women workers under federal jurisdiction?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): First I must thank the hon. lady for the assurance that she gave me in the course of that question. May I take the question as notice.

Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Then may I ask a supplementary question. When does the government propose to ratify the maternity protection convention passed in 1919 by the I.L.O. at Geneva?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I wonder whether that question is very urgent.

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

AMALGAMATION OF NAVY, ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The house resumed, from Friday, April 14, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof—Mr. Hellyer—Mr. Rinfret in the chair.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Chairman: Order. House again in committee of the whole to consider Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and others acts in consequence thereof. When the house rose on Friday evening, clause 2 was under consideration.

On clause 2—*Canadian forces, Canadian armed forces.*

[*English*]

Mr. Kennedy: When I spoke toward the end of Friday's debate on Bill C-243 I was making an appeal to the Minister of National

Defence to delay further consideration of this measure until additional studies had been carried out as to its possible effects upon our armed forces. I was referring to the amount of defence which a country such as Canada can afford. What we must strive to attain is the most effective defence possible having regard to the means we have at our disposal; we must seek to strike a balance, and this principle applies not only to Canada but to all countries.

The cost of defence arises almost entirely from the maintenance of personnel and the supply and maintenance of equipment. From the point of view of cost it matters little what type of organization is set up; what does matter is that the force should be organized on the most efficient basis. Major changes should not be undertaken unless there is a reasonable chance of success. When a major change is made such as is contemplated by this bill, it is unlikely that in future years we shall be able to return to what we have now.

Everything has a price, freedom included, and we must be prepared to meet that price if we value our freedom. If we can preserve our freedom by the expenditure of dollars let us get on with it because in the past our freedom was won at a much costlier price, paid with the blood of our young people. If we can avoid paying such a price in the future by having a force which can deter or effectively contain a threat to our freedom, let us get on with it, but I would point out that our forces as at present constituted in three services have a tremendous record under the traditional idea of units raised through voluntary contribution by many people. In times of emergency our men gave all that men could give, and I do not know how any reorganization of our forces can improve on a man who is already giving everything he has.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Traditionally our concept of Canada's armed forces has always been that these forces are of a voluntary nature. We ran into difficulties whenever we resorted to any other way of raising forces. In effect this means that in peacetime we must have regular and reserve forces, particularly reserve forces because we cannot afford a large enough regular force to handle all emergencies. Supporting our regular force we must have an organization which allows quick and efficient mobilization of partly trained personnel.

Recruitment to our forces depends upon some attraction, and the greatest attraction at present is the three choices open to those who wish to serve their country. They can go into the navy, the army or the air force provided they can meet the basic requirements of the services. It is no secret that in all our present-day forces including the infantry, which has always been looked upon as the bottom of the barrel, every serving man is a specialist in his own right. Even the infantrymen are specialists today. Nobody should think that the infantry is outdated. In Viet Nam more infantrymen are being used than any other type of fighting personnel.

I wish to deal briefly with the question of morale. It is something which is hard to explain. Morale is something that is within a man himself. Not even the man who possesses it can explain what it is. It depends on many things such as environment and faith or confidence in various things, not least faith and confidence in the people surrounding one. One of the major attributes of morale is esprit de corps. I do not know how greatly unification is going to disturb esprit de corps but I suggest that our present method of organizing forces linked to traditionally famous units is very good for morale. It invites friendly competition and even in peacetime it is a great attraction for those who wish to serve their country by affiliating themselves with something to which they can look with pride.

One of the greatest difficulties I found in service operations lay in the field of communications. There was no difficulty in having various arms of the services. On the beaches of Normandy on D-day it could not have mattered less that a lad was in a naval suit, an army suit or an air force suit. As a matter of fact, on the beachhead many people wore the uniforms of many countries. It did not matter to the infantry coming in on a landing barge that a navy chap piled out first into the water with a rope and went ashore in order to make fast the barge so they could follow with their equipment and reach shore without drowning. There was no misunderstanding. Everyone knew his job and did it.

So far as morale on D-day is concerned, many men went ashore ill from seasickness after crossing rough water, but they had been so well briefed and the organization was of such a standard that the minute they reached land they went into action and were as good as the rest in practically no time. I know of a company during the second world war which started with 110 officers and men. It went through hell to reach an objective

and only 18 men survived to reach that objective. You cannot tell me those men did not have morale.

We must be very careful in peacetime not to do anything with our forces that will upset the spirit of challenge and opportunity and security. These are the three most important things which affect morale. We know that at present there are certain people who are "browned off" with the forces and want to get out of them. I have talked to a lot of these people and their principal grievances are about these three things. They do not know where they are going. They become tired of being pushed around without being given a straight course to follow.

I might say that there is also a bit of hypocrisy involved in this issue. During the time of mourning for our late and beloved Governor General I had an opportunity to see the chief of staff, General Allard, being interviewed on television about the famous Canadian regiment, the Royal 22nd, in which both he and the late Governor General had served. He mentioned the terrific esprit de corps which this regiment had created. General Allard said that from this regiment eight generals, I believe, had sprung, and he expressed the opinion that had it not been for the existence of such a regiment many of those people of French descent might never have reached such high rank. That admission shows that an established regiment does a lot for a soldier.

• (3:40 p.m.)

There is another bit of hypocrisy with reference to the celebrations commemorating the great battles of the first world war. Endless reference has been made to the famous units which took part in those battles and the fact that the men covered themselves with glory in order that the names of their regiments would get into the history books.

In conclusion I express the fear that if complete unification is proceeded with it may bring into the armed forces some type of socialism. It might upset the relationship between officers and men which is so important. It might lead to a complete rotting away of the heart and soul of the armed forces. It might even end up in a type of dictatorship. Furthermore, I believe that unification will lead to compulsory service in peacetime and conscription in time of war. As an old infantryman I know that a large part of the training of an infantryman is concerned with learning how to use the ground. This means that he learns to use the ground to conceal himself from the enemy, protect himself and get as close to his objective as possible. The objective of the infantryman is to close with the enemy. The only danger is that once he finds a hole in the ground, gets into it and is then shot at, it takes a lot of courage to get out of the hole again. I should like to say to the minister that he has been shot at not only by his own troops but by his enemies. He has perhaps got himself into a bit of a hole. I hope he will have the courage to get out and face reality.

[Mr. Kennedy.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rochon: Mr. Chairman, at the very outset of this debate on integration and unification of the Canadian armed forces, I proposed to take part in it.

Then, having heard the members of the opposition, and more particularly those of the Conservative party, and the lack of seriousness of the arguments put forth by their leader, I felt my intervention would be useless, convinced as I was that they had muffed their strategy and that the house could, the very next day, pass the bill.

Now, however, events having turned out as they have, in view of the partisanship and their obvious obstruction, I have thought better of it; I decided, at the very last minute, to revert to my first intention. Indeed, I felt it was my duty to intervene and protest against the ill will, the lack of understanding and the retrograde attitude which inspired most of those we have heard.

In his speech the official opposition leader (Mr. Diefenbaker) gave us a fine vaudeville act. It was lively, I admit, but not very constructive. He proved that his party had run out of arguments to fight this government project. We realized that he, as much as his members, opposes the bill perhaps not for the sake of opposing it but rather to lead the people into believing that they are, in our Canadian parliament, the true defenders of our traditions.

For almost two months now, Mr. Chairman, either in the permanent committee on national defence, or here in the house, we have heard the same arguments, if that name can be given to a negative and systematic opposition far more akin to sentimentality than to reality.

We have heard thousands of words based on what retired members of the forces have said. They are certainly not incompetent, for they served their country well, they performed their duties nobly, and we are grateful to them for it. But mind you, they are no

longer responsible for administration and command and, therefore, they are not as well informed as those who are on active service.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mr. Chairman, I followed closely the proceedings of the defence committee, I listened to and I studied the evidence given by the experts who paraded in the front of us and I came to the conclusion that the unification problem is, first and foremost, a technical problem.

Indeed, our military commitments, the policy of development of our armed forces and the matters of strategy, are closely related to the very structure of our military system. In that sense, it is normal for the hon. members to examine the policy of the government, and to wonder whether the new planned structures for our armed forces will meet Canada's requirements.

But I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we narrow deliberately the scope of the debate when we completely forget the technical area in order to show that the new format of our forces will reduce our military capabilities and therefore, jeopardize the defence of our territory and our continent.

To look upon unification as a simple matter of adopting a common uniform, eliminating the word royal and making a few other changes, generally of minor importance, compared to the tremendous administrative, economic and military advantages of the government project is to distort the problem further.

A lot has been said up to now about the opposition of some senior officers to the government project.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to emphasize the false impression that the opposition tries to create by implying that all the well-informed military people are opposed to the project when those who support it, are either misinformed or politically committed.

First, we must remember that, by tradition, military people are rather conservative. They do not like structural changes and generally prefer the status quo to innovations. That is, I think, something which can be noticed in all the armies of the world. I do not say that such a stand is wrong in itself. On the contrary, in a sound democracy such as ours, it is precisely traditionally based institutions like the Army, the Navy and the Air Force which ensure the permanency of certain principles which are dear to us.

But this does not mean that we should stand aloof from progress, be wrapped up and live in the past, without being aware that the world is changing all the time and that in this atomic age, every year, even every month is bringing something new, as one would have to be blind not to understand that we also in Canada should make it our duty to progress, to change and improve what was good 25 or 30 years ago, in order to adapt it to the needs of modern times, for the greatest welfare of this country.

Mr. Chairman, may I at this stage quote a few lines from the evidence given by General Allard. I quote:

> The complexity of modern strategy and the size of forces we can afford to maintain make it essential that our forces be made up of mutually-supporting, flexible and mobile forces. This type of force dictates that in the planning, management and command aspects the whole emphasis must be on unified thinking among all its elements. So much for the changing circumstances under which we are operating.

Much has been said up to now, Mr. Chairman, about the opposition shown by certain senior officers to Bill C-243. Allow me to recall once more some other words on the part of the chief commanding officer of Canada's armed forces—as part of his evidence before the committee on February 28 last. I believe they do reflect the feeling of the majority of the Canadian people:

> On the one hand, there are called before you officers of the forces, like myself, who are responsible for the organization, efficiency and morale of the forces for your defence, and who can speak only within the bounds of these responsibilities under the policies set forth by the Government. On the other hand, other people are called before you, who have no responsibilities to anybody but themselves, and therefore can make statements on matters for which they bear no responsibility.
>
> I would like to make it clear, therefore, that in making my presentation before you I do so as the man responsible for carrying out the policy of the government through the Minister of National Defence, for ensuring that the defence forces we have today are organized, equipped, and trained and possess the morale—

—something was said about the morale, Mr. Chairman—

> —to accept any task they have or are likely to be given. Since the passing—

General Allard went on,

> —of Bill C-90 and my appointment as Chief of Operational Readiness, then as Commander Mobile Command and latterly as Chief of the Defence Staff, I feel absolutely confident—

Here again, these words are from the chief commanding officer of Canada's armed forces,

> —that this task can be carried out best by the reorganization of the forces as set out in Bill C-243.

Following these words, Mr. Chairman, I understood that I could not very well accept the first objection raised, even if it originated from respectable military circles.

I have a great deal of respect for Admiral Landymore, General Fleury or General Moncel, but the fact remains that they are not at present in the armed forces. They served their country gloriously, and we should be very grateful to them, but it is quite another thing to accept their evidence as the integral truth, and we cannot conclude from this that all experienced military personnel are against the program proposed by the government. Even those who, like General Miller, do not accept this program, cannot help but say, as they did before the defence committee: "Perhaps the program will eventually turn out to be a good thing".

Another mistake, Mr. Chairman, on the part of those who are against the program, is that they turned a basically technical problem into a sentimental and political football. Instead of trying to show that Canada will be less prepared to take on military responsibilities within NATO or NORAD or to assist the United Nations, efforts have been made to question the integrity of the chief of staff, to involve royalty in this problem, to arouse the public on a matter of uniforms.

The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer) was brilliantly supported on this point by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) who made it quite clear that Canada will not only be in a position to carry out its military commitments but will be in a better position to play its proper role in the defence of the free world.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Instead of insisting on wasting the time of the house, to discredit the parliament of Canada, as was the case with the flag debate, it seems to me that the opposition should once and for all admit that the government may sometimes be right, that the experts of the national defence department are not all incompetent, that the armed forces personnel agree with the project and, finally, that the majority of Canadians have given the present government the responsibility of carrying out this project.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege last fall to visit the Canadian military bases in Europe. Allow me to say how proud I was of being a Canadian. Our servicemen received

the parliamentarians with warmth and dignity. They displayed good manners and reassured members of parliament on their excellent training. I think Canada is second to none as far as its forces' behaviour and their excellent morale are concerned.

If, as Conservative members claim, morale is very low among our forces, this was a perfect opportunity for the officers to say a word about it to the visiting legislators. In fact, Mr. Chairman, we never heard—and here I am certain that the hon. members for London and Queens-Lunenburg (Messrs. Irvine and Crouse) who were in the group will agree with me—unfavourable comments on unification.

But so many favourable comments, Mr. Chairman. Servicemen were happy to talk about the numerous administrative and even strategic advantages, in regard to co-ordination of command, for instance, thanks to the plan now before the committee of the whole.

I do not venture into technical discussions where even experts take divergent views. And that is not new. If generals find it difficult on the battlefield to agree on a plan of attack or defence, as we can see from memoirs of every army chief, all the more should we expect that, sitting comfortably in their offices, they have a tendency to apprehend certain innovations, while others endorse them enthusiastically.

Therefore, if the commanding officers can hardly reach an agreement, how do you expect me to share the views of laymen in this matter, such as the hon. members opposite, who have been attempting to raise a bogey for so many days?

Where did they get they military science, which they believe is so up to date? Where, Mr. Chairman, I ask them?

On the other hand, we keep referring to the evidence given before the committee on national defence. I was a member of that committee, and I followed its meetings with a great deal of interest.

What did I see there? I saw members who came not to find out objectively what the merits and faults of the bill were, but to oppose the minister, and to use every possible means to try to extract from the witnesses a condemnation of this measure.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the people—and what we have seen in the papers for several days is a striking indication of it—have already drawn the line between partisanship and seriousness a long time ago, in this debate.

I myself prefer to trust a man like the hon. Minister of National Defence who is not given to putting forward ill-prepared bills or a man like the hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs who gave his approval to the bill, rather than the perpetual malcontents opposite, who cannot draw the line between their duty to legislate and their desire to be re-elected by any means.

When the time comes, Mr. Chairman, and I hope it will be very soon, I will wholeheartedly support the government's bill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member permit a question? Would the hon. member like to correct his remarks in *Hansard* and remove the reflection that he cast upon members of the committee, whom he said went there not to gain information about the bill but merely to make life difficult for the minister? Were not members of that committee in the same position as the hon. member? Were they not there for the purpose of performing their duty to the House of Commons?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rochon: Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) that I did not mention the members who belong to the committee, but rather those who attended, as spectators, the meetings of the committee and who tried, on several occasions, to distract by their remarks, the witnesses and the members who wanted them to give some explanations.

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member is casting reflections on members of the House of Commons. He is imputing motives to them in their attendance at that committee. Every member of the House of Commons is entitled to attend committee hearings and is in the same position as the members of that committee with regard to responsibility. But I suggest—this is the question of privilege—that the hon. member is imputing motives to members of this house and he should withdraw that statement.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rochon: Mr. Chairman, I do not impute motives to any member of this house, but we must understand that words have their meanings; that is "yes" means "yes" and "no" means "no". When there is criticism, we can understand what the critic meant to say or do.

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I raised a question of privilege on which I think you must make a ruling. It is all very well for the hon. member to get up and say yes means yes and no means no, but he made a statement imputing motives to the members of the House of Commons who were in attendance at that committee. It is not within the rules to impute motives and the hon. member must withdraw that statement. I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I believe the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Rochon) knows the rules of the house. It is not the practice in the house to impute motives to other members as far as their attendance in the house or in a committee is concerned. I trust that the hon. member did not intend to impute motives to hon. members of the opposition who attended meetings of the committee on national defence, either as members of the committee or as spectators; therefore, I would ask him to withdraw his words.

Mr. Rochon: Mr. Chairman, if my words have been misinterpreted, I shall give in to your request and withdraw them.

Mr. Régimbal: Mr. Chairman, like several other hon. members who spoke in this debate, I had also decided not to speak but to listen to the views of the members of the standing committee on national defence, for most of them were particularly knowledgeable in this field, either because they were former ministers of national defence or because they had served in the armed forces, or because they had closely followed the committee proceedings and heard the evidence and comments of various witnesses who appeared before the committee.

For my part, not having had any of these experiences, I did not think myself competent to participate in the debate. However, it was the very weak speech made last Tuesday, on April 11, by the minister himself, which led me to change my mind and gave me self-confidence.

As it can be found in *Hansard* of that day at page 14792, the minister stated the following on April 11:

> Of course the chiefs of staff were predominantly opposed to the unification of the armed forces. Chiefs of staff all over the world are opposed to the unification of the armed forces.

So in the light of their experience, their knowledge, their studies and their research, the chiefs of staff are opposed to this experimental measure concerning unification, which has already been rejected by all major countries of the world, after long and careful studies.

For this reason, our officers have been summarily fired or forced into early retirement, because the views of the little corporal must prevail.

So, in his view, experience no longer counts. Wisdom and prudence have little meaning any more and if that is a worthwhile principle, it should find some application elsewhere, in industry, in the teaching profession, in the cabinet, as well as in the House of Commons.

Therefore, I have no fear in putting forth my opinions since the minister encourages me to do so, and under the same principle he must admit that I speak with greater authority than he, inasmuch as he has more experience than I, and experience does not count.

I take part in this debate for the simple reason that little by little, as it becomes more protracted, public opinion is beginning to awaken and to take an interest in the matter.

I fully realize that by prolonging the debate, we take the risk of being charged with filibustering, but I am quickly consoled for I realize that those reproaches come almost exclusively from narrow-minded persons, from blind supporters of the government, from servile followers who contributed to *Hansard* prepared speeches, delivered unconvincingly and without much imagination.

They also come from those who take particular pleasure on every occasion in making fun of those procedures—

Mr. Béchard: On a point of order. A little earlier the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Rochon) had to withdraw certain remarks because it was claimed that he was trying to impute motives to some hon. members. Well that is what the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes is now doing in his speech.

Mr. Régimbal: Whoever feels stung should scratch himself. But, if one listened attentively, I said: for I realize that those reproaches come almost exclusively from narrow-minded people. Therefore, if the hat fits, wear it.

They come also from those who revel on every occasion in making fun of the procedure of this institution.

[Mr. Régimbal.]

Besides, I realize more and more that the public, the people in my riding as well as in others, and the editorial writers practically everywhere, are beginning to see the dangers inherent in that unification adventure, as stated earlier by the hon. member for Laval; that adventure into the unknown.

• (4:10 p.m.)

An ever growing concern is being felt in all segments of the population because of the uncompromising attitude of the minister who is left alone to defend himself. Only two ministers have come to his rescue, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) who admitted himself the weakness of his arguments, and the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) who soon fell back upon a diplomatic jargon, remaining silent about the direct implications of unification on our commitments to various military alliances.

At the beginning, the population in general would have supported the minister, because he had carefully started by speaking about integrating the general staff and unifying command for purposes of effectiveness, of co-ordination and economy.

It has only been realized in the last ten days that the intention is to develop a kind of international police force, made up of handymen, interchangeable from one occupation to another, but unable, according to expert evidence, to ensure our own national defence.

The people are concerned by the fact that not a single allied country came and testified for that project. They realize, from day to day, that once it is over, that change will oblige us to depend on our neighbours to the south for our own protection and even to allow them to occupy strategic points in our country.

They fear that if a foreign country thus occupies those strategic points, it will try first of all to protect and defend its own territory, and we will be expendable.

In addition, a good number of our citizens may have noticed that the unification of the armed forces, to such an extent as to completely remove the means of identification of the various services, or units, does not exist in any other field.

Then, why did we not unify social clubs whose common goal is to help? Why not just one social club? Why do we have the Richelieu, the Lions, the Kiwanis, the Kinsmen, the Rotary clubs? Again, why not a single group of university graduates, a single

association? Why have doctors associations, lawyers, engineers, sociologists and teachers associations?

In all these areas, at all times, it has been found that the identification with a particular cause or task has been an efficient, stimulating and progressive way of increasing one's skill and achieving full development. Why should it be different with the armed forces? The evidence given by the experts has been practically unanimous on this point.

Mr. Chairman, there is another matter on which nobody has insisted very much and which will certainly recur when the house examines clause 6 of this bill. I refer to this at the resolution stage of the debate and some hon. members opposite have called this a childish point. Still, it was stated that to fulfil the contemplated tasks properly, it will be necessary to have at least 100,000 people in the forces. It is a fact, moreover, that the number of resignations is increasing and that there are fewer enlistments. It is feared, and rightly so, that young people will more and more hesitate to enlist in a common force, rather than in a definite service, such as the air force, the army or the navy.

What will happen if the number of our men becomes less than the required minimum? There is only one answer, and indeed, the minister did not deny it, that is conscription. I can hardly imagine how some members opposite and members of other parties, especially members of the Ralliement Créditiste, will manage to explain their attitude to their constituents?

Yet, the result is unavoidable and the first signs can already be seen. In fact, the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Nowlan) pointed out to the house last Friday, April 14, the objections put forward by five of his constituents who are in the armed forces at the present time and who were refused permission to retire so as to return to civilian life, notwithstanding commitments to the contrary made to them when they enlisted. This is conscription.

We were also told that the men in the armed forces at present will have to accept transfers due to unification. Again, this is conscription. It is obvious that if future commitments force us to bring up the strength of our forces, there will have to be conscription, and this, as I say, the minister has not denied and cannot deny.

Still, the present system is fully adequate in terms of our obligations. So, why the transformation? To gratify the ambition, the idea of one man who, once again, stands alone in his stubbornness.

This leads me to the last point, Mr. Chairman, which has been mentioned repeatedly: the whole armed forces system, the whole system of national defence must be closely related to the external affairs policy; it is obvious that the unification the minister proposes cannot meet the demands of our commitments with NATO or NORAD, for instance.

No co-ordination is possible with the armed forces of our closest allies, namely the United States, Great Britain, France, or the western countries, for the simple reason that they have not adopted the same defence system. We are bound to be completely alone and we shall inescapably become an international laughing stock. Last week, the minister candidly asked us to give up the discussions and to put the question immediately.

My hon. friend from Sainte-Anne (Mr. Loiselle) repeated the same request saying: We are willing to take our responsibilities, and if we are mistaken, if this undertaking is disastrous, the people can always vote against us. What candour! What arrogance!

The security of the country is involved, not the security of the party or the Liberal government; we do not care about them, we do not give a hoot about them. Our national sovereignty is involved, so is our international prestige; also involved is the confidence of our allies, in short our maturity. We are not concerned about the minister's future but about our own future and that of the whole country.

[*English*]

We must admit, Mr. Chairman, that many points have been repeated in the course of this debate in order to try to get our feelings, our doubts and our objections across to the minister. I also admit that this has been the most futile and frustrating experience of this whole session. The minister will not listen to reason. The minister insists on going ahead with his own little game of Russian roulette. If he wants to commit political suicide, I suppose that is his business, but trying to prevent this nation from committing suicide is our and everybody's business. This is why I do not agree that we should get back to other government business. What is the hurry? What more important business is there

than the security and the defence of our nation for years to come? We have been on this subject for nine days. No one should mind spending 90 days when our future is at stake if we can avoid suicide or having to rebuild our defence system if this pipe dream proves to be the failure which we expect it to be. It is not time to stop the debate; it is time for the matter to be taken out of the minister's hands and for us to hear a greater authority on the subject than he is. It is more than time for us to hear from the Prime Minister himself.

[*Translation*]

That is why, Mr. Chairman, there can be no question of putting an end to the debate until the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) himself tells us in this house that he takes full responsibility for that measure, explains what he means by unification, what it will cost the nation, what our allies think of it.

The minister has very clearly lost the confidence of the opposition, the general staff, or a good number of them, newspaper writers and commentators, and a large number of citizens. It is time for the Prime Minister to step in; the Canadian people have the right to expect explanations, either his full approval and his reasons therefor, or his disapproval and his decision to postpone consideration of the matter, after thinking it over and consulting all the parties concerned, in Canada and abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I do believe that the Prime Minister should take the floor.

• (4:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: The hon. member mentioned the absence of the Prime Minister during the whole course of this debate. Is the hon. member of the opinion, in view of the threatened resignation of the Minister of National Defence and the absence of the Prime Minister during this debate, that the Minister of National Defence is really the most powerful member of the Liberal cabinet?

Mr. Régimbal: It would seem so, without a doubt. He feels very much alone, and we have constantly underlined the fact that he is sitting alone.

Mr. Hellyer: I wonder whether the hon. member would permit a question? Would he indicate to the house who wrote that speech, because it certainly did not sound like him?

[Mr. Régimbal.]

Mr. Régimbal: I have a witness in the house who can prove it was written by me. Even the most reasonable people in this house are unanimously of the opinion that unification is a bad move.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Mr. Chairman, I was proud to be a witness this morning in the other place to the installation of the new Governor General, His Excellency the Honourable Roland Michener. I am sure that all hon. members will permit me at this moment to say on their behalf as well as mine that we were all proud to be there at this fine ceremony which brought home to us once more the importance of our system of government. We are proud also of His Excellency and of his gracious lady and the part they played this morning. Canada can take great satisfaction, Mr. Chairman, from her long line of illustrious Governors General. The late incumbent so dear in our memory, Hon. Georges P. Vanier, brought great prestige to this office. I know that the outstanding man Canada recognized and installed in the office this morning will in turn bring his great discernment and knowledge to that high position. The great magnanimity of this outstanding Canadian will bring honour to this position and to his service to Canada as Her Majesty's representative. As the program progressed I thought, as I am sure other hon. members did, of our political system of responsible government under a constitutional monarchy. Like many others in that great chamber I concluded that in this year of our centenary of confederation this system has stood the test of time. May it continue to serve our country far into the many centuries of our future.

Having permitted me to mention the events of the day, Mr. Chairman, we must now get on with this debate. I have listened carefully to the proceedings thus far. Last year I spoke in protest against unification of the armed forces and my remarks appear in *Hansard* at page 9793. I spoke on behalf on the Napanee and Picton militia units in the riding of Prince Edward-Lennox. The policies of this government have annihilated these militia units so they no longer exist. I protested the closing of the armouries in my constituency and in other constituencies. At that time we put forward logical arguments on behalf of the volunteer system, on behalf of the well tried and proven militia system which has been the defence of this country in the past.

The maintenance of these services, the persons who manned them, their methods and

their great principles, have been part of the policy of the Conservative party. We do not believe in abandoning methods and systems that bring to the fore the enterprise of the individual. We do not believe in abandoning productive and reliable existing services that are now and have been employed for the protection and defence of the individual and of our country. We will not sit here passively and submit to the passage of Bill No. C-243 because we believe it is our duty as Canadians to offer constructive criticism to this, the worst military legislation that has ever been presented to a Canadian parliament.

I have been awaiting with interest the rumoured lawsuit the Minister of National Defence said he was going to bring against the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona if he repeated certain utterances outside the house which he had made within the house. The minister has, through his minions in his department, fired all those who would dare offer any opinion against the unification scheme. Through the Prime Minister, the cabinet and party discipline he has been able to silence most of those on the Liberal benches. However, there are bound to be many supporters of the Liberal government who are against the unification policy. Of course, party discipline has a far greater influence on their minds than the happiness or welfare of the members of the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force. I have used this nomenclature, the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force because they still exist. However, if clause 5 of this bill passes those names will pass forever into obscurity and oblivion, which they certainly do not deserve.

I have another point to make. The minister has contended that a man's attitude toward unification has no bearing upon his service with the Department of National Defence. When I was at Trenton the other day I found this statement was not borne out by the facts. An example is clearly evident in Trenton. Air Commodore Diamond, the commander of air transport command at Trenton, who was never an advocate of unification and who had been uneasy about it, was recently retired prematurely. He still had a couple of years to serve. Recently he was replaced by Air Commodore Hull, an advocate of unification who, as of last Friday, was promoted to air vice marshal in charge of the same command.

Mr. Hellyer: I rise on a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman. Air Commodore Diamond retired I believe about three months ahead of his normal retirement time at his own request in order to take a position with private industry. He was a fine, dedicated and gallant officer. There has been a request outstanding for many years to recognize the important part that air transport command plays in the over-all operations of the Canadian armed forces. It was never given the recognition it deserved and I accepted a recommendation of the staff that we promote Air Commodore Hull in a long overdue acknowledgement of the excellence of air transport command and the important part that it plays in the over-all effectiveness of the Canadian armed forces. I have no hesitation in saying that there is no connection of any kind whatever between the beliefs of these two men, because I do not personally know their beliefs, and the recent promotion which took place. It was simply, a long overdue recognition of the relative importance of that command and the excellent air and ground crews who serve under it.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Alkenbrack: I thank the minister for his effort to explain the glaring coincidence that nevertheless continues to exist. I also thank him for correcting me on the length of time that Air Commodore Diamond would have been able to serve. I said that he retired prematurely and the minister has borne that out; there was still time remaining that he could have served. However, the people in the Trenton area as well as the servicemen at the air station there could not help but be aware of the inequitable policy of the Minister of National Defence and of the present government.

What is the reason for this, Mr. Chairman? I have been watching this situation for some time and I contend that the minister and his staff have betrayed the services. I am sure we can all see now what is taking place, something which has been mentioned before. What we are witnessing is sweeping socialism, or perhaps we might better call it creeping socialism. Socialism has now crept up on these three services with the assistance of the minister and the present government.

The government today is not a Liberal government which is carrying on the time-honoured traditions of Liberalism. This government is nothing but a socialist government, consisting of a minority of the members

of this house who are supported on the government benches by the splintered crutches of socialism. This sickly body of members is ready to vote yes at the first opportunity without debating the matter in order to pass this bill and to further additional socialistic policies and legislation which will stifle and stultify individuals in this country.

This is all too evident today, Mr. Chairman, as we watch the actions of this government. They took away one good and distinctive flag and gave us two or three others in its place. In many cases they have removed the coat of arms as a distinctive insignia. Wherever the government could disregard or remove any of Canada's traditions they have done so, especially our Anglo-Saxon traditions.

I wonder what explanation the government will have for a little incident that occurred in the other place this morning when only six bars of the royal anthem were played. The same thing occurred in front of the peace tower.

Mr. Prud'homme: Could I ask the hon. member a question? I understand that six bars are played for the Governor General, nine bars for the Queen's husband, the Duke of Edinburgh, 12 bars for Princess Margaret and the entire anthem for the Queen. That is why six bars were played this morning.

Mr. Alkenbrack: It was most inadequate, Mr. Chairman, and the explanation of the hon. member is also most inadequate. To continue my remarks, what possible advantage can there be in taking from our servicemen their traditions and time-honoured uniforms as well as the insignia that identify them proudly and particularly with the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army or the Royal Canadian Air Force?

I am sure that economy cannot be the reason for this step. Stocks of uniforms and related equipment now held by the government must be of enormous value and represent a tremendous investment. Even at the most conservative estimate the cost of such a changeover must be overwhelming. Not only are the present stocks to be sacrificed but the tremendous cost of new uniforms and equipment must be met as well. No, sir, economy cannot possibly be the reason. Such a measure as this, Mr. Chairman, is obviously self-defeating before it starts. Talking just about cost at this time is useless, but it does remind

[Mr. Alkenbrack.]

me that the present government in its spending practices is the most irresponsible government that Canada has ever had. This government obtains less value for the taxpayer's dollar than has any government in our history.

I ask the minister this question, and I think I know what his answer will be. Why this passion for conformity at this time, this passion to put all our soldiers, sailors and airmen into one uniform? Is this for the sake of appearance or is the minister just anxious to get this measure through in time to send a detachment of our armed forces to Expo in their new green uniforms? I suppose such a consideration is not even worthy of thought.

The existing uniforms of our armed services are hallowed and respected not only by the men who wear them but also by the Canadian people, not just because they are time-honoured but because they have been worn by men who shed their blood in conflict. By whose declaration do these uniforms suddenly become unworthy? While we are speaking in this chamber young men are following in the traditions of Chateauguay, Crysler's Farm, Beaver Dam, Queenston, the Transvaal, Yprès, Vimy Ridge, Dieppe and Hochwald Forest. These are but a few among many names of places where Canadians have served and they ring with courage and with sacrifice. We are now about to discard one more of the many traditions which were so bitterly won in these fateful places.

Mr. Hellyer: Would the hon. member permit another question?

Mr. Alkenbrack: No, Mr. Chairman, I think I have been very generous in giving the minister time, but I will permit a question when I am finished.

Last year I remember accusing this government of following a policy of nihilism, of being interested in nothingness. In face of all of the honour which has been won by our soldiers, sailors and airmen we are proposing to take their trophies away from them. We are going to lump them together in a nondescript, common and unidentifiable cloth shorn of honours and indicative of nothing. Up to now one could identify a serviceman on the street and the honoured occupation of his choice by his uniform. This will not be the case if this bill passes. The minister, the Prime Minister and his cabinet—this cabinet of socialistic nihilists—will have done their work of consigning the three individual defence systems to oblivion.

I suppose that of the three services the navy will be the hardest hit. The uniform of our seamen is the oldest and least changed of the three throughout the years, and it lacks for nothing in the pride with which it is worn. What could possibly replace our naval uniform, Mr. Chairman?

• (4:40 p.m.)

I have a further point to make in opposition to this bill. Certain sections of opinion in this country are against the coercive measures which the minister is proposing. At some time in the future these could lead to the impressing of our youth into the monolith which the minister is trying to build. I have in mind the conscription measures which could result from this legislation.

A great many men joined one or another of the three services because of difficulty in finding civilian employment, or they had dropped out of school. At present they exercise a degree of freedom to the extent that they can enter the service of their choice. Recruiting from this source is one of the mainstreams which has fed our volunteer system, and it has been found good. Unification might well damage this system. A man might wish to join the air force. Under this unification plan he might find himself serving in the navy or in the air force. This is tantamount to conscription.

Mr. Hellyer: I am sorry to disappoint the hon. member but that is not going to happen.

Mr. Alkenbrack: I wish to make a further point. What is it that attracts visitors to the spectacles at Old Fort Henry, Fort York and other historic places where the old drills and formations are reenacted by platoons of men in the direct tradition of those who took part in those engagements long ago? What about the colourful changing of the guard ceremony which is held right here on parliament hill—a tremendous attraction to tourists who come to our country as well as being of tremendous benefit to culture? During the summer months this ceremony is performed by the Canadian Guards, one battalion of whom is stationed at Picton in my own constituency of Prince Edward-Lennox. One is bound to agree without hesitation that on these occasions the colourful and distinctive uniforms are the chief attraction. By what strange process do we reason that the three services cannot work together as an integrated force unless they are dressed in the same uniforms?

Amphibious landings on a gigantic scale were successfully carried out in the second world war. I think particularly of the landings in Normandy on June 6, 1944. One of my brothers who took part in that operation said: "Thank God for the blue-clad navy which made it all possible and for the air force which secured the air over our hard-pressed troops as they found the land beneath their feet."

One is reminded that centuries ago it was the custom to deprive a regiment of its unit badge or some other insignia as a punishment for having retreated contrary to orders or for committing some other piece of gross misconduct. Today we are doing the same to the Canadian armed forces and debasing them for no better reason than political expediency. One of these expedients is the removal of Anglo-Saxon traditions from our services.

Mr. Hellyer: Nonsense.

Mr. Alkenbrack: That is glaringly obvious. It is so obvious that it cannot be anything else but deliberate. If there are any other reasons they are as yet obscure and denied to the knowledge of the Canadian people. Regiments of marching men, men who man ships at sea and submarines beneath the sea, men who fly our aircraft and who service them on the ground have their separate distinctions even within the pattern of their individual services and to insist on driving them into one common mould is to deprive the nation of the efficiency which has arisen because of their pride of service in their separate organizations.

What does our youth think about this question? I quote an excerpt from a first-prize-winning address made by Mr. Glen Davidson of Flinton, Ontario, a student of North Addington high school, at an oratorical contest held at the town of Napanee last week. His subject was unification and I quote one powerful paragraph from the address which this intelligent young man made:

> We now have a volunteer army of men who choose to join either the army, the air force or the navy. If these men are now to be railroaded into the new system, their contracts torn up and themselves forced into a unified force, then their preferences are trampled upon and this can demoralize them as defence men. Moreover, it kills all competition among the three forces and hence will hurt morale.

Mr. Chairman, that is the youth of Canada speaking, and speaking very eloquently and sensibly.

Mr. Nowlan: He won the contest.

Mr. Alkenbrack: I warn the Prime Minister and the government that they should pay attention to the youth of Canada and govern themselves accordingly.

I also wish to quote from the *Globe and Mail* of April 13. This passage may have been quoted earlier. In any case I believe it is timely to mention it. These words appeared in the column headed "Just what was said" and the newspaper quotes Admiral the Earl Mountbatten with reference to the reorganization of the armed forces in Britain. He said:

> In the British reorganization care has been taken to preserve esprit de corps and morale. It has been accepted that to achieve this the three services must retain their uniforms and ranks with an identifiable professional head of their service. The idea of a single uniform and rank structure was also rejected as undesirable and unnecessary. Unified command at the appropriate level is exercised by an officer from any one service, wearing his own uniform and using his own service rank (assisted by an integrated staff) who commands all units of the three services placed under his command.

I am sure Earl Mountbatten's naval record will commend this quotation to the administration.

There is one other point I wish to make. The Minister of National Defence has not made out a good case for unification. He has tried to be a Hitler or a Mussolini or a Napoleon by firing all those who disagree with him and lionizing those who agree. Those who occupy positions of power can always find plenty of Allards during a contentious issue such as this but the invaluable Landymores do not come forward in very great numbers.

• (4:50 p.m.)

I quote here from an editorial which appeared in the Napanee *Beaver* of April 12, a newspaper in my own constituency:

> Neither Defence Minister Hellyer nor any serving officer has been able to make a good strong case for creating a single service with a common uniform and rank structure.
>
> Mr. Hellyer has never been anxious to specify exactly what kind of role he sees for the unified Canadian force. If the defence committee succeeds in clarifying that, even if it fails to stop unification, it will have served a useful purpose.

The Canadian people, all of whom are interested in the preservation of the defence of this country, do not require the Minister of National Defence to be taking any cues from or listening to the admonishments of the Secretary of State for External Affairs or even of the Prime Minister. I say this to him because the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs are pacifists who will do anything for peace, such as the selling out of the interests of Britain and France by the Prime Minister in 1956 of the Suez Canal question whereby he put Colonel Nasser of Egypt in the driver's seat which Nasser has occupied ever since.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Alkenbrack: This won the Nobel peace prize for the Prime Minister in 1957, and it is also sponsored by a socialist and pacifist organization. I say now to the Prime Minister, in the light of the latest happenings in Aden, Arabia, that he should admonish his protégé, Colonel Nasser, to stop fighting the efforts of Britain, so beleaguered at this time in trying to keep the peace in that country to which, I understand, Colonel Nasser has sent upwards of 50,000 troops. I would think the Prime Minister's influence might go a long way with these ruffians.

To return to the Minister of National Defence, I simply ask him to pause for a minute. He should forget about this grandiose plan and forget about playing with those things that are dear to the hearts of the men who serve this country. He should think about his own personal duty in the position of power that he occupies. He should think about his duty with respect to the defence of Canada. The minister of defence of this or of any other democratic country is not supposed to be a pacifist. It is the duty of the Minister of National Defence to see that the most effective war making instruments and devices are available at all times to the people of this country through their armed forces, no matter what the international situation is, no matter what the Prime Minister tells him, and regardless of what the Secretary of State for External Affairs informs him is the state of NATO, NORAD, the United Nations or any other international defence organization.

I remind the Minister of National Defence that he does not perform duties such as his with normal and expected efficiency by tearing down the morale of the men who have to fight for Canada. In any and all eventualities the minister might better resign than force this bill through by closure at this time. The people of Canada are watching again, as they did before, and the Liberal parliamentary pedigree is running true to form: pipe line debate—closure; flag debate—closure; and now unification of the armed forces into the same pants and jacket—closure. I admonish the minister to think twice before he proceeds with legislation that is going to be so injurious to the men who defend our country, so

injurious to their morale, and does nothing for the defence of Canada at this time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, the question I was going to ask the hon. gentleman is this: Does he really believe that the other ranks, particularly in the air force and the army, are proud of their summer uniforms?

Mr. Alkenbrack: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think that all ranks are proud of their uniforms.

Mr. Hellyer: Is the hon. member not aware, that the cloth is so bad that after they wear the uniforms on the parade ground three or four times they look like they have not been pressed for days or weeks, and is he not aware that they can hardly wait to get a decent cut and decent cloth so they can be smart on parade and wherever they go?

Mr. Alkenbrack: Mr. Chairman, I would refute that statement with the suggestion to the minister that if the cloth is inferior, if it will not stand up to normal use in all normal weather, then that is a matter for him to investigate. If it is inferior that is his fault.

Mr. Hellyer: That is what we are doing.

Mr. Alkenbrack: The remedy is to change—

Mr. Hellyer: We are doing something about it.

Mr. Alkenbrack: —the cloth, not change the uniform.

Mr. MacEwan: Mr. Chairman, this is the first opportunity I have had to speak on this bill in committee of the whole. I spoke on it before it was referred to the defence committee which held lengthy hearings that were most instructive. I have not changed my mind one iota in the interim. In fact the committee hearings and the evidence which came from them have pointed out more and more that this bill should not be proceeded with.

I heard the hon. member for Laval speak today and on April 7 I heard my hon. friend from Chicoutimi speak on this bill. In that connection I refer to page 14675 of *Hansard* for April 7 where the hon. member for Chicoutimi is recorded as saying:

> Opposition to this bill on emotional grounds is understandable but I cannot condone it. Opposition on logical grounds indicates a lack of information, but opposition to this program when hon. members have had as much information and evidence as has been presented to them by the standing committee on defence is nothing short of obstruction and is a reactionary attitude.

He went on to say:

> The same members who opposed the flag are now opposing the unification of the forces, and for the same reasons. They are rooted in the traditions of a foreign country—

To this I reply that I attempt to be and am broadminded on matters which go on inside this house and outside it. I enjoy getting together with members like the hon. member for Chicoutimi and singing many French songs, "Le Régiment" and so on, and in turn I expect French Canadian members, from the province of Quebec and other parts of the country to have some idea of my feelings in matters of tradition.

If I am accused of being emotional at times, I do not care. I am of Scottish descent. If I feel a bit of emotion when I hear the skirl of the pipes and the swish of the kilt, or when I sit back on Sunday at home and listen to Sir Harry Lauder, then I say I am proud of my heritage just as I know the hon. member for Chicoutimi is proud of his, as he has every right to be. I say to hon. members, no matter what your heritage and nationality have been, you have the right to be Canadians. That is not the leading factor. The leading factor was the evidence so very aptly brought out in the defence committee, which very amply points to the fact that this bill should not be proceeded with. I shall go into details with respect to that as I go along.

I always enjoy listening to the hon. member for Colchester-Hants. He is a man who is close to the people, a man with extensive military experience and a lot of good common sense. One thing which he emphasized so well this afternoon was that if we proceed with this bill at this time we cannot turn around in the future and make changes. I believe it was the hon. member for Trois-Rivières who said, when he was asked by opposition members to show a little self-control, that if the government was making a mistake in respect of the bill the voters will pass judgment and turn out the government at the next election. This matter was referred to by the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes. This legislation is not ordinary legislation; it is legislation which has to do with the defence of Canada.

I believe there is ample reason for not proceeding with this bill. The first is the defence of Canada. We know that at the present time there are three armed services and I believe they are most necessary. Then there is the matter of our international commitments. I liked the way in which the hon. member for

Qu'Appelle put the situation when he spoke in the house. He set out the various matters in respect of national defence which must be looked at. He put forward what I would call a legal brief. I may be jumping around in making my presentation, but this is the way I like to set out things. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle outlined the situation very well. He went into the matter of the defence of Canada, our international commitments in respect of NATO and NORAD and our role with the peace keeping forces throughout the world.

Other members on this side of the house have gone into the evidence which was given before the committee. I do not intend to spend any time on this. In my opinion the evidence given before the committee by such distinguished witnesses as General Moncel pointed out that with a unified force our role can be only that of peace keeping. We know that the principles of NORAD and NATO probably will be renewed in 1968 or 1969.

• (5:00 p.m.)

As I have said, we cannot turn back. I believe we should hesitate now, pause to see what our role will be internationally and then cut out our defence suit to fit that role. The policy of the New Democratic Party, of course, is one of peace keeping. I see the hon. member for Kootenay West sitting there. General Moncel said in effect that if unification were carried out peace keeping would be the only role for our defence forces.

Mr. Herridge: Correct.

Mr. MacEwan: I stated that I would not go fully into the evidence given before the committee and I do not intend to do so. However, there is one matter mentioned by Admiral Rayner to which I should like to refer. This is something which is most important especially to areas such as mine on the Atlantic coast. On page 2006 of minutes of proceedings and evidence No. 31 of the committee on national defence for March 13, 1967, Admiral Rayner said:

> The Minister assumed office in April 1963. Here is what has happened to the navy since that time:
>
> (a) It has been run down by nearly 4,000 men.
>
> (b) The numbers of ships in commission were reduced from 64 in July 1963 to 34 in July 1966. Now, in 1967, we are informed there are only 28 ships left, of which a mere 16 are immediately available.

[Mr. MacEwan.]

He goes on to mention the matter of experienced officers being prematurely retired and then states:

> After nearly three years nothing new and substantial seems to have been added to the naval equipment program except for gas turbine propulsion in the helicopter-destroyers. All the principal items were either under way, or in the planning stage, before the present minister took office. At least three years have been lost in the ship replacement program and every day that passes without ordering the helicopter-destroyer widens the gap.

Last week I asked the minister about this. He said that he understood tenders would be called for these in March. The minister did not say definitely this would be done but that he expected it would be. Now he says it will be later in the year. In the *Chronicle-Herald* of March 16, 1967 there is an article headed "Nagging Doubts".

Mr. Hellyer: In what paper?

Mr. MacEwan: The *Chronicle-Herald.*

Mr. Hellyer: It is the only one.

Mr. MacEwan: The minister says it is the only one. I will refer to another in a moment. The article reads as follows:

> Doubts about whether the Royal Canadian Navy's anti-submarine role is to be maintained, or expanded, under the defence department's unification program continue, notwithstanding Defence Minister Hellyer's protestations.
>
> The latest to express such doubts is Captain P. B. Ryan, U.S.N., former American naval attache in Ottawa, who has written an article which asks whether the minister and his aides are "relying on the U.S. Navy to assume the burden of anti-submarine warfare operations for both countries?" Presumably, Captain Ryan is worried about the possibility that a future emphasis on peace-keeping operations might reduce the Canadian navy to a troop transport role.

The article points out that the minister denied this. Then it continues:

> Why, he asked—

The minister.

> —would the government continue a military procurement program, including destroyers and submarines, if that were its sole intention?
>
> The reason for such doubts as Captain Ryan expresses undoubtedly is that the navy's anti-sub ship replacement program appears to be of a magnitude which can only increase the average age of fleet ships, and thus their eventual reduction in numbers. In short, not enough new ships are projected to keep the fleet at its present, and reduced, strength.

In line with that I quote from a second paper in the Atlantic area, the New Glasgow *Evening News.* This paper has reprinted a letter which appeared in the Toronto *Globe*

and Mail. It is from a very distinguished Pictonian, a man who served his country well in the last war, Rear Admiral Leonard W. Murray. Rear Admiral Murray comes from an area in my constituency known as Granton and now lives in the United Kingdom. In respect of the officers he points out the following:

—it will be difficult for their NATO counterparts to be able to realize that their old friend Lieutenant-Commander Huggins who is the C.O. of H.M.C.S. *Chaudiere* is now some sort of a peculiar major in command of the C.A.F. *Chaudiere* or that the captain of the C.A.F. *Bonaventure* is a brigadier. It is all so damed silly and to no good purpose.

He points out that the navy takes a pride in being able to show how smart a Canadian can be. He says:

They are sailors and wish to be recognized as sailors and they do not relish the task of putting Canada across in a nondescript green uniform of the Canadian Rangers.

He calls the force the Canadian Rangers. I do not know whether that is the name. When speaking on second reading I pointed out what the native people in Halifax had to say about the jolly green jumper. I do not know whether I can find the quotation again but it is worth rereading. One sailor said a couple of years ago he would not have thought of wearing his dress uniform on the street because it was very worn. He said, however, that he would not buy a new one because he knew the jolly green jumper was coming. With the jolly green jumper coming he did not think it seemed to matter.

A saltier colleague put his feelings in more colourful language. He said:

I'll be flipped if I'm going to wear the Jolly Green Flipping Jumper regardless of what Paul Flipping Hellyer flipping well says.

I do not know whether the uniform is going to be the green uniform of the rangers or the jolly green jumper, but I do believe that nothing can be gained by having this new uniform. The minister did not answer the hon. member who asked whether this will be the uniform used at Expo. We will have to wait and see. I would not be surprised. Perhaps there will be a guard of honour outside one of the pavilions and we will have to go and watch it perform.

Rear Admiral Murray, a man who served his country well, said—I think this is most important and it goes along with what the hon. member for Colchester-Hants had to say—that he does not believe any economy would be achieved by unification. He went on to state:

• (5:10 p.m.)

Anyone can save money on the fighting services by the simple expedient of not spending it. This has been done frequently with the Canadian forces in the past, but it has always shown up very quickly in the value of the end product...

In the case of the fighting services, since the lives of your sons may some day depend upon its efficiency, no efficiency can be considered satisfactory which is less than 100 per cent. Any money saved at the expense of the end product is not a saving at all. It merely means that the remainder which has been spent is spent to no avail in building up a fool's paradise. It cannot but fail the nation in the hour of need.

The minister has set out various points and it has been argued that most of the objections to unification and this bill have come from admirals, generals and so on. Let me point out that two O.R.'s from the air force came to see me a few days ago to place before me their feelings in respect of unification. Some of their senior officers, one of whom was due for re-engagement soon, interviewed them and said: "Do not worry, have faith". Those were the exact words. The senior officers did not spell out what unification would mean to the future of these young men. I was glad to talk with these O.R.'s from the air force as I had talked before with a number of junior members of the navy but none from the air force. These young men do not know what unification will mean to them. They feel the navy has been let down and they have reached the end of their careers.

Many young men in our forces will soon have to decide on re-engagement. If many of them have this attitude they are not likely to re-engage. I suggest this will leave the air force and army in a similar position to that in which the navy finds itself, unable because of a lack of personnel to man its ships. Soon we will not have men to fly our aircraft.

Not only are top ranking and retired officers of our forces complaining about unification but many O.R.'s are concerned about what will happen. They feel that something is in the air; yet all they are told by their senior officers is to keep faith. I should like to ask to what they are supposed to be faithful.

The hon. member for Halifax and the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings spoke very forcibly on the situation in respect of the naval recruiting and training base at *Cornwallis.* One hon. member pointed out the necessity of having such a base located close to the coast. Surely trainees should be trained

to sail ships. The evidence of Admiral Rayner to the committee made this very clear.

As pointed out by the hon. member for Halifax, I believe these bases are extremely important to the economy of the Atlantic area. They are also tied in with our anti-submarine role in NORAD and NATO. If we keep retiring ships without building new ones with adequate crews, we cannot perform that role. So far as our naval force is concerned it well end up with a transport function. That is not good enough.

If we take the step of unification I believe, like the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, that we will regret it very much. That hon. member made a suggestion to the minister last week to the effect that we stand the contentious clauses and deal with the remainder of the bill. In this way we could have the opportunity to discuss other parts of the bill. Apparently the minister has decided to reject that suggestion and proceed on the same basis.

Many members on this side have argued that we should move forward very slowly with unification. The defence of Canada is the most important feature of our national defence organization. We realize that because of the size of this country and its population we cannot carry on alone. Let us go ahead with integration. I have always agreed that the administration and service corps of our services should be integrated. In view of the fact that the renewal of two international agreements relating to NORAD and NATO will be coming up soon we should not take the step of unification.

Many people feel that in order to be progressive we must have change. I believe it was the hon. member for Laval who said that this step involved only a technicality and meant nothing else. Apparently he is in favour of change for the sake of change. Edmund Burke once said:

> People will not look forward to posterity who never look backward to their ancestors.

The immortal Burns, for whom I have a soft spot in my heart, said to the masses.

> The best laid schemes o' mice and men
> Gang aft a-gley;
> An' lea'e us nought but grief and pain,
> For promis'd joy.

Let us go back even farther to the Greeks. I think the following can be related to the minister and this bill:

> Men having often abandoned what was visible for the sake of what was uncertain have not got what they expected and have lost what they had—being unfortunately an enigmatical sort of calamity.

[Mr. MacEwan.]

Mr. Stewart: Who was the author of that statement?

Mr. MacEwan: That is from Aethenaeus, 200 A.D., Austingave Demetrius Phalerius.

Mr. Hellyer: He was a Conservative too, was he not?

Mr. MacEwan: I think it is so appropriate the minister should take that statement from the Greeks and have it framed. Perhaps if he hung it in his office or put it under his pillow and slept on it he might withdraw this bill.

Our anti-submarine role is not only important to the defence of this country on the east coast but it is important for another reason which came to light during a trial which took place in Ottawa. A young chap was accused of taking certain maps from the former department of mines and technical surveys. An article appeared in this regard in the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* on April 8 of this year. A witness was being asked about the operation of Russian trawlers off our coast. He apparently refused to answer questions on the grounds of security. After a short recess he went back into the stand and was asked:

> Is it suspected they are doing a hydrographic survey?

Commander Norton then replied:

> Among other things, yes, sir.

That is another indication of the importance of our anti-submarine role. Surely we must have an adequate navy in view of situations such as the presence of this large trawler fleet off our coast.

• (5:20 p.m.)

There are other matters which I could go into but I shall not at the moment. I do not intend to repeat the arguments that have been put forward except to say to the Prime Minister of this country: Tread softly for our good internationally and especially nationally. For the good of the defence of Canada, withdraw this bill.

Mr. Chatterton: Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words with respect to the unification bill. My objective will be to debunk some of the propaganda being spread from the other side of the chamber. The minister has been quoted so often as an authority that I thought I might bypass him and confine my remarks to the people on the other side who are supposedly most knowledgeable in this area, namely, the two chairmen of the defence committee, the hon. member for Victoria

(B.C.) and the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra.

One of the first pieces of propaganda being spread from the other side is that the debate now going on is adversely affecting the morale of the armed forces. I quote from the speech made by the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) as reported at page 14775 of *Hansard*:

> I have no hesitation whatsoever in saying that this house is in the process of creating, if it has not already partly created, a problem of morale in the armed forces which requires active consideration by all of us as members of parliament.

Again I quote from the speech of the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) as reported on the same page:

> For example, were the armed forces of Canada to become demoralized by protracted debate and ridicule lightly heaped upon this new idea by this house, we would all suffer.

Then we get the echo from the hon. member who was later chairman of the defence committee. It is to be found at page 14715 of *Hansard* there the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra is reported as having said:

> It is necessary that we finish the work of reorganization now, get off the back of the chief of staff and let him get on with his work. It is essential that these men should know what to call themselves if they are to have pride and a sense of esprit de corps as members of the new force. It is essential that this be done now and that we cut out this ridiculous debate.

To my mind this argument is one of desperation. The theme of hon. members opposite is that by our continuing this debate we are in effect causing morale in the armed forces to drop. This is an argument of extreme desperation because there has been ample evidence that a number of separations from the armed forces occurred long before this debate started. From listening to the opinions of members of the armed forces, certainly those in the greater Victoria area which includes the base at Esquimalt, the fact of the matter is that morale is so low that the arguments we are presenting are offering a ray of hope at least to members of the navy.

So much for the first piece of bunk, namely, that this debate is affecting the morale of the armed forces. I come to the second piece of bunk, namely, that unification and integration are the same thing. For many months propaganda has issued from the Ottawa office of Mr. Leaky Lee to the people of Canada that integration and unification are the same thing. Reams of propaganda material have been issued showing the savings affected by integration. The obvious implication was that similar savings would be accomplished by unification. The minister has recently devised the term "the integration-unification cycle". The hon. member for Victoria (B.C.), at page 14774 of *Hansard*, tries to continue the spreading of this false propaganda when he says:

> My personal definition or view, which incidentally is the same today as when I started considering the matter many monthe ago, is that when we speak of unification we are talking about taking integration as far as it is practical to go.

We on this side of the chamber have not said that integration has been wrong although we may have differed with some of its aspects. But there is an obvious attempt not only by the minister and the two chairmen of the defence committee but by other hon. members on that side to try to confuse the Canadian people as to the difference between integration and unification. If I need any support for my argument I can quote from an editorial which appeared in the Winnipeg *Free Press* of April 4, 1967, as follows:

> It is beyond comprehension that Mr. Hellyer, by insisting on total unification, should ask parliament now to endorse a completely new defence structure, entirely foreign to both British and U.S. defence organizations. Unification, and elimination of service identities, despite Mr. Hellyer's statements to the contrary, have been openly rejected by Britain after much study—as declared in the white paper of 1963. A check with Washington would also reveal that the U.S. has no intention of unifying its combat units. To the contrary, the present purpose is to build up the proud reputations and esprit de corps of individual fighting units, whether it be the "Green Berets", the Marines, or the First Cavalry Regiment. For Canada to launch into a radical experiment which will make our defence organization incompatible with the U.S. and British organization constitutes the most drastic step ever taken with the defences of this country. It could, in large measure, destroy our existing defence structure.

• (5:30 p.m.)

The first argument to which I would like to refer is that put forward by hon. members on the opposite side of the chamber that those people who oppose the unification bill are, so to speak, old fogeys, sticks-in-the-mud, people who do nothing but look backward and do not look to the future. The Minister of National Defence has given the impression that the uniforce he is going to create will be a modern force which will accommodate the requirements of a modern society. I quote from the speech made by the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.), a man who has had distinguished service in the Royal Canadian Navy. In the speech he made in the house on May 10 he gave examples of how in the past the navy had resisted changes. The first of these changes was when it was suggested that naval

men should be allowed to mix cola with a tot of rum. I can do no better than quote from an editorial in the Victoria *Colonist* of April 14. It is headed "A Rum Business", and reads as follows:

> When Canadian sailors were allowed to mix cola with their rum tots, former R.C.N. captain Mr. David Groos, M.P., said in the Commons, "you should have heard the uproar" from some of his "overly conservative" one-time naval colleagues. Whereas, he added, Admiral Nelson would have liked the mix because he was a very progressive admiral.
>
> One hopes Mr. Hellyer was listening, for a year or two ago he was reported as telling local naval officers when pressing his unification theme that they weren't living in Nelsonian days. And he didn't mean this as a compliment to the world-renowned admiral of history.
>
> But speaking by the way how does Mr. Groos know that Nelson would have liked to have his drink diluted with something else? He may have preferred it straight and true, the stronger the better.
>
> What Lord Nelson wouldn't have liked, one feels sure, would have been to see his navy downgraded and its proud title absolished. Mr. Groos should have been more careful in his allusions to famous men. For he is decidedly in favour of Mr. Hellyer's plans.
>
> So much does he support the unification bill that, he told the Commons, he would return to the navy willingly tomorrow.
>
> What "navy", one may ask? When the bill goes through there will be no formation of such designation; there will only be one composite armed force, under a name yet to be chosen.

Next there is a reference to me which, being very modest, I will omit. However, I will read the last two paragraphs of this editorial:

> If one is to judge by Mr. Hellyer's advocacy on the subject, there is to be no limit to the extent of military unification. The defence minister in fact claims that as far as military organization is concerned Canada "will be leading the world".
>
> It would be interesting to hear what defence staffs of the major military nations think of that chauvinistic boast. And Mr. Groos also.

The hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) tried to convey to the house the idea that the armed forces, and in particular the navy, have always been too conservative, have never wanted to face the facts and have always looked at the rear view mirror. I received a letter from another naval officer in Victoria who said that the only reason the navy personnel objected to the Canadian volunteer service medal being worn was that it was made of compressed cardboard and it split at the seams at sea. Furthermore, the same medal was awarded also to conscripts. The hon. member for Victoria (B.C.), in trying to show how outmoded and backward the navy was, also gave the example of the painting of the maple leaf on the funnels of Canadian warships. This officer told me that the maple leaves were ordered removed from the funnels by order of the admiral in charge of the various ships because it could be used as a mark to aim at.

The hon. member for Victoria (B.C.), also used as an example of how backward-looking the navy was the fact that during the last war navy personnel objected to wearing the Canada flashes on their shoulders. The officer from Victoria to whom I have already referred wrote to me as follows:

> We didn't need Canada flashes. We could tell a Canadian by the cut of his jib. The word "Canada" was on our buttons, so why the shoulder badges?

It seems to me that the examples given by the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) were the poorest examples that could be used by an ex-officer of the Royal Canadian Navy, one who gave distinguished service while in the navy, to illustrate that the navy was always behind the times. Even if his arguments that the navy refused to wear shoulder badges and certain medals, that it refused to have the maple leaf painted on the funnels of warships and so on, were correct, how can they be used as reasons for the major step being proposed by the minister and the government for the reorganization of our armed forces?

The idea that any opposition to change is being advanced by people looking to the past was promoted also by Major General F. F. Worthington in an article in The Ottawa *Journal* of Tuesday, April 14, 1967. The headline of the article was: "Annihilation Could Be Result Of Keeping Old Generals". That is an eye-catching headline. The article reads in part as follows:

> Unification of certain trade structures and professions cannot help but be beneficial in achieving efficiency and economy in such branches as medical, pay, communications, transport, police, mechanical engineering and so on.

So even General Worthington, the great advocate of annihilating all the qualified and expert people in the armed forces, admits that only the unification of certain services would be of advantage.

The most ridiculous argument I have heard from the other side came from the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra. By this time no doubt the hon. member and many others and possibly many members of the cabinet have heard from people all across Canada. They are becoming worried. I know full well that last October and November there was very little

interest across the country in unification. As a result of the very clever propaganda put out by the minister's office, people accepted the statement that unification and integration were the same thing. The minister quoted reams of figures to show how integration had saved the taxpayers' money. Of course, the obvious implication was that more money would be saved by unification.

• (5:40 p.m.)

When the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra and others started to hear from people across the country that perhaps unification and integration were not the same thing and that they were perturbed about the possible destruction of the identity of the three fighting forces, the chairman of the defence committee came up with a most ingenious idea. He told the people that the only thing involved in Bill No. C-243 was a change in the name of the armed forces. I should like to quote from the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra as recorded on page 14714 of *Hansard*:

> Only one thing of any real importance remained to be done and that was to give the new single force which we had created in 1964 a name.

On page 14715 we find these words:

> I repeat that this bill asks us to do only one thing of consequence. It asks us to give our forces a name: "The Canadian Armed Forces."

How desperate can those on the other side get when they will say that the only effect of this bill—this statement was made by the chairman of the defence committee, one who supposedly has the confidence of the government and the endorsation of the Minister of National Defence—is to give the forces a new name. I should like to hear from the Minister of National Defence before long as to his reaction to the interpretation of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra of this bill. All it seeks to do, according to the hon. member, is to give a new name to the forces that already exist.

If that is all this bill does the question arises, why the hurry? Why is there this pressure? The minister has said that after the passage of the bill it will not be proclaimed for four or five months. Why the rush if the only effect of this bill is to change the name? Why the insistence by the minister that the morale of the armed forces must be preserved and we must proceed immediately to approve this bill during this session? He says that the department cannot get on with the reorganization until the unification bill has been passed. In my opinion this is an argument of the utmost desperation.

Let me point out the difference between the old sections 15 to 18 of the National Defence Act and the provisions of this bill. The old sections of the National Defence Act read in part as follows:

> The Canadian forces are the naval, army and air forces of Her Majesty raised by Canada and consist of three services, namely, the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force.
>
> There shall be a component of each service of the Canadian forces consisting of officers and men who are enrolled for continuing full-time military service; and those components are referred to in this act as the regular forces.

The fact of the matter is that the main effect of Bill No. C-243 would be to destroy the identity of the three fighting services of our armed forces. Yet the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra dares to say that the only significant change that would be occasioned by the passage of this bill would be to change the name of the armed forces as already created by Bill No. C-90. No wonder the Liberals are not putting up any more speakers; they have obviously run out of even the most desperate arguments.

I believe this would be a good time to quote from an editorial which appeared in the Winnipeg *Free Press* on Wednesday, April 4:

> In his initial position on "integration" Mr. Hellyer's statement indicated both wisdom and a broad-minded approach.

I do not completely agree with that statement. We were in agreement with the general idea of integration, although we believed the minister committed many faults in bringing it about.

> Seemingly when he raised the matter of total unification, however, he was unable to accept the fact that his most experienced officers, both outside and within the service, advised strongly against it. This qualified and considered advice was interpreted by Mr. Hellyer as interference and personal opposition to his will, an attempt to obstruct and thwart his own ambitions. In this context, Mr. Hellyer has apparently determined to plunge blindly ahead regardless of any harm done to himself, the services, his government or the nation.

Surely by now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of National Defence and the government must have some inkling of the serious opposition to the proposed unification measure. I have received a great number of letters on this question. Incidentally, I would venture to say that the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) is out of touch with the people at the Esquimalt base. Judging by the letters I have received and by

the telephone calls I received when I was home for Easter, there is great concern amongst the members of the navy at Esquimalt. Quite a number of these people are afraid to let the way they actually feel be known. This letter is typical of the ones I have received from junior officers and describes some of the penalties that are involved. I should like to read from this letter:

> We have seen statements by the Minister of National Defence which imply that dissatisfied personnel may resign with notice—but with no other benefit. Although there have been opinions expressed as to the legality of compulsory conversion from the old services to the new, there has been little emphasis on obtaining for those who do wish to resign, some recognition for services rendered.
>
> To give you a specific example of some of the economic effects presently involved, a 31 year old lieutenant with a wife and three young children would receive: no pension; no rehabilitation leave for 13 years' service; no interest on pension contributions returned (less income tax); no portability of pension beyond the civil service; and no relocation expenses. Since in my own case I should wish to return to the west coast, the cost of moving family and effects would be about $4,000—a little more than returned contributions. Thus at the very outset of a fresh start I should be in debt.
>
> This is part of the price to be paid for a resignation by a junior officer on a point of principle.

• (5:50 p.m.)

I would ask the minister to keep this in mind. To my knowledge there are a great number of cases of members of the Royal Canadian Navy who would not wish to continue once the unification bill is passed. However, leaving the ranks would make things so difficult for them that they have little alternative but to stay in the armed forces. In effect, Mr. Chairman, this amounts to compulsory service. Surely the minister will realize that people who continue to serve against their will because they are forced to do so for economic reasons cannot give of their best to the navy or to other branches of the armed forces.

The Prime Minister has been strangely silent in this debate. He did make a brief press announcement following Air Chief Marshal Miller's evidence, seeming to be impressed with that evidence. Consequent upon the statement of the Prime Minister we had hoped that he would make a speech in the house. This is a matter of great national importance possibly affecting the security and sovereignty of Canada. Certainly it is causing great doubts in the minds of people across the country. Therefore I feel it is time for the Prime Minister formally to associate himself

one way or the other with the policy announced by the Minister of National Defence.

Mr. Churchill: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Chatterton: Certainly.

Mr. Churchill: The hon. member is mentioning the Prime Minister. Has the hon. member any reason for the Prime Minister's complete indifference to this debate? Is it because the Prime Minister is afraid of the Minister of National Defence?

Mr. Chatterton: This is why I mentioned in the first place that questions are being asked not only by the members of the opposition but also by people across the country. They are asking where the Prime Minister stands on this question. This is a government bill dealing with a matter of great importance to Canada. Yet the Prime Minister has not spoken on it with the exception of an indirect reference to the bill when he had read the evidence given by Air Chief Marshal Miller. Certainly we had hoped the Prime Minister would speak.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Chatterton: Mr. Chairman, in closing, if I can just urge—

The Deputy Chairman: Does the committee unanimously agree to the hon. member continuing?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chatterton: If hon. members on the other side listen they do not understand, or what they hear they do not want to hear.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Why don't you make a contribution then?

Mr. Chatterton: Why does the hon. member not stand up and make a speech? A great number of members on the other side remain silent on this question. How many of the ministers on the front benches have stood up and made a speech? The Minister of Transport made a contribution, and I have never heard such a lame defence of any government measure as that made by him. He did not even refer to the subject matter of the bill. But how many other members on the front benches have spoken, Mr. Chairman? After all, this is an important measure. The Minister

of National Defence says that it will be a great thing for Canada, that it will create a force to serve Canada in the future.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chatterton: Why do hon. members opposite not support the minister and make a speech? Are they afraid?

An hon. Member: Let us bring it to a vote.

Mr. Chatterton: They are trained seals. Why does the Prime Minister not make a speech?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Let us take a vote and then we will find out who has support.

Mr. Chatterton: That is the old, arrogant attitude of the minister—we know we are right so let us vote. That has been the attitude of the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) as well as the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra. Why does the Prime Minister not stand up and say where he stands?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Let us vote on the matter; that is the attitude of democracy.

Mr. Chatterton: Surely this house is entitled to hear from the Prime Minister of Canada—

Some hon. Members: Time up.

Mr. Chatterton: —and leader of the government as to where he stands on the question of unification, a matter which a great number of people in this country feel could affect the very future and sovereignty of this nation. Why is the Prime Minister not in the house listening to the speeches? May I call it six o'clock.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I would ask hon. members for their customary indulgence, so that I may read the different questions to be debated at the time of adjournment tonight.

It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be debated at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette): Public buildings—Ottawa—inquiry as to contracts for demolition; the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow): Housing—inquiry as to possibility of meeting economic council target; the hon. member for Charlevoix: discontinuance of passenger service between Quebec and La Malbaie.

[*English*]

Mr. Sherman: Mr. Chairman, my constituency could not be described as a military constituency or one that has a direct economic interest in the ramifications of the bill under consideration at the present time, but I should like to participate at this point in the debate to emphasize one or two matters that I think are important. I also wish to prevail upon the indulgence of the committee in order to move into an allied area and say one or two things which I think are of equal importance.

With respect to the unification aspect of the present bill, if the various regiments and corps of the army are intended to survive the unification procedure I wonder whether it is possible to make the assumption or to reach the conclusion that the mere disappearance of the army as a service will not make much practical difference to those serving in it. The permanent nature of the army's subdivisions, corps and regiments means that a soldier's first loyalty is to that subdivision to which he belongs—his corps or regiment. His loyalty is there, and this is why soldiers have been known to attempt every trick and to use any procedure in the book to avoid being posted to another unit.

However, I suggest that the disappearance of the navy and the air force as separate entities compares with the disappearance of the army as a separate totality is a very different matter. Sailors and airmen are going to be deprived of a permanent institution to which they feel a loyalty of their own. If this were the case with the army it might be possible in the end to overcome this weakness by building up a single loyalty on the part of all three services to the new combined service that is proposed. However, one questions the possibility and the likelihood of that being done if the individual corps, regiments and units of the army continue to exist. The soldiers will continue to have a sense of belonging to the artillery, the Black Watch, the Royal Engineers and so on, and within these groups they will feel at home. The sailors and the airmen will have nowhere to feel at home; they will be permanent outsiders and their morale is bound to suffer.

• (6:00 p.m.)

This could be avoided, theoretically, by widening the army's corps structure to include all three services. Thus, all gunners

could be put into a single artillery corps. One doubts, however, that this would work. Techniques of gunnery on land are so different from those at sea that it would not be practical to exchange gunners between sea and land, and unless this could be done the corps would never develop the cohesion which is so essential, nor would it develop the loyalty which is so necessary to the proper fulfillment of its functions.

What the effect of all this will be on the navy and the air force is hard to say. It is possible that it may not have much effect on the air force. This is because the air force does not fight as a force. It is unique in that the actual fighting is done by a very small proportion of its numbers. The fighting members of an R.C.A.F. squadron are so few that they can, and do, build up a squadron loyalty in a very short space of time. The vast majority of air force personnel are required to keep planes flying and to put them into the air. The pilots are the men who go to fight. It must be exceedingly difficult to create and maintain any esprit de corps within the ground staff of the air force, and this includes all its non-commissioned ranks.

One would expect the effect on the navy to be catastrophic. Warfare in the navy is total, even more so than in the army. Even in an infantry battalion there are some men who are not in the front line. But in a ship everyone is in the war. If the ship sinks all hands sink with it. A high state of morale among the whole crew is essential aboard any navy vessel and it is difficult to see how this can possibly be achieved unless the sailors who man the ship are proud of being sailors, and they will not be proud of being sailors unless there is some recognizable organization of sailors to which they belong and with which they can identify themselves. This is the organization we now know as the navy.

The minister's answer to this argument could take one of two forms, as I see it: First, that the separate regiments and corps within the army could be abolished. If the hon. gentleman is planning to do this I suggest he should do it before doing anything else and see whether he can run an army without any regiments and corps. The present time would seem to be the logical point at which to undertake such an experiment—an experiment on a small scale rather than on a large scale. Or he might say, in the second place, that we could if necessary create a naval corps within the unified force. But this would make nonsense of unification, would it not? He would just be recreating the navy. Nothing would have been achieved except for the change of uniform and rank structure.

On the subject of rank one cannot help notice that the two lowest ranks in the new force are to be corporal and private. This gives rise to two interesting questions. In the artillery, as most of us know, corporals are called bombardiers. One wonders whether it is intended to change this practice and call them corporals. In the rifle regiments privates are called riflemen, in the engineers, sappers, in the armoured corps, troopers, and so on. Are we to assume that all these ranks and titles are to be changed and that all the men serving in these capacities are to be identified as privates or corporals? If the answer to these questions is yes, there will of course be howls of protest from various parts of the army. If the answer is no, then why is a seaman to be called a private while the troopers' title is to be left alone?

Another potentially dangerous result of unification in my view is that the tactical thinking of the numerically strongest arm, the army, will come to dominate that of the navy. If we call an admiral a general we are half way to thinking that a sailor is merely a soldier who fights on water. There is a great myth about unification, it seems to me, the myth that this is a forward thinking and progressive concept whereas in reality, historically speaking, it is retrogressive to the extent no less than four full centuries. Contrary to what is being said, the idea of a unified fighting service is not a new one. Far from being progressive in his thinking, the minister is putting the clock back 400 years. Before that time all fighting was done by soldiers and all armed forces were commanded by generals. The English were the first to realize that fighting at sea was a different art from fighting on land. So they organized a separate navy. This happened during the reign of Elizabeth I. When Philip II of Spain decided to attack, he put his army on a fleet of ships commanded by his best generals and sent them off to England. This fleet was, of course, the famous armada. The naval battle in the channel was the last ever fought by a unified service and the armada was destroyed just because it was a unified force. The men who commanded it were soldiers and their object was to fight a land battle on the water. The English fleet was commanded by sailors who knew how to fight a naval battle. And they won.

The lesson was not lost on the men of those days and soon every nation separated its navy

from its army. It would seem, however, that the present government does not care to take cognizance of this lesson of 400 years historical standing and is planning to make the same mistake as was made during the period of Philip II, thus putting naval and military organization back at least four centuries.

These are some of the thoughts I have had on the question of unification and the bill before us. There are one or two other arguments which are set out in an excellent series of newspaper articles written by the publisher of the Winnipeg *Free Press*, Mr. R. S. Malone. The former colonel makes his points so eloquently and well that I would not presume to try to improve upon them and I ask the indulgence of the committee to put one or two of his conclusions on the record. Mr. Malone was the author of a series of articles which appeared on the editorial pages of the Winnipeg *Free Press* during August, 1966. In the course of preliminary articles in the series he drew attention to two or three of essential errors in the program of unification now being undertaken by members of the government. In one of these articles toward the conclusion of the series he wrote:

> It is considered by many qualified observers that by sacrificing regimental spirit and identification Canada will lose far more than she can gain in dollar economies or efficiency by forcing integration down to the level of combat units, either army, navy or air force.

● (6:10 p.m.)

> As indicated in the earlier articles, England, although adopting a degree of integration after a serious study of the factors, has stated that regimental identification of combat units will be preserved as an absolute essential to morale.
>
> Recently New Zealand has also considered this subject and come to the same conclusions regarding combat units. In a white paper this year—

That would be 1966.

> —it states that while they accept the fact of unification of such facilities as supply, personnel, administration and other support areas and standard procedures, in supply depots separate identities will be retained in the combat units.
>
> The same situation exists in the United States where an increasing effort is now being made to create and expand on regimental identification. To quote the U.S. Secretary for the Air Force, "men have functioned most effectively as members of an identifiable group. The spirit of unity . . . of brotherhood . . . is enhanced by tradition, pride in one's organization and by a distinctive uniform which is a mark of membership.
>
> The value of esprit de corps cannot be measured with precision. No price tag can be placed on it, yet we all recognize its intrinsic contribution in the quality of our armed forces. It is the heart of the true fighting force.
>
> We should not tamper with that precious esprit de corps, that sense of identification, by immersing it in a vast agglomeration of a single service."

As I have said, Mr. Chairman, these points are made in what I and many others consider to be a profound series of articles on the question of integration and unification. I know that the minister himself considered it a profound and reasoned series of articles, although obviously he and Mr. Malone take different points of view. But I felt it valuable to place one or two contributions from Mr. Malone's editorials on the record and in the context which I have offered them because I think they state the case for retention of individual identity at the combat level far more eloquently than I could do myself.

That brings me to an allied subject which I presume is covered under the aegis and umbrella of the debate in which we are involved at the moment. I want to say one or two words about the area of our international commitments which is inextricably tied to our defence posture, defence planning, and defence deliberations in this committee. With respect to the change in our defence system and the make-up of our armed forces being contemplated by members of the committee, I would ask whether or not this country, in the view of the Minister of National Defence and of the government, is embarked on a path for Canada of professional neutralism? If we are embarked on such a path are we sure we are right in going in that direction?

The question of collective security in the world and of our commitments under collective security accords into which we have entered must be paramount in our consideration and reasoning as we address ourselves to this proposed legislation. It seems to me that the legislation as drafted and proposed envisions some kind of world where there will never be another conventional war, at least not one in which Canada will be involved. It seems to me that it takes for granted that the era of war in the classical sense, in the historic sense, war as we have known it so painfully in the lifetimes of all of us in this committee, has come to an end, and the only kind of war with which we may be confronted in the future is one of two types, either a total thermonuclear holocaust which will not permit of any kind of protracted hostilities, or a type of brushfire war, the type of police action war in which many of our troops and units have been engaged in recent years under the flag of the United Nations.

I hope that if we make that decision, sir, we will have considered all the possibilities for the future. I hope we are possessed of a

certain omniscience in coming to that conclusion because, should we be wrong, the pain and the agony that will confront us as a nation involved in any kind of conventional war in the future will be severe indeed. It seems to me we move too hastily if we assume we can take for granted that we will not be involved in a conventional type of war and conventional type of defence of our country. The proposed legislation which we are now considering assumes just such a development.

We have moral commitments under the collective security arrangements and agreements into which we have entered around the globe, and I submit we owe a debt and discharge of a fulfilment to our allies that requires the maintenance, improvement, development and, if necessary, the expansion of conventional forms of fighting arms, conventional forms of fightings units, that can fit into the over-all pattern of defence envisioned by those allies who, with us, belong to those collective agreements and collective arrangements. Therefore, as many a speaker preceding me in this debate has pointed out, we come to the vital question of foreign policy and the more crucial question of whether or not our foreign policy is being decided and determined by our defence policy. Sir, I wonder whether Canadians are satisfied in coming to the conclusion, or having the conclusion developed for them, that in the future we are merely to be the bearers and operators of an international fire brigade? This is what we would be reduced to being with the unified force proposed in this legislation.

As I asked a moment ago, what of our allies with respect to this question? What do they expect of us, what do we expect of them? Can we fulfil the commitments and the pledges we owe if we make such a drastic, revolutionary and convolutionary change in our military posture and establishment? With respect to the possibilities of a major conventional war, will we not have our traditional responsibilities as partners in the free world alliance? I submit it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to fulfil those responsibilities if we proceed with the revolutionary change proposed in this legislation, at least before much fuller consideration has been given to its development in the context of the collective arrangements to which we belong and in the context of the threat to freedom in the world today.

We owe much to our allies. In my view we owe much in particular to our brave allies in

the United States whose sons are dying in Viet Nam today to keep the world safe for democracy. President Johnson said with respect to that struggle, "We did not choose to be the guardians at the gate, but there is no one else."

I was in the Pacific a few weeks ago. I was fortunate enough to have a few days in Viet Nam and Henry Cabot Lodge, the outgoing, widely loved and respected United States ambassador to South Viet Nam, told me, "It is not a choice out here between war in Viet Nam and the broad high road to peace. If it were such a choice we would take the broad high road to peace, but this is a dangerous world in which we live, and this is a particularly dangerous part of that world, and the choice out here is between different dangers, between a broken arm and a broken leg. That is always the choice in a dangerous world. We are making a stand in Viet Nam which we would have to make somewhere."

My own personal view of the situation and of American involvement there really turns on a statement made by Thomas Jefferson many years ago when he asserted that it is sometimes necessary for men to fight small wars in order that great wars can be avoided. I think this is the moral fulcrum on which American involvement in Viet Nam turns, and I believe in the essential correctness of the American involvement at this time in that place. I also believe in the essential correctness of criticism, but not distortion, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me that criticism in this country of our American allies has grown out of all proportion and now amounts in many cases to nothing more than incontrovertible distortion of the role that the United States is playing in world affairs.

• (6:20 p.m.)

There is a cult of anti-Americanism being formed in this country which is unworthy of us as Canadians and destructive to the causes of friendship, freedom and peace. This is an imperfect world. Together, we and our historic friends and allies can make it better. We debase the dreams of all North Americans of good will, Canadians and citizens of the United States, when we demean ourselves by stooping to the practice of mean and petty criticism of our friends, encouraged by those who have no care for the dangerous game they are playing. This is a practice which is based on half truths, untruths, rumour and a misguided form of so-called patriotism. I deplore the widespread denigration of the American effort. We should do all we can to

contain this run-away criticism before it does both our countries irreparable harm.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman, I wish to take part in this debate again for two reasons. The first is that a number of questions have been put to the government during the course of this and previous stages of the debate which have not been answered. If any answers have been given to most of the questions with which I will deal, they have been given either in a vague way or with equivocation. One reason, and I believe the main reason despite what some members of the government may think, that this debate has gone on so long at the different stages is that there is a genuine desire on the part of the members on this side of the house to find out what exactly are the implications of this bill.

I do not think there is any member in this house, whatever his party, who really would wish to jeopardize our defence effort. All of us are interested in the future safety of our country. Some of us are worried about the course the government is taking. Until we have adequate answers to many of the questions which have been asked I do not believe we will be in a position either to approve or disapprove of this bill. The reason I am making further remarks at this time is that I hope to elicit answers from the minister. I sincerely hope the minister will give us these answers before the debate on this stage of the bill is completed.

The second reason I am taking part in the debate again has to do with the tactical handling of this bill by the government. I believe this to be a matter of very great concern not only to members of this house but also to people outside the house. I suggest that the government has not handled the bill well from its inception. I realize I cannot refer to matters previously passed on by the house and I do not intend to do so. I do wish to refer, however, to the difficulty we have had in acquiring the information we need.

In this regard I suggest it would have been better had the government in the first place sent this bill to a committee, perhaps at the resolution stage, so that the matter could have been gone into at that point. At that stage we might have learned about the nature and content of the bill. Then, at a later stage when the bill came back to the committee of the whole it might again have been referred to the standing committee as was done after second reading. It is quite evident now from a reading of the evidence before the defence committee that many questions are still unanswered. Had there been two sets of hearings, I believe that some of the points which are still unanswered might have been answered and clarified.

If I may use a favourite expression, this is water under the bridge. This is something which I believe the government should have done. The government has embarked on a very strange course indeed, the course of closure. I know it may be said by my friends on the government side of the house that it is not closure on which the government is embarking now. There is an old expression, "No matter how thin you slice it it is still boloney". This new rule in some ways is a much more severe form of closure than the old closure rule because under the old rule closure had to be applied to each clause of the bill whereas under this arrangement the whole bill has to be dealt with summarily in a very brief period of time. It seems very strange that the government should have embarked on this procedure in dealing with this bill.

As of last Thursday afternoon when the government house leader mentioned it was the intention of the government to allocate time—I believe that is the term which was used—25 members of the official opposition had spoken on this bill and 29 members of the government and its allies in this house. I have been a member of this house for quite a long time and it always has been my impressoin that when closure or any form thereof was invoked it was because one group in the house was greatly protracting the debate or was holding it up by what sometimes is referred to by members of the government as filibustering. If one wishes to be very technical about this, I might point out that up to the time of the announcement by the house leader 29 members supporting the government had spoken and only 25 opposition members. One might ask who was filibustering.

It seems very strange indeed that this type of procedure should have been adopted. However, that is the government's responsibility. I believe these matters should be clarified. Closure of any form should be used only if a matter is of great urgency or import. I do not think anyone would claim that this subject is not a matter of great import; of course it is, and very much so. However, it certainly is not a matter of urgency, to say the least. The other day the minister told us that if the bill should be passed right now it was not his

intention to have in declared law until another six months have passed and the regulations have been drawn up. Therefore it would not seem that there is any urgent necessity to get this bill through the house at the present time. That argument seems, as one might say, to have been knocked into a cocked hat. There just is no reason for doing it.

I believe this government has its own reasons for invoking closure. From the government point of view I think the reasons probably are rather good. The minister, and when he is not here his associate minister, either cannot or will not answer questions. The Secretary of State for External Affairs has developed quite a reputation in this house for some time as a master in circumlocution, but the Minister of National Defence when he does answer questions makes the Secretary of State for External Affairs seem informative and concise by comparison. I think his failure to answer these questions adequately, has been the source of considerable embarrassment to the government. This has been pointed out very well by editorials which have appeared in a number of prominent newspapers in this country, including the Montreal *Gazette* of last Saturday, the *Globe and Mail,* the Winnipeg *Free Press* and others. They have all pointed out that the purpose of this bill and everything connected with it is unclear and murky. This is not surprising in view of the minister's failure to answer questions adequately.

• (6:30 p.m.)

For that reason I think the government wants this debate to end as quickly as possible. It has also taken this point of view in respect of the desire, as announced by the Prime Minister, to have this session end and the centennial session commence. We have been told that this session should conclude by the end of this month. The centennial session would then begin and last through to the end of June or the early part of July. I am sure most members would like to see that happen.

But whose fault is it that we are again faced with a critical situation—if it is critical? I suggest this situation is the result of mishandling of the business of the house of the government.

Mr. Robichaud: Be serious.

Mr. Nesbitt: If the Minister of Fisheries would like to know the reasons behind that remark I will be glad to give them at this stage. It is quite clear that one might say the cabinet is made up of a number of prima donnas who have pet projects they want pushed through the house. One cannot know the reasons because he cannot look into the minds of members of the government to ascertain their motivation. The Minister of National Health and Welfare threatened last year that he would resign if the medicare bill was not put through. That was an important measure, but certainly there was no urgency because it will not become law until 1968.

Last summer we dealt with the Canada Assistance Plan. That also was a very important measure but it was pushed through this house under the threat that we would have no vacation and that hon. members would not be able to return to their constituencies to carry out their normal duties. It was also suggested that we were holding up the extra assistance to be given the needy. That measure was passed last July, but it has not been put into effect anywhere in Canada, except in the province of Ontario, and even there only as of April 1 of this year. There was no great rush in that regard.

We are now faced with this measure which the minister said will not go into effect for at least four to six months. On the basis of the evidence given before the defence committee it may not be put into effect for two or three years. What is the hurry?

In my submission the business of this house has been mishandled by the government. I do not blame the government house leader because I should not like to have his job; it must be very difficult to arrange parliamentary business in an orderly way when this sort of thing is taking place. In any event those are the reasons for this lengthy session. The minister wants the bill put through in a hurry so the centennial session deadline can be met. It is no one's fault but the government's that this deadline cannot be met in an orderly way.

Another very strange development in relation to this bill now before us was the suggestion in a letter by the chairman of the government caucus to his constituents that undoubtedly it was going to be necessary to use closure. That suggestion was made before we had commenced this stage of consideration. Surely that is a strange way of doing things. Had the statement been made by a backbencher on the government side, or someone with little responsibility, I would not have thought much about it: But it was made by the chairman of the government caucus.

As a result of that statement coming to light the chairman of the caucus was taken to

task by an editorial which appeared in the *Globe and Mail*, which stated that a great many things should be brought to light before any kind of closure was brought in. Certainly before closure has been brought in by any government it has been the accepted practice not to use such a procedure unless the government has overwhelming public support for its legislation, and that it involves a matter of urgency. Certainly there is not overwhelming public support for this bill and on the basis of the admission of the minister, there is no urgency. We view with great concern the course of action the government is now following in the handling of this bill. There is no reason for that action and no explanation, except those relating to the government's embarrassment and the desire to commence the centennial session.

One can find a clue to the government's action in pushing this bill through from the statement made last Thursday by one of the minister's fans in the press gallery. A public affairs commentator said in reference to questions posed by the opposition to the minister that they had not found out the answers either. I think that situation provides another answer as to why the government wishes to terminate this debate.

Many of us have found something else very strange in relation to our unanswered questions. I refer to the rather odd but detached manner the Prime Minister has taken not only in respect of this debate but on the matter of unification itself. He has had a lifelong concern for the subject of foreign affairs and foreign policy. Defence measures are really the strong arm of foreign policy. It is startling to most of us to note that the Prime Minister is apparently disinterested in this matter. According to information revealed by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre earlier during this debate, the only time the Prime Minister discussed this question with the former chief of staff, Air Marshal Miller, was in 1964; and at that time the major discussion was integration, not unification.

Certainly before this debate concludes we should hear from the Prime Minister about this very important matter of unification. Unification will have an effect on the whole defence future of this country. I hope because of the interrelationship between defence and foreign affairs we will hear from the Prime Minister, who has been associated with and has a great reputation in the field of foreign affairs.

Let me now refer to the questions which have not been answered—and it is my submission that if the minister will provide some answers he will find it much less difficult to get this bill passed, thus creating a more amiable atmosphere in the house. To date he has not done so, but I appeal to him to reconsider his position in the interests of putting this bill through in an orderly fashion.

Let me remind the minister of the example set by one or two of his colleagues. When the highly complex transport bill was before this house it was examined carefully—

Mr. Hellyer: Would the hon. member permit a question? Will he indicate the specific questions I have not answered?

Mr. Nesbitt: Yes, I was just going to do so. I have them enumerated and I will be very glad to bring them to the minister's attention. I would suggest to the minister that he look at the results achieved by his colleague the Minister of Transport with regard to the transportation bill. That was a very complex, technical matter. The bill went to committee and was carefully studied. A great many amendments were made to it, some 70 of which I believe were accepted by the minister. This was referred to by many writers and observers of parliament as being parliament at its best.

• (6:40 p.m.)

Then there was the Bank Act, an equally difficult and complex matter. The Minister of Finance, again, accepted many suggestions that were made. Many people thought that bill would be a matter of great controversy. There were some controversial aspects in the bill, but generally speaking it was not controversial. The minister listened to suggestions and accepted them when he thought it wise. Of course no one expects a minister to accept all suggestions made, but at least he should be prepared to accept some. In this case the Minister of National Defence has not shown an inclination to accept any of the suggestions made.

A few moments ago the minister asked what questions I have in mind that he had not specifically answered. The first question is: Who was the author, who conceived this plan of unification? Was it one of the senior staff officers; was it the minister; was it one of the minister's advisers? Who was it? I think we should know the answer to this question because this is a very important matter, one of the most important that has

come before the house. I think therefore we are entitled to know whether this concept of unification was a matter thought up by some people with a great deal of military expertise, or was it thought up by persons lacking this expertise, however well intentioned they may be? I am not suggesting that it was thought up by persons lacking military expertise, but we would like to know who was the author of the plan.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. gentleman agree that Lieutenant General Weeks, a former vice chief of general staff in the United Kingdom, would be a good author for this kind of program?

Mr. Nesbitt: The minister is telling us that he is the author of this program.

Mr. Hellyer: I did not say that, but I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman would have confidence in his judgment, in view of his experience in the second world war and the fact that he conceived a plan which is almost identical to the one we are proposing for this country. Would the hon. gentleman, in view of those facts, consider him to be a proper authority?

Mr. Churchill: I thought Terence Robertson was the author.

Mr. Nesbitt: I would be very interested to see the plan of the gentleman mentioned by the minister. I should also like to see the general's qualifications. But again, Mr. Chairman, I ask the minister, who was the author of this unification plan? In reply to what the minister said earlier, Earl Mountbatten does not seem to have the same view as General Weeks. I take it that General Weeks was one of the indirect authors of the plan, but we would be very glad to hear from the minister who else he got the idea from. The next question concerns the purpose of this unified force. Unfortunately we have heard various explanations on the functions of the force.

Mr. Hellyer: I told you in my speech on second reading.

Mr. Nesbitt: Yes, and I will be coming to that shortly, if the minister will contain himself for a minute. The Secretary of State for External Affairs said in effect that the purpose of the force was to fulfil more effectively our present military commitments. Unfortunately the Secretary of State for External Affairs did not place before us one whit of evidence of how this was to be done. In his customary genial, bland manner he said that is what the force was going to do and he was satisfied that it would more adequately and effectively fulfil our present commitments to NORAD, NATO and the United Nations. He did not say how, of course, but he said the force would fulfil these commitments.

The Minister of National Defence has denied categorically in this house—this is one thing about which the minister has been very specific—that the new, unified force is designed only for service with the United Nations. This matter has been raised on many occasions by many hon. members, and the minister has categorically denied that this is the purpose of the force. Newspaper comment and editorials have been to the effect that the force is intended to fulfil more adequately our commitments to that organization. However, somebody very close to the minister, who I think is really in a position to throw some light on this point is the present chief of staff, General Allard. I have read part of the evidence he gave before the defence committee and I shall put it on the record again. His evidence was quite contrary to what the minister told us. The question with which we are faced is, whose evidence are we to accept? We should accept the minister's explanation, of course, because he is in charge of this department; but his own chief of staff says something different. Where do we go from there?

I again put on the record General Allard's evidence given to the defence committee on Tuesday, February 28:

> Canada now wants, while remaining faithful to its existing commitments, to decide itself on the part it wishes to play in the new international society. This is not only its right, it is also its duty. It is its duty to participate, to the best of its ability, in keeping the peace by supporting the organization which has made itself the champion of the smaller nations, the United Nations organization.
>
> In short, that is the transformation proposed by the white paper. That is what we are trying to do. My duty is to organize the military forces in accordance with government policy.

When you read that statement and the minister's statement, you find that the two are as far apart as the north and south poles. This makes it very difficult for members of the house to decide just what the answer is to the question as to what is the purpose of the force. I hope the minister will make a further attempt to clarify this matter, or perhaps he will get his chief of staff to give a further explanation of what he meant when he gave that evidence to the defence committee. It is

confusing to people to have these contradictions.

Mr. Matheson: What is the next question?

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman, what is the hon. member for Leeds asking now?

Mr. Matheson: Is there any other question?

Mr. Nesbitt: Yes, there are several more questions. I would ask the hon. member to just contain himself. I might add, in the same vein, that after his speech in the house on the purpose of this force, when the Secretary of State for External Affairs told us that the whole purpose of the force was that we could more effectively carry out our present foreign affairs commitments, the other day in the external affairs committee he made the announcement—it was really more a statement to a press conference than to the committee—that he was going to offer troops for Viet Nam, should they be required, for peace keeping.

In view of what General Allard has said, and editorials which have appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen*, which is often thought of as the spokesman for the government—and for good reasons—editorials which have appeared in the *Globe and Mail* and other prominent newspapers, and the fact that the Secretary of State of External Affairs mentioned this offer of troops for peace keeping, it is not unreasonable that people would think that the new force is designed only for United Nations service. What else could a person think?

The next question concerns the matter of saving money. I agree that when it comes to the country's safety the saving of money is not the all-important factor. It is important enough, certainly, but it is not the all-important factor. The saving of money has been one of the reasons the minister has given for wishing to have this bill passed.

• (6:50 p.m.)

Air Chief Marshal Miller said in effect that there was no particular financial advantage to unification. Then we find in the estimates for the present fiscal year, starting April 1 of this year, that $115 million more is being spent on the armed forces. These estimated expenditures are based on the assumption that the unification bill will go through. Various government members have tried to explain away the $115 million. The explanation of the hon. member for Peterborough as reported at page 14630 of *Hansard* was most entertaining when he said:

> Hon. members should consider for a few moments the effects of inflation upon a relatively constant budget over a six year period.

This just goes on to show the problems one can sometimes get into in the house by trying to make excuses for one action of the government, and blunder into a rather unfortunate admission regarding other activities of the government, in this case in the field of the control of the cost of living.

But despite all the explanations—and I know some hon. members have said that it might be more expensive if we did not have unification—we have not had an adequate explanation of the $115 million increase. Hon. members can say that the ratio of defence spending has decreased in proportion to the total government expenditure, and other such explanations can be made, but the fact is that defence is still costing more. I do not think it is a matter of all importance, but it is certainly a matter of some importance.

Then there was one question which the minister has not answered, and it is this: Will this new unified force have to be trained in all three services? I think General Allard referred to them, rather unfortunately, as finks, that is flying infantrymen with naval knowledge. How in these days of specialization are these people suddenly to carry out purely army type duties with our NATO allies? This has never been explained. I believe some months ago a question was put to the minister asking whether there could be an interchange between army and naval officers, and he replied that there is no reason that a gunnery officer in the army could not take on general duties in the navy. Superficially this looks possible, but there are certain duties that naval gunnery officers have to carry out, such as shiphandling and navigation, which an army officer could not perform.

The Deputy Chairman: I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted to his speech has expired.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, I am prompted to make a few comments at this time because of the attempt by the hon. member for Oxford to denigrate, besmirch and generally tarnish the provisions of standing order 15-A. He advanced the most amazing argument I have ever heard. He tried to argue that because he did not receive satisfactory answers, and I presume agreeable answers, to the questions

he has put to the minister, he and his colleagues have the right to deny every other member of this house the right to make a decision. As hon. members know, this has been going on in the committee for the past 10 or 12 days in the discussion on clause 2.

However, that is not all. We have also had a repetition of thoughts which had already been advanced in the house previously—

Mr. Churchill: Prove that.

Mr. Olson: —respecting the same matter, during about four days on an interim supply motion in November of 1966. We also had the same arguments advanced on second reading of the bill earlier this year. In addition there were about 40 meetings of the standing committee on defence—I am not sure of the exact number—where the same ground was covered.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): We have heard that also.

Mr. Churchill: The hon. member is repeating himself.

Mr. Olson: It seems to me to be a complete contradiction for anyone to subscribe to the provisions of a democratic institution and at the same time argue that he has a right to prevent members of that democratic institution from taking a decision, after all the points of view from all those who want to be heard have been put forward. The only argument that was advanced by the hon. member for Oxford this afternoon to support the continuation of this filibuster was that the members of his party have not received satisfactory answers from the minister.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Does not the hon. member realize that the Minister of National Defence just denied him an answer?

Mr. Olson: I am not arguing at this time whether or not I agree with the answers given by the Minister of National Defence, but if hon. members wish to be reasonable they have to extend to the minister the same privileges as to any other members of the house. They cannot force him to say something he does not want to say. The minister has a right to his opinions, the same as members in the Conservative party have a right to their opinions, and have a right to express them. The hon. member for Oxford said a few moments ago that only 25 out of 95 or 96 members of the Conservative party have taken part in the debate.

Mr. Nesbitt: I never said that.

[Mr. Olson.]

Mr. Olson: We know that some of them have spoken on clause 2 as many as four or five times. Surely it follows that if any of the other 70 or 71 members of that party wanted to make a contribution to the debate they would have full and ample opportunity to do so. Therefore no member in the house has been denied the right or the opportunity to speak; and I contend—

Mr. Régimbal: Seven o'clock, Mr. Chairman.

The Deputy Chairman: It being seven o'clock, pursuant to an order made on April 6, the committee stands adjourned until 8 p.m.

SITTING SUSPENDED

SITTING RESUMED

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Olson: When the committee rose at seven o'clock, Mr. Chairman, I was making a few comments on the amazing argument advanced by the hon. member for Oxford as to the justification for this filibuster that he and his party have been carrying on for the last few days on clause 2 of this bill. It seems to me that it is a disservice to this house and to the standing orders—

Mr. Nesbitt: Why didn't you bring it up at the time?

Mr. Olson: —for any member to attempt to defile the provisions of the standing orders which have been agreed to by this house. I know he is probably still under the illusion that there is some stigma attached to the word "closure" because of what happened in the House of Commons in the famous pipe line debate of 1956. He may be right. However, as I said, I believe this is an illusion. While I was not in the house at that time, I am convinced from reading the record and having taken an interest in the proceedings through the various news media, that there were other contributing factors in that particular debate which led to success in the next election campaign.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, it is a wrong concept of the processes of democracy when a small number of the members of this house can continue to violate the rules to carry on a filibuster which results in preventing members from taking a decision. I am reasonably sure that the hon. member for Oxford and his colleagues, the 25 to whom he

referred who have taken part in this debate once or more than once, have not changed their minds. I am not asking them to change their minds. They are entitled to their opinion respecting the bill that is before us, and they are entitled to vote in accordance with that opinion. What I object to, Mr. Chairman, is this small minority of members preventing the majority from doing the essential public business of the country.

As I said before seven o'clock, Mr. Chairman, they have a right to be heard. This is also one of the fundamental democratic processes. They have been heard over and over again, as many as four or five times. When an hon. member says there has not been an opportunity for every other member of that party or any member in this house to be heard, he is making a wrong assessment of the situation. I know that the chairman of this committee has been careful to make sure that any member who has not been heard will have precedence over any member who tries to speak a second time.

Mr. Churchill: You are speaking a second time.

Mr. Oslon: I know, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Churchill: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member has indicated that members who have not spoken in this debate should participate before members speak a second time. He is now speaking for the second time, so I think you should ask him to sit down and surrender his place to someone who has not participated in the debate.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Olson: The hon. member—

The Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Cape Breton South.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I rise on the same point of order, Mr. Chairman. If you were to work out the ratio I would have to make 50 speeches in order to make the same representation for my party as the hon. member is for his.

Mr. Olson: The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre is consistent in his usually confused way in trying to imply that I said something I did not say. I did not say that any member of this house does not have a right to speak a second time in committee. I said that the presiding officer in this committee has meticulously, in my opinion, given precedence to those members who have not spoken if they indicated a desire to speak.

Once more, for the benefit of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, may I say I believe this is a proper precedence to be given? The fact is I would not be surprised if the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre is not one of those who have spoken more than once. In fact, I believe he has spoken four or five times since we went into committee on clause 2. He also made a contribution, for whatever it was worth, to the debate, on second reading. He made several contributions, perhaps five or six, on the supply motion back in November, 1966, on the same subject matter. I presume he has exhausted himself in so far as bringing up anything of value is concerned. If he has been unable to persuade other members of this house, surely there ought to be a time when we can vote on whether or not we have accepted these arguments.

Mr. Churchill: There is a general demand for me to speak again.

• (8:10 p.m.)

Mr. Olson: That is not what they are trying to do. What they are trying to do is to prevent a decision being taken by the majority of the members of this house. I do not mind this sort of tactic for a while. In fact this house has had to put up with it on a number of occasions in various previous debates. But then to come along when they are faced with standing order 15A, which was agreed to by this house, and to try, as the hon. member for Oxford did, to denigrate, besmirch, tarnish and generally defile the provisions of the bill before this standing order can be used, is in my opinion doing, a great disservice not only to democracy but to the proper functioning of this house. They have violated the rules all through the debate; and what is more, they have admitted as much.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Since the hon. member for Medicine Hat has been imputing motives, which is clearly out of order and unparliamentary, as I think the hon. member, who prides himself on being an expert on the rules, should know—

Mr. Olson: What is your point of order?

Mr. Nesbitt: My point of order is that the hon. member, as he says, was in this chamber while I was making my speech. Since he is so concerned about the rules of this house, I

would point out that at no point did he raise a point of order during the course of my remarks. It is only since then that he has decided to do so. I think he should have raised this point at the time, not now. We should like to know why the hon. member is raising the point now instead of at that time, when he should have raised it.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Okanagan-Revelstoke has just whispered to me that I am long suffering, and I think that answers the hon. member's point. The answer is that there was no valid point of order, as I am sure the hon. member knew when he rose.

Mr. Nesbitt: Now you have no valid point of order.

Mr. Olson: What I was trying to explain, Mr. Chairman, when I was interrupted a few moments ago, was that the members of the Conservative party who have participated in this debate have admitted that they have been violating the standing orders of this house. If the hon. member wants me to quote to him chapter and verse from the standing orders I will do so. Standing order 34(2) says:

> Mr. Speaker or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the house, or of the committee, to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance, or repetition, may direct him to discontinue his speech, and if then the member still continues to speak—

—Mr. Speaker is authorized to take other action. The hon. member for Oxford admitted that he was asking the same questions over and over again, and that in itself is a violation of the rules. He is not supposed to repeat his remarks or the remarks of any other hon. member.

So it seems, Mr. Chairman, that a new definition or concept of our parliamentary and democratic processes is being foisted upon this house by the Conservative members at this time. First of all, they argue that if they cannot have their way they will continue the debate interminably and impose some kind of perseverance test.

Mr. Danforth: Who said that?

Mr. Olson: That is precisely what the hon. member for Oxford tried to convey. He said that unless and until the minister gives satisfactory and agreeable answers, they are going to carry on and on with the debate. These are not his words, but that is the essence of what he was trying to say. It was not even necessary for him to say it, Mr. Chairman, because it has been completely obvious to us all for the past week or ten days.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I should like members in all parts of the house to know that the terms of standing 15-A of the standing orders of this house do not have any stigma attached to them as far as I am concerned. I think that we, as members of parliament elected by the people of Canada to conduct essential public business at the federal level, have the responsibility to move from one piece of legislation to the next. We know very well that because of the tactics which are now being employed a lot of essential legislation and public business is being neglected. We are not getting to it.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I agree that these members have the right to be heard. They have been heard over and over again. I think it is now time for these half dozen or dozen Tories to respect the rights of the other 200-odd members of this house and let the members of the house come to a decision on a matter that has been occupying their time for far too long now.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Chairman, in spite of the homily from apparently the self-appointed guardian of the rules of parliament, I would point out that I have yet to speak on this issue. The hon. member may not wish to hear me, and I am sure that most of the government benchers will have no interest in what I have to say.

Of course the problem created by rule 15A is the government's problem. The committee that suggested it—I was a member of the committee and was very glad to be a member of it—envisaged the business committee meeting more or less constantly. It is too bad that the government has waited until this highly suspect and controversial bill is before parliament before having the courage to invoke the formula that was provided by the rules.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, may I raise a point of order. The matter before the committee of the whole for discussion at this moment is clause 2 of this bill. Standing order 15A is not before the committee.

Mr. Ricard: Why didn't you say that a while ago?

Mr. McIlraith: I should like an opportunity to be heard and to raise my point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think that is a proper request.

Mr. Ricard: Why didn't you speak up before?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, I show respect to the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot, though I admit there are times when it does test one's patience.

Mr. Ricard: This is nothing but hypocrisy.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, it is quite improper for the hon. member to charge me with that. If he will read the rules he will see that what I say is the case. If the hon. member were a different type of member I would ask him to withdraw that charge—

Mr. Ricard: Don't worry about me.

Mr. McIlraith: —but since he does not have that kind of nature and background I will not make that request of him.

Mr. Ricard: This is sheer hypocrisy.

Mr. McIlraith: With all respect, Mr. Chairman, I want to raise a point of order, and I started a moment ago to do so. What is before the committee is the clause by clause consideration of this bill. We are now discussing clause 2. The hon. member who has the floor is seeking to debate one of the standing orders of the house. With great deference, that standing order is not before the committee of the whole house at the moment, and therefore his remarks are out of order.

I think the hon. member, who has a good appreciation of the rules, will agree on reflection that the rule in committee of the whole house is that hon. members should stick to the clause of the bill under discussion. Admittedly clause 2 is quite wide in scope and gives the hon. member latitude to debate the question of the armed forces; but it is not—

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Would the minister on reflection agree that he ought to have raised this point earlier?

Mr. McIlraith: I was not in the house at the time. As soon as I came in—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McIlraith: I am sure hon. members noticed when I came into the house.

Mr. Nugent: Would the minister accept a question?

Mr. McIlraith: I will in a moment. Had this rule been debated earlier in my presence I would have raised this point of order. It was not debated in my presence, I am sorry to say.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, since the minister says that he was not in the house and the entire speech of the hon. member for Medicine Hat was devoted to this particular rule, and in view of the fact that the hon. member for Royal was only going to take a few minutes to answer the hon. member, does the minister not think that he should withdraw his point of order so that, in fairness, a short answer might be made to the lengthy and completely hypocritical tirade of the hon. member for Medicine Hat?

• (8:20 p.m.)

Mr. McIlraith: No, I would not agree to any such proposition. When I came into the house a moment or two before the hon. member for Medicine Hat had concluded his remarks, he was taking the official opposition to task for their conduct during the last number of days—for repetitious debate. That is what he was discussing.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): That has nothing to do with clause 2.

Mr. McIlraith: In any event, I have raised the point of order and I respectfully ask your ruling on it, Mr. Chairman.

The Deputy Chairman: I must say that the Chair allowed a certain latitude when hearing the hon. member for Medicine Hat on the subject, and maybe we could hear the opinions of the hon. member for Royal on the subject raised by the hon. member for Medicine Hat. However, I would ask that, having heard the hon. member for Royal, hon. members of the committee should confine their comments to clause 2.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McIlraith: There is one difficulty. It is only fair, and indeed it is my obligation to point out, that the business committee of the house for which provision is made in rule 15A has not yet reported; it is still active, and until it reports its work becomes impossible if the proceedings under the standing order are to be debated in the interval.

Mr. Olson: On a point of order: Two or three members of the committee have stated that it was I who raised the matter of standing order 15A. I should like to point out that it was the hon. member for Oxford who raised this question and tried to decry the provisions of that order. This prompted me to make my comments.

Mr. Fairweather: Now that we have followed the perambulations of the leader of the house with regard to points of order and so on, I should like to assure the hon. gentleman that I was on the committee which recommended rule 15A to parliament. I support the rule. But I feel it is too bad that the government did not have the courage to use the business committee throughout our proceedings in parliament, and has resorted to it only when a bill as controversial and as badly conceived as this, is before us.

I have one or two other things to say about the rule which I intend to get off my chest, in spite of spurious points of order. As was pointed out in the Montreal *Gazette* on Saturday last, closure or a form of closure should be used in connection with legislation which has evident, urgent and imperative aims. The bill before us fulfils none of these requirements. We have the minister's own evidence and his speeches before this committee to support that statement. The questions asked by the hon. member for Greenwood remain unanswered. He said on April 3:

> Mr. Chairman, what we in Canada need in the field of defence is a clear defence policy. In all the mass of words spoken by the defence minister and his aides on the subject of unification, there has been complete failure to clarify or justify our defence roles, a failure to say what the future of the armed forces is to be, what purposes they are to serve, what sort of hostilities we expect to be involved in.

As the *Gazette* points out, a fundamental weakness in the government's position is the lack of clarity, the cloudiness surrounding this bill.

> It is unreasonable for the government to push ahead with dogged determination on such an issue and expect the opposition (among them many who are friendly to the principle involved) to go along for the ride. It cannot drive ahead on a cloudy issue, except by driving into the clouds.

We have been treated to a good deal of editorial comment on this issue in the last few months. As many speakers have pointed out, one of Canada's great newspapers, the Winnipeg *Free Press,* has dealt with this matter, and its distinguished editor Mr. R. S. Malone was undoubtedly the editorialist who wrote the article which appeared on April 4, from which I take these words:

> Members must surely recognize the grave responsibility they bear as individuals when voting on this bill. This is a question which far transcends both politicking and party.

It is in this spirit that I wish to say a word or two about the bill before us, in spite of the fact that some people object to an issue taking up ten or 12 days of the time of parliament. I make no apology for adding a few minutes to the length of this debate. I happen to be worried because the defence structure of this country is being dismembered without either the minister or his department really knowing what the alternative will be. By using the technique of public relations and hard sell it is easy to smother the committee and the country with statistics and with figures. Nowhere, however, have I seen a clear exposition of Canada's role in defence for the next decade, or for that matter for the next three decades. I believe we are entitled to this information as we study a matter of such crucial importance.

Nowhere have I seen any real evidence of substantial savings—one of the great boasts made by the minister in the early days of the hard sell—as a result of this new proposal. Nowhere have I seen any evidence that the efficiency of our fighting forces would be increased. I myself, for what it is worth, favour integration at the command level, for logistic support, in the administration and in the ancillary services. Our forces must be so organized that they may continue their ready integration with United States and United Kingdom forces—that word "integration" is a dangerous one to use in this debate, but the use of the word integration is all right in this context because, obviously, no matter what may happen in the world in the next two decades, those two countries will remain our closest allies.

I am not one who is against radical experiments if they are made to reform situations or overcome problems of such pressing urgency and importance that ordinary time-tested methods will not do. But I am against having a concept forced upon the country for no other reason, as far as I can see, than to advance the minister's ambitions.

The hon. gentleman has become, I suggest, the captive of his own propaganda. He has become, I maintain, a handmaiden—if that is a possible concept—of the technocrats whose thrills are obtained by listening to the whirring of computers and whose excitement is the result of flashing lights and figures disgorged in steady and unrelenting streams.

May I return to quote a paragraph or two from the editorial which appeared in the Winnipeg *Free Press* on April 4?

Mr. Hellyer: That has been read into the record seven or eight times already. There is

a rule against repetition, of which I am sure the hon. member has heard.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Mr. Fairweather: If the rule of repetition were enforced in this parliament we would have been home four years ago.

Mr. Hellyer: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fairweather: I think that if we all had to plead guilty to the breach of such a rule the place would be emptied forthwith.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): The truth is always the truth, no matter how many times repeated.

Mr. Fairweather: Quoting the editorial:

> In Mr. Hellyer's white paper on the subject of integration two years ago, he forecast that it was experimental, that we would have to feel our way, that errors might be made. Surely the time has come for honest acceptance of the fact that it would be a major error to force 'complete unification' and destroy all service and unit identifications.
>
> In his initial position on 'integration,' Mr. Hellyer's statement indicated both wisdom and a broad-minded approach.

That is an historic statement, part of the history of the development of this bill, and I am sorry that part of its history has been forgotten.

> Seemingly when he raised the matter of total unification, however, he was unable to accept the fact that his most experienced officers, both outside and within the service, advised strongly against it. This qualified and considered advice was interpreted by Mr. Hellyer as interference and personal opposition to his will, an attempt to obstruct and thwart his own ambitions. In this context, Mr. Hellyer has apparently determined to plunge blindly ahead regardless of any harm done to himself, the services, his government, or the nation.

It has been said, and I must admit there is truth in this statement, that the country is bored by this debate, and that the issue is not one which interests the majority of Canadians. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest that this fact, if it is true, makes it even more important that we here, as representatives of the public, reach a right conclusion after careful and exhaustive consideration of this proposal.

As Air Vice Marshal Miller told the defence committee—and by the way, I am sure the minister will be disappointed that I shall be quoting him for a paragraph or two, because undoubtedly others have come across his evidence and placed portions of it on the record—

> —that unification, while it might wel be the end result of integration, would not at present be timely, that more time was needed for the orderly development of the integration process. "I felt that a lot of careful planning was necessary and probably time to educate people was required before the next step of unification."
>
> He said that he saw no significant financial or military advantage in unification over integration.

What I have quoted, Mr. Chairman, is part of an editorial in the *Globe and Mail* of Wednesday, March 22.

Surely if there are neither military nor financial justifications for this measure, then there is no other reason for it.

Presumably the charge will be made that we who are in the opposition should have some alternative proposals, and because I like to dabble in the somewhat cloudy ideals of defence and international affairs I am going to dare to make a suggestion or two to the minister. Where we should use the word integration is in the formation of our defence and foreign policies. Here we need an integrated if not a unified approach. As I said a minute or two ago, our relationship with the United States is crucial.

We have been warned recently through a very interesting series of articles in Canadian newspapers about the build-up of the debate in the United States concerning a program costing $30 billion for antiballistic missiles. The debate is going on between the Secretary of Defence in the United States and his military advisers, and will soon be joined by the United States Congress. Mr. Chairman, Canada cannot be drawn into this arms race under any pretext and I assume that we—"we" meaning the government of Canada and the country—have already served notice on Washington to this effect.

The west can continue on its present course of repression of social problems and effective action on them through global military commitments and continuing "far off wars"—to use an expression from that interesting book titled "1984". These will involve a direct racial conflict and will keep the world precariously on the edge of an arms race and nuclear war, and will involve a continuing drain on men and the morality of the empire to maintain the frontiers—that, of course, is the empire of the west—or the west can embark on a full program of dealing with the root problems of developing areas in a "helping the people to help themselves" manner which will promote international co-operation and intercultural exchange, eventually bringing about world law, if not world government.

Perhaps I will be accused of idealism, but perhaps it is time, in a debate that has gone on for 10 days, for a few minutes of idealism.

Of course the second of the alternatives I outlined is the one that I espouse.

What might be in order, then, to use a phrase coined by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, is the employment of the "walking into the beverage room backwards" technique, and we might be using this technique with our good friends the Americans. Perhaps these suggestions may have some merit. At least they will take the house leader's mind off standing order 15A which seems to trouble him a bit.

The first suggestion is—and here of course I speak for myself and not my party, something which will be obvious in a minute—that the Canadian armed forces might be reduced to a mobile brigade group on United Nations standby. Canada would also supply UN training cadres for international forces and the Canadian militia, if there is such a thing any more.

Second, a specific function in the total North American defence network would be assigned to us, this function to be in a non-arms race sector, and preferably to have civilian application, that is, application in the field of communications, medical services, radar warning, transport, or what have you.

Third, there might be a year of compulsory national service for all Canadians at age 18 in one of the following areas—I digress to say I see my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe-Bagot look at me with alarm, but I would repeat that this proposal is only my own—the first of the areas being the militia or reserve forces. Second, and of equal importance in this catalogue would be the Company of Young Canadians; third, an adjunct to that, a youth conservation corps; fourth, hospital work; fifth, work in our northern areas, the choice in each case to be up to the individual. This, I am advised, would amount to about 400,000 people a harnessing of youthful idealism, and if I can still claim youthful idealism I shall do so. In any event, this is the number of people who could be enlisted each year.

Another suggestion is that $1 billion of the $1.6 billion we now spend on defence would be used for foreign assistance programs for developing areas. My suggestions are that this could be used through integrated economic development programs for total regions and nations. There would also be what I call personal service, because I do not like the word personnel, covering the provision of teachers, doctors, technicians, etc. some of whom might be drawn from the corps of 400,000 which I have mentioned.

[Mr. Fairweather.]

• (8:40 p.m.)

Also included would be capital assistance to individually owned farms of up to a certain acreage, to small industries controlled by the workers and minority shareholders, to co-operatives, and to all popularly controlled enterprises which would promote true free enterprise rather than perpetuate a basically feudal system. Then there would be grants for specific jointly planned projects such as universities, schools, plant and so on which would be returned in trade, or not at all, depending on the facility. Surely in respect of any subject such as this it is important that we in Canada help other countries train their people in those countries, and not rely so much on bringing them here to Canada thus creating the additional problem of their forgetting their homelands. I believe Canada could perform an invaluable service to the United States and the world in general by taking the lead in dealing with root problems. Canada has all the advantages of the United States, such as wealth, technology, and so on, and less of the disadvantages such as civil rights problems, colonies, size of population and so on.

A lot of this no doubt is highly idealistic, but I must say that as a result of what I read and study I become a little tired when I hear experts tell me that the solution to the problems of man rests in alliances such as NATO, NORAD and so on. I think that somehow, once we get into these alliances, we become so inflexible in our policy that detachment from it becomes increasingly difficult. NATO obviously was an important instrument of policy when it was initiated some years ago. I for one feel that its days are numbered, and the sooner we in this country recognize that fact the better it will be. I am not thinking in a miserly way of the dollars involved: I just believe, in my humble opinion, that the need long since has been overcome by events.

Now, if I may—still not committing an infraction of rule 15A—I should like to place on the record two paragraphs from a book written by one of the truly great men in the world, Lord Boyd Orr. I believe that if we spent more time listening to idealists such as Lord Boyd Orr we would have less trouble over matters of national defence. In a book entitled "As I Recall The 1880's to the 1960's" he said:

> The most important question today, when the terrific advance of modern science has shaken the economic systems of the twentieth century, is whether man has attained the wisdom to adjust the old systems to suit the new powers of science and to realize that we are now one world in

which all nations will ultimately share the same fate. The only hope of survival, as so many statesmen who are not in office and other intellectuals have realized, is a world government able to keep peace by getting the cooperation of all nations, including China, as political equals, on a basis where their influence is adjusted to the size of the population. Some people believe that man's wisdom has not kept pace with his scientific achievements, and the wealthy privileged nations will continue to exercise their powers to retain their privileges.

Lastly, this great man of the world says:

The many non-governmental organizations to which millions of people adhere in all countries are continually holding conferences to consider ways and means whereby we can attain peace, economic prosperity and international friendship. It is difficult, however, to get governments to realize that this is the only road for the survival of our civilization. After the first world war president Woodrow Wilson tried to usher in the new era by setting up the League of Nations for which the European countries were not ready. Their governments tried to build up the old system which collapsed in the second world war, and unless the present efforts succeed, our civilization will collapse in a third world war. It is a race against time. The hope is that wisdom may prevail and the great powers of science be applied in co-operation by all nations to create a wonderful new era free from the intolerable evils of war, poverty and disease. Then we will have a world in which the people of all countries will rise to a higher standard of living and a higher culture than has yet been attained by the most privileged people in the most privileged countries of the world. Such is the world which the present statesmen could, if they were wise, hand on to our children.

Mr. Chairman, as one who represents a constituency in what is one of the privileged countries of the world I suggest that parliament and the people of Canada would make better use of their time by thinking about some of the concepts put forward by Lord Boyd Orr and others toward ensuring the peace of man than, I suggest, in wasting it by considering this bill which it seems to me is nothing more than a technique in personal puffery.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I have never spoken previously in this debate, but after hearing the hon. member from the neighbouring constituency of Medicine Hat I felt prompted to enter into the debate for two reasons. First, I wish to answer his argument and, second, I wish to set forth some of the points of view which I, as a Canadian in this day and age, feel should be set forth at this time in respect of the matter of defence. There was a suggestion made by the hon. member for Medicine Hat that we were carrying on delaying tactics with reference to this bill. I would say to him that anyone who has been reading the newspapers—

An hon. Member: Liberal minded.

Mr. Woolliams: Yes; I know he is very Liberal minded on occasion, and at the right times. I should like to say to him that if he wishes to project himself forward as the representative of a small divided group and say to this committee that the main opposition in parliament is delaying this legislation, this is a good way to project his personality, get the necessary propaganda back home and say "I am the great man from Medicine Hat and I am saving parliament". He has tried those tactics on many occasions since I have been a member of parliament. I know them well and do not intend to answer them any further. I do, however, wish to show the House of Commons once again the motive and nature of the man from Medicine Hat, who is Liberal minded at the right and proper time to save the government from embarrassment.

As I have said, I have not spoken previously in this debate, but I am happy now to enter into a debate such as this which concerns the security of this nation. If I may be personal for a few moments, let me say that only last week I had my fiftieth birthday. Twice during the past 50 years the freedom of the western world has been threatened. Had it not been for those countries of the western world who can work together, although sometimes they fail to do so, perhaps the freedom I enjoy tonight to speak freely and have members on the government side listen would not be possible.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Before entering into the main theme of my remarks tonight I should like to say that young Canadians, and I used to consider myself among them, would realize how important it is not to rush through parliament, measures on the important matter of defence and security, had they witnessed German solciers goosestepping down the streets of Canadian cities and had there been that destruction in Canada which occurred overseas as a result of bombing. Surely these young Canadians, had they seen the suffering of civilians during the last war, would realize how important our defence forces are, not only to the security of this nation but to the very existence of the western world.

If this country is to have influence, we must be prepared to take our place alongside the nations of the western world. The world is becoming smaller, as has often been said, but the various camps are becoming larger. We now have the camp of the western world on the one side, with communism on the

other. It has been my belief for some time that even had we not been victorious, because of our combined and dedicated services toward the maintenance of freedom, that way of life which best suits man would have survived.

Let me come to my next point in reference to delay. I joined with members of the Conservative party in asking that this matter be sent to a committee for study before second reading in order that we could hear the evidence of experts. Had we been allowed to do so I am sure this debate would have been shortened. The minister on that occasion, because he is a stubborn man, was as unyielding as he is tonight. He would not move because he is inflexible. His attitude has been one of stubbornness. He has said we intend to do certain things and they must be done his way without compromise. In this regard let me first say that had the minister been prepared to compromise and allow this matter to go to the committee in order that the bill could be examined clause by clause before second reading, we would have saved time. For that reason I make no apology for taking part in the debate at this time.

I have thoroughly read the only speech made by a member of the executive on the government front benches, other than the minister of defence. That speech was made by the Minister of Transport, whom I have always respected for his intelligence, though never for his intellectual trickery such as that exemplified by the change in his position on the Crowsnest Pass freight rates, in the transport bill. I never thought I would, either as a Canadian or a member of this parliament, read a speech of the nature delivered by that minister. Let us look for a few minutes at what he said. Many of the things said by that minister should be exploded before this debate concludes. I hope the hon. member for Medicine Hat has read his speech and will be able at the appropriate time, and place, and with the appropriate audience in Alberta, to endorse his words.

Some of the things the Minister of Transport said are very unusual. In reference to the question of unification he suggested this was not something for experts to decide. He said there was no point in calling the chiefs of staff and high ranking officers because we had never before attempted unification, and to do so would be a waste of time. He said he did not put much faith in that kind of evidence because it was worthless. In the event that anyone doubts my analysis of what he said in this regard let me quote briefly from his speech. I know the rules in this regard and if anybody objects to what I intend to do let me say that I am familiar with his words and can readily paraphrase them. This is what the Minister of Transport said, which was so shocking:

> The point I am making is that in so far as the progress on integration is concerned, that has been going on for three or four years and the evidence of military experts is, of course, of great relevance.

Apparently this evidence was of relevance in respect of integration. As pointed out by the hon. member for Calgary North, we have realized for a number of years that integration must take place and has been taking place. This is true of Canada as well as of other nations. Then the Minister of Transport said:

> —in so far as unification is concerned it has no relevance whatever.

Let me point out that the fight being debated in parliament tonight is not in respect of integration but in respect of unification. I have heard on television and read in newspapers the use of the two words as meaning the same thing. A distinguished British officer, and I do not intend to mention his name, was being interviewed on a C.B.C. program. Twice during that program I heard the words "integration" and "unification" used as meaning one and the same thing. Surely that was done for the same reason the minister uses the words in this way. It was done to confuse the people. Even the Minister of Transport followed the same course in an attempt to indicate that there was no difference between integration and unification.

I intend to define these two terms by quoting the definitions of those experts the Minister of Transport feels should not pass an opinion. The Minister of Transport then said, as reported at page 14667 of *Hansard* for April 7:

> I want to repeat that. The evidence of experts is of no relevance whatever because there are no experts. There never has been, under modern conditions at least, a unified military force. It is like every step forward, and I believe this is a step forward; it is a step into something in which nobody has any experience.

In other words he is suggesting that the air marshal and the chief of general staff and other high-ranking officers are not qualified to speak on unification.

Who are the two Canadian experts on the question of unification? Apparently they are the Minister of National Defence and the Minister of Transport. That being the case,

why did the minister bother calling the committee together? Surely that was simply a waste of time. The Minister of National Defence is the same man who boasted when on this side of the house that when he became minister he would set up a special defence committee to hear evidence and expert opinion. The Minister of Transport, I am sure with the support of the Minister of National Defence, said that the opinions of these men would be worthless because we have never had unification. Let me draw an appropriate analogy. Apparently the evidence and expert opinion of a top medical practitioner would be worthless in respect of a new treatment because it was new and had never been used before. That is the pith of the argument used by that intelligent Minister of Transport and, of course, endorsed by the Minister of National Defence. If what they suggest is true, then the defence committee wasted its time.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Let me pause here for a few minutes without taking too much time of the committee—and I am sure this is relevant. I have come to the conclusion, in my 10 years as a member of parliament, that in many cases—I do not say all, because I want to be fair —committees of the House of Commons are a farce because the government controls committees. I will draw an analogy. I know more about the general subject of committees, because I was not a member of the defence committee, but I have read the reports and will quote from them. Take the committee on northern affairs. That committee heard evidence for a week. The government members were in the majority and were hand-picked by the minister. They whitewashed the whole picture as far as our national parks are concerned. This sort of thing went on in the defence committee and goes on in every committee in the House of Commons. Hon. members opposite talk about the great intellectuals on that side of the house and how they will improve our committees system. They know as well as I do the extent to which politics are played in our committees.

An hon. Member: Committees are loaded with government members.

Mr. Woolliams: An hon. member says committees are loaded. They are loaded in more ways than one. The government members on committees whitewash the reports of committees. If there are politics in the subject before the committee, it is swept under the rug. I would think that the hon. member for Medicine Hat, because of his length of service, experience as a parliamentarian and as a rules expert, would have seen through this subterfuge. Listen to what the Minister of Transport had to say, as reported at page 14667 of *Hansard*:

> It is like every step forward, and I believe this is a step forward; it is a step into something in which nobody has any experience. I suggest that generally we are apt to get the most imaginative views from young people who have a sense of adventure and not from people who fought the last war—

I say to the minister that I have a great deal of respect for our youth, those in colleges and universities, and always have, because the strength obtained through knowledge is the strength of the nation. I recall that in 1935 to 1939 the Oxford Group wandered around the western world preaching and selling peace like insurance agents selling insurance policies. One by one the freedoms of the western world were drained to the depths by these people. If it had not been for Winston Churchill and other great leaders of the western world I would not have had the opportunity tonight to express my views, which this government does not want to hear anyway. I agree with a former minister of national defence of our government, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, when he said, as reported at page 14667 of *Hansard*:

> I am fed up with this stuff from non-combatant people who are making fun of fighting men.

I am a red-blooded Canadian and I am glad the former minister of national defence had this to say and put it on the record of *Hansard* for others to read. He had this to say about the great debate in which we are engaged—and it is a great debate:

> Mr. Churchill: I thank the minister very much. But when I spoke in rather a personal fashion I was not speaking for myself, because I do not care much what is said around here. However, I am disturbed about the attacks that are made upon men who served much better than I did in both wars. People are making scurrilous remarks about them, talking about them as being out of date and all the rest of it. They are attempting to pretend that these men were not good servants of their country, and that is what I object to.

That is what I object to in reference to this debate. I object to the standard of debate that we have seen from the front benches, the executive, of this government. In my opinion the speech of the Minister of Transport is, in plain, ordinary English, a disgrace. I am sorry to see the Minister of National Defence endorse that type of drivel, particularly in view of the ambitions he had, about which I have read in many periodicals in the last few

years. With the greatest respect to the Minister of National Defence, and he knows that I have respect for him, I do not think his image as potential leader of that party has been enhanced by that kind of drivel.

What went on in the defence committee? We heard the Minister of National Defence time and time again—as we have heard him in the last two or three years—criticize the hon. member for Calgary North and the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre in respect of defence matters. The minister has said he can save the country money. He has said this right across our nation. This has been his great sales talk. He has said, "I can save the taxpayers of this country money because I am an expert and can streamline defence."

Even though the Minister of Transport does not agree with Air Marshal Miller, Air Marshal Miller had something to say about the saving of money in the area of defence. Let us look at page 2297 of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the committee on national defence. Air Chief Marshal Miller was asked this question by a former minister of national defence, the hon. member for Calgary North:

> Do you, yourself, see any financial advantage accruing from the proposed scheme of unification?

What was the answer? Air Chief Marshal Miller replied:

> There are no significant financial advantages whatsoever as far as I can see.

Naturally the Minister of Transport had to say that we cannot accept the evidence of these experts. He asked, who are they to pass opinions? They only served 30 or 40 years in the services. Then the Minister of Transport said that they pushed aside these men of experience in the first war and put in young people in the second war. When the former minister of national defence asked him to name the great generals of the second world war, he could not name them. His argument fell flat on its face, as have his words across this nation. What else did he say about that subject? As reported at page 2302 of the committee proceedings, the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona asked this question:

> In fact, sir—I am going away out on a limb here—was there any thought in your mind or did you have any evidence on which to base an opinion that unification itself had any hope of achieving any sort of substantial savings in itself, at all?

Once again Air Marshal Miller said, "No." How, then, can the Minister of National Defence continue to peddle that sort of drivel across the nation and say that this program, no matter how dear and close it is to his heart, will save the taxpayers' money? The proof of the pudding is in the eating. The estimates of the minister's department have been published, and the budget for defence is up by $150 million.

An hon. Member: It is $115 million.

Mr. Woolliams: Somebody says it is up by $115 million. I see that the minister is laughing. What is $115 million to him? If he thinks an increase of $115 million is a lesser sum than $150 million, in this context, he and I went to different schools. Then we have the great cross-examiner, the hon. member for Kootenay East. I would never want the hon. member to be beside me in the defence of any case, because if I were defending he would be the most powerful prosecution attorney one could imagine. If you are defending and want to make a point for the prosecution, you put Byrne in. Listen to this one. This is a dinger. This will be quoted in our law schools across Canada for time immemorial. He really brings this matter to a head for the Liberal government. I congratulate him, because he has put this matter in the proper perspective. This is the kind of cross-examination I have always dreamed of but hoped it would never happen to me. The hon. member for Kootenay East asked this powerful question:

> Then, do you believe that the implementation of Bill C-243 would result in significant demoralization of the various forces?

This was most potent cross-examination of Air Marshal Miller:

> Then, do you believe that the implementation of Bill C-243 would result in significant—

I like that word.

> —demoralization of the various forces?

That has been our argument. That is the great question. What did Air Chief Marshal Miller say when answering that question put by the prosecution? He said:

> If rushed, I would think so.

What a question, and what an answer. This is where I rest our case, Mr. Chairman. I am glad to see the chairman of the defence committee, the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, wave at me from across the way. He made a great speech. He said that this bill, with all its clauses, means nothing. He said it merely changes the name of the forces, and that the feelings of the serving men and their morale are nothing. The hon. member says we

are really debating nothing. It is something like medicare, we will merely pass this measure to gain influence and for window-dressing.

• (9:10 p.m.)

So I say to the minister, first, it is not saving the nation money, and second, it is demoralizing the army. He may say, as did Air Chief Marshal Miller, that he cannot predict whether or not there will be less recruits. But I cannot believe that a man will join a force in the belief that he will serve at sea, and end up as a footslogger in the jungles. The minister denies now the charge that he cannot get the necessary recruits for the air force and the navy. I say the minister is a failure.

Tonight we are making history because when the present government occupied this side of the house—and I believe this is the very seat the minister occupied—the defence policy of our government was attacked and we were defeated. At that time the hon. member for Medicine Hat and other members in his party, which was much stronger at that time, voted with the government and turned out the Conservative government on account of its defence policy.

If ever there was a climax and a mess created by the Liberal party and the Liberal government, it is that government's policy on defence. I will remind the government that its record in that regard is consistent tonight, and in looking back at the history of that party with regard to military affairs I should like to hang an albatross around their necks. I am referring here to the scandal of Hong Kong. It was a week before Christmas when the Liberal government sent our ill equipped force there. I should like the minister to visit one hospital in Calgary and to look at some of the human wrecks who are there now as a result of the decision taken by those great experts on defence, the Minister of Transport, the Minister of National Defence and the Prime Minister, all Liberals. This is the albatross I would hang around their necks when they speak about defence matters. What I am saying may seem a little tough, but it is true and true facts cut deeply.

The hon. member for Medicine Hat says we should not debate this subject any further. Yet I am still convinced that in working together with our neighbours we can keep peace and security but, as the late President Kennedy said, we cannot negotiate from a weak position. We can never negotiate from fear but we must not be afraid to negotiate: A weak force means we would be negotiating with other nations from fear. If we allow ourselves to be weakened, the communists will run all over us. That is no way to secure peace. The policy of appeasement has failed in the past and we have seen the loss of freedom which it has brought about.

I should like to conclude with the words of Winston Churchill when he spoke about defence, with reference to world affairs. He made the speech at Harry Truman's birthday party. At that time the western world was afraid of the Russian communists, just as now it is apprehensive about China. Let us hark back to those times. I do not remember the exact words which Winston Churchill used, but he said in effect that the United Nations, which he hoped to be the majestic centre of world security, has been reduced to a mere cockpit where ancient states and mighty nations hurl reproaches and recriminations at one another to prepare for what would seem a third world war. He said at that time that Russia dreads our friendship as much as our hostility. Then he offered a solution. He said that that is why he believed in strength, and that in working together as friends we can save the world. He said that if the iron curtain were lifted so that millions of good hearted human beings on either side could have free intercourse one with the other, the 14 men in the Kremlin who control millions of good hearted people would soon be undermined and peace and security would be ours.

I direct these words to the minister because I believe that in bringing about unification of our forces against the opinions of our military experts and of experts all over the world —because nowhere else is it being tried out in the face of such opposition—we are weakening Canada's endeavours to maintain peace and security in alliance with the western world.

I make one appeal to the minister, and I think it is a worth-while one. I ask him to reconsider his position on unification. The Prime Minister said in Calgary that it will take a few years before unification is brought about. He, the Prime Minister said he had some doubts about unification, after having heard the statement made by the deputy minister. Surely if it is the responsibility of the Prime Minister not only to govern this country but to work for the safety and security of the world, then the Minister of National Defence should cease to be so arrogant and should withdraw unification from the bill.

National Defence Act Amendment

• (9:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to participate in this debate but, in so doing, I have no apologies to make since it is a privilege shared by everyone of us, members of this house.

I have no objection to anyone in this house expressing an opinion, but I would not take it kindly if someone were to try to prevent me from speaking out.

It is not on account of some military experience that I rise to speak in this debate tonight, for I have none at all. But I have followed attentively the various speeches and it seems to me that some important points need clarification.

Many questions have been put to the minister and all or most of them have remained unanswered. Another reason for taking part in this discussion is to protest on behalf of the voters of my constituency against the government, once again, trying to gag us. They may be using a method different from the one they previously resorted to, but with the support of our friends opposite, they would fain prevent us from expressing our views.

Every time a measure is introduced to prevent us from speaking, I shall make it my duty to rise and protest, on behalf of those I have the honour to represent in this house. All we want is a clear and definite explanation of what the hon. minister wants to have passed by this house, and nothing else.

Mr. Chairman, we are accused of filibustering. What else can we do? When we ask the minister to give the information we need, the information our electors request, he refuses to give it. I feel that we cannot honestly be blamed for renewing our request; on the contrary, the minister should be blamed for his uncompromising attitude, his arrogance, his stubbornness in failing to give us the information we are entitled to.

I would hope that if we repeat this often enough to him he will come to understand at last and will be willing to make half of the way and give us at least some, if not all, of the explanations we require, if we are to feel justified to exercise the rights which are ours in the house.

Mr. Chairman, if there is one important question for a country, it is the question of defence. The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer) will be the first to admit this and he will also agree with me that it is every member's business to know as much as possible about this country's defence.

Who, both in this house and outside, would want to depend upon a foreign country for the defence of our land? This country belongs to us; it is ours, and we must take all available means to provide for our own defence. We simply want the minister to tell us how he intends to discharge his responsibilities as Minister of National Defence.

When he introduced this bill, the Minister of National Defence led us to believe that unification would save the taxpayers a lot of money. If one looks at the figures, one cannot but notice that over the last few years defence expenditures have gone up steadily. In fact, they climbed to $1,658 million and, this year, they increased by $115 million.

How can the minister blame us for taking a little time on such an important matter, on such heavy expenditures and for asking him to account for them? In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, we are only doing our duty as members of parliament and the remarks made by an hon. member opposite prove what I am saying. I refer to the hon. member for Chicoutimi (Mr. Langlois) who stated the following, as shown on page 14676 of *Hansard*:

> As members of parliament we have a direct responsibility to ensure that public funds are spent in the most effective way.
>
> I suggest that to ignore the advice of experts as to ways to save money and make this country's armed forces more effective is a very serious dereliction of duty.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the present minister has completely disregarded the views of the hon. member for Chicoutimi (Mr. Langlois). He does not seem to pay any attention to the amount of the expenditures. He seems also to reject or ignore the advice of at least a dozen experts, who do not approve of his proposal. And they are career men, who have devoted the greater part of their lives to the armed forces. They have told the minister that his unification proposal was not appropriate for the country.

But the minister, in his obstinacy, remains set on imposing a plan which he conceived himself and, in spite of the wish of experts in this field, he still wants to implement a plan which, according to these experts, would not answer the needs of our armed forces.

It seems to me the minister should not be surprised that we ask him questions. It is his duty to give us information. There are also other reasons why our attitude should not come as a surprise to the minister.

Hon. members will remember that a certain piece of evidence of one of the senior officers in the army was tampered with to meet the current needs. How can the minister be surprised now to see that we do not accept all he tells us without reservation? Furthermore, he accused an admiral, Admiral Landymore, of having betrayed his country. He accused him of treason and then presented his excuses. Nevertheless, he has left this admiral, a high ranking military officer who gave his best for many years, under a cloud—that of treason. How can the minister today be surprised to see that we do not accept all he tells us without reservation? It seems logical to me that we should ask ourselves whether he tells us the truth. We are justified in adopting this position by recent events.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the minister has no reason to think that we are acting otherwise than according to our conscience.

We heard him say the other day that he was trying to carry this plan into effect because he was convinced that this was in the best interest of the country.

• (9:30 p.m.)

On the other hand, on the basis of the evidence given by experts, by people who know our armed forces, we are convinced of fully performing our duty by refusing to let the bill pass before we get all the required evidence or information.

There are, in my riding, people who occupy very enviable positions in society—I am speaking of lawyers, even judges—who held high ranks in the armed forces during the last war. All those with whom I have discussed unification unanimously agreed that some degree of integration, of unification can take place, for instance, with regard to medical, legal, supply, mechanical repair services, etc. However, as far as the air force, the army and the navy are concerned, they think that those who served in the armed forces generally believe in keeping their own identity.

It is in the light of this information, Mr. Chairman, that I urge the minister to reconsider his position, because I think he is going astray.

Every year, I take part in the ceremonies on Armistice Day, November 11. We find in those ceremonies the evidence that servicemen prize the uniform in which they served. In fact, very few are those who do not wear their uniform for those ceremonies on November 11. It is noticeable how sailors stick together, as do infantrymen and the other members of the armed forces, while the airforce boys join together to share memories on feats of arms when they were at the front.

Mr. Chairman, our soldiers do care, even in peace time, for the uniforms in which they served. This means that the minister does not recognize, or want to recognize the requests of those who served in our armed forces, that he still insists on getting them all to wear the same uniform, to gratify his own wishes, his own ego. To my mind, there is no other explanation for his attitude.

I am surprised, Mr. Chairman, at the reluctance of the Liberals, mainly those from Quebec, to take part in this discussion and to raise objections, particularly with regard to clause 6 of Bill No. C-243, for this clause is the equivalent of conscription. After seeing the Liberals make their campaigns on the conscription issue for 25 years, it is odd to see to what degree they remain silent on a matter they talked so much about, to scare the people.

However, after thinking it over, Mr. Chairman, there is practically no reason for being surprised, if for instance one goes over the position taken by the hon. members opposite during the 1962 and 1963 election campaigns when they went around the province of Quebec in particular promising their constituents that they would oppose nuclear weapons.

Yet, only a few months after their coming to power, we saw them rise to a man to indicate that they were in favour of nuclear weapons which they had denounced so vigorously during the election campaign.

But they had been elected. They had what they were looking for: power. And when they are in office, their attitude is somewhat different from what it is when they sit in opposition or during an election campaign.

It may also be advisable to remind my friends opposite that in 1942, they devised that plebiscite in order to evade their obligations. Because, as you surely remember, Mr. Chairman, some people claimed to be strongly opposed to conscription in the province of Quebec.

You also remember that during the campaign preceding the plebiscite, the fathers of my good friends opposite, at least some of them, campaigned for the negative side in the province of Quebec, whereas in the rest of the country, other Liberals were campaigning for the other side.

Two policies, one for one part of the country, and another for the other part, according to the votes that could be gained for the Liberal party.

Well, Mr. Chairman, all those things have been prejudicial to Canadian unity and have given rise in the mind of Canadians to the idea that Quebeckers were not willing to assume their share of responsibility for the defence of the country.

The facts are the opposite, and I am happy to point out that during the 1914-18 war as well as during the 1939-45 war, Quebeckers fulfilled their duties.

Mr. Chairman, to conclude, I would like to appeal to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer). I want to tell him that he is wrong in not accepting the advice of experts on defence, and urge him to reconsider his position.

I know that he is anxious to discharge his duties but if he really wants to serve the country, he will have to accept the advice of the admirals, the rear admirals and all those who try to talk him out of his project. If the minister continues on his course, then the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) will have to take the matter in hand and simply withdraw this bill, so that we may have more time to study it and obtain the information which we need to enlighten our constituents.

I think that the hon. minister should think it over and not rush on with this, because the decision he is making now will certainly be against the best interests of the country.

• (9:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether I could be so bold as to place before the committee once again the suggestion which I made last Friday morning, as set out in *Hansard* at pages 14925 and 14926. My proposal then—and I offer it again now—was to the effect that we agree some time soon, possibly tonight or tomorrow, to let clause 2 stand and go on to some of the other clauses of this bill. May I make it very clear, Mr. Chairman, that I am not trying to close off debate on clause 2. I am not suggesting that a vote be taken at this time. Indeed, if we let the clause stand it will not have been passed until we come back to it at some later stage of our proceedings.

I am positive that my suggestion does not prejudice the work of the business committee. I happen to be one of the members of that committee; therefore, I shall not report on what it is doing. But I am sure that if we were to go on from clause 2 to other clauses, that would not clash with anything which the committee might report or fail to report.

I should like also to make it clear that my proposal should be considered as one which does not seek to strengthen the position of either the government or the opposition in this debate. I put it forward because it seems to me that at some point members will want to discuss other clauses. There has been a suggestion of that in the speech made by the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot who found himself discussing clause 6 of the bill; I believe this is one of the clauses which a number of hon. members wish to debate at considerable length.

And I said, my proposal does not strengthen the position of either side; it simply makes sure that whatever time we do spend on this bill we will divide among clause 2 and the other clauses in which hon. members are interested. I plead with the government not to bring in my suggestion in the form of a motion. I hope this is something we may agree on. It will not make sense if we spend all our time on clause 2 and then, because of the application of a rule, or whatever else may happen, the committee has to let the other clauses go by without debate. On Friday morning I thought Monday night would be a good time at which to agree to this course. That is why I have been bold enough to take the floor at this point in the debate, hoping that hon. members will consider what I had to say.

Incidentally, if there are members who feel they have anything to say which relates to clause 2 and which has not yet been said—I make no comment on that—it seems to me there are other clauses which are just as general as clause 2. For example, clause 5 states that the services now known as the three we have shall be embodied in the new single force. Surely this clause is wide enough for any discussion or for any contribution members may want to make.

I offer this suggestion in good faith. I do so without taking sides as between the two main contending groups at the present time. I do so in the hope that whatever time we spend on this bill we may apportion reasonably as among the various clauses. That is my proposal, that either tonight or some time tomorrow we agree to allow clause 2 to stand, without voting on it, and go on to clauses 3, 4, 5, and 6 as the committee might wish.

Mr. Nugent: I want to say a few words tonight, principally because of the intervention made by the hon. member for Medicine Hat—not that he said anything about the bill, but certainly his attitude echoed the prevailing sentiment on the other side of the house. Several of the things he said found an echo there because as usual the hon. member was following the line which he knows will please those who dominate him in this house—the Liberal party.

He said, in essence, that the committee had heard enough speeches—that it was the democratic thing, now, to vote. Hon. members, he said, wanted to vote on the issue and had the right to vote, now. It seems to me this illustrates several fundamental errors in the thinking of the hon. member for Medicine Hat, errors shared by hon. members who sit opposite. They are not sure enough as to the duty of members of this house or, at least, their idea of their duty does not coincide with mine. They have no conception as to the seriousness of this legislation and they do not understand the duty of a member when he feels that a course proposed by the government is basically very wrong. I refuse to accept the proposition that the minds of hon. members are so settled that they cannot be reached by some of the facts which have been so clearly brought out before the committee. I feel that when, presented in the proper light, the evidence is so clear that some of those who sit opposite will come round to our point of view.

I cannot comprehend the attitude taken by the hon. member for Medicine Hat. He seems to believe that when carrying on a fight the only question to be considered is whether you are likely to win or lose. I do not know whether it is my Irish ancestry or not, but the only thought I have is that when something is bad, you fight it. And when the results are likely to be very, very serious, you must fight it with every weapon you have. Any other concept is unacceptable to me. The hon. member's attitude—"It looks hopeless so why don't you give in?"—is one I can neither accept nor understand.

It seems to me that part of the democratic process consists of an attempt to persuade. That process includes making sure that the people of this country understand the issues. As members of the opposition we have the right to attempt to convey the facts to the people so that they may understand—to awaken their comprehension of what is going on. In consequence they might express themselves in a way which would have its effect on members opposite, so that we might even intimidate them—if I may use that word—to the point at which they would go slow with this measure. And that is the most which has been asked by so many defence critics.

I would point out to hon. members that of the time taken on this bill in the committee and in this house, about half has been spent in discussion of the method adopted by the government in bringing forward its legislation on this subject—something about which the utmost concern was expressed by the ministers senior advisers who critized the unseemly haste which the government was adopting, despite the fact that there is no logical reason for its passage at this time. There must be a suspicion in the minds of the people of this country that perhaps there is a reason for this delay and for our belief that the longer this takes the better the people will be educated as to the facts. Once they know the facts they will realize what the government is doing, and the government will be found to be in the wrong. If this indeed be the situation, I suggest that hon. members on the other side are being political when they tell us that now is the time to take a vote. They are worried about their political skins and are scared to death that the people will awaken to the truth of what the Liberals intend to do in this country. They fear the people will give us their support in time to stop them. We hope it will come to that.

• (9:50 p.m.)

I was amazed at the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Justice, for one, who suggested, "This is democracy. We want to vote now. Our minds are made up." Apparently the wish to speak on this is antidemocratic. The hon. member for Leeds and other hon. members opposite used somewhat the same argument by saying, "Let us get on with the job," as though only the vote is the job, and the consideration and the right of persuasion is not part of the job.

I would point out that those who labour under this apprehension of what democracy consists of certainly have a strange idea of democratic functions in this country. I loathe that tone of unctuous righteousness with which the hon. member for Medicine Hat puts forward his idea of, "Vote. Let the majority rule, and that is democracy." Of course if one belongs to the Social Credit party one must learn that tone of unctuous righteousness because this is the way they always talk.

As the hon. member demonstrated in his speech, he had nothing to say about unification. I do not think he has read the evidence of the committee. I do not think he knows anything about it; but he undoubtedly knows how to make one of those typical Social Credit speeches which reveal to us the limitations which Social Crediters believe exist on democracy—that the majority have the right to vote and that is democracy. Certainly rule by majority is the cornerstone of democracy; but don't forget that majority only indicates the power, the balance of power, and that the right to rule by power is held by every other form of government. Any form of dictatorship, if you have the power, gives you the right to rule. It is the way we get the power that makes our way of ruling by power the better. But ruling because we have the power is not the crowning glory of democracy.

It is time that Social Crediters, especially in this house, who are fundamentally lacking in this knowledge, should understand that the crowning glory of democracy is respect for the rights of minorities and individuals. It is this which gives us the right of free speech. It is not the rule by majority that is so important to us. It is that protection which individuals and minorities enjoy under our system that they do not get under those other systems which rule by power, that makes democracy worth while; it is the right to use that freedom of speech to persuade. That is the basis of our democratic and parliamentary system of government, and that is the system we are using now.

There have been suggestions from the other side of the chamber, echoed by papers across the country, that now is the time to stop this debate, that now is the time to take the vote because all the evidence has been heard. I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that only a small fraction of the very valuable evidence before the committee has been brought before the house, that there are many good, sound arguments to be heard, and certainly no one can deny us the right to that last resort of every politician in this country who feels he is fighting for what he must fight for, the attempt to try to get the time to educate the public on this very complicated and important subject, and to ask the house to allow a time for public knowledge to spread so that public opinion can make itself felt.

I certainly realize the risks I run, Mr. Chairman, if, being one of those who has spoken, as my opponents would say, to an excessive length of time in the house, my

[Mr. Nugent.]

electors should feel I have been wasting the time of the house, and they come to the conclusion I was wrong. Certainly while it is human nature to allow someone to make a mistake, if you make a mistake and press vehemently on with it, and in that course of action continue to waste the time of the house and fight as hard as I intend to fight, then I presume the penalty one would pay would be extra severe. I am quite prepared to take that risk. Of course I am convinced in my own mind I am running very little risk, but they always say the person who is crazy is the last one to know it, and it could be that I am. However, I have studied the evidence and I do have tremendous respect for the witnesses who appeared. I am convinced in my own mind that, given an ample opportunity, the result of public opinion on this subject is going to vindicate my stand and the stand of my party. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very clear again that the points I am making are simply to illustrate the approach to this debate.

Last Tuesday, the last time I had a chance to get the floor, the minister took umbrage at my reference to the technique of the big lie, but there was something in an Ottawa paper, the Ottawa *Citizen* on Saturday, which is such a beautiful illustration of this technique that I must touch on it.

To begin with, to understand what I mean by the technique of the big lie, it is not necessary for someone to tell a direct lie. In fact some of the most skilful methods employed in the technique of the big lie do not use a lie at all, although certainly they use half truths. The whole idea of the technique of the big lie is to make sure the facts are hidden, or at least to make sure that if the facts are revealed they are either confused or swamped under false arguments.

I have time tonight to give only one illustration. In the Ottawa *Citizen* on Saturday there appeared an editorial, which I presume was written by Chris Young, headed "The Nugent Case—What's the Limit on Privilege." Anyone who read it would be led to believe that there is something wrong with the privileges of parliament, because I somehow was able to get protection outside the house and the minister was not able to get at me. This would be a distortion or false use of the rules.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, nothing could be farther from the truth in this case. The man who wrote that editorial knew very well I said outside the house exactly what I said

inside the house without any question of parliamentary immunity or privilege whatsoever. I think that if I tried to ask for parliamentary privilege for what I was repeating outside the house it could not be extended to me, but I made it plain I was not reading from *Hansard*. I left Ottawa Wednesday morning before *Hansard* was available. Out west I was trying to use the exact words I had used in the house so that there would be no suggestion that I backed down on what I said. But the truth has not bothered the editor of the Ottawa *Citizen* whatsoever. He writes this editorial to cover up the facts with a smokescreen. It is perfect example of one technique used to perpetrate the big lie. We are used to that in the Ottawa *Citizen*, and I hope tomorrow I can continue with a few other illustrations of the classic use of the big lie in this debate.

May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Hellyer: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, in the spirit of getting on with the business of the house and of the country, since there are some other things we would want to do later this session and next session after this bill has passed, if the committee would agree to extend the sitting beyond ten o'clock tonight?

Mr. Nugent: We have received little cooperation from the Minister of National Defence in this debate. I can understand his tender susceptibilities about time but I believe the minister had his tongue in his cheek when he said he was making that suggestion in the interests of getting along with the other business of the country.

It is ten o'clock, Mr. Chairman.

Progress reported.

• (10:00 p.m.)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

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

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC BUILDINGS—OTTAWA—INQUIRY AS TO CONTRACTS FOR DEMOLITION

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I come back to a matter I raised a few weeks ago, the tearing-down of public government buildings, namely the old printing bureau and the Roxborough building in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, the point is to decide whether a serious investigation is necessary to unveil the truth about the adjudication of demolition contracts to companies that seem to be in collusion. In fact, a comparison of the tenders submitted to the Department of Public Works on two occasions, first for the old printing bureau and second, for the Roxborough building, reveals that the same contractors who missed out on the Roxborough demolition job, had all the chances to recoup themselves with the old printing bureau demolition job.

When the time came for the demolition of the old printing bureau, which is under way at present, the department chose to call on some contractors. Instead of calling for public tenders, where everyone would have had a chance to tender for this contract, where all contractors would have competed, they preferred to call six companies: Cohen & Cohen, Hugh M. Grant, Teperman & Sons, Greenspoon Bros.—who had not done any demolition in Ottawa for many years—Palmer-Levitan Ltd., in Hull and Hurdman Bros. in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, at the time of the first call for tenders to wreck the Roxborough building, in October 1966, Cohen & Cohen tendered for the job with Teperman & Sons—another company, which was supposed to be a rival, but they joined forces—for a total sum of $138,000, while Beaver Demolition tendered for $143,600, Panzini Ltd. for $164,000 and Palmer-Levitan Ltd. for $169,000.

Now, honest officials of the department stated that the cost of such demolition could not go beyond $25,000 or $30,000. Tenders were called for and then, Panzini Ltd., for instance, having first tendered for $164,000, now tendered for $57,000, a difference of 107,000. On the other hand, Palmer-Levitan Ltd. of Hull tendered for $68,000 or a difference of $101,000 between the two tenders.

I understand that high officials of the department, having taken a position, the companies were slightly embarrassed not to tender again at a price lower than previously quoted. But when the small difference is noted between the first tenders, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe there was collusion between the companies. The same situation occurred in connection with the demolition contract for the old printing bureau, when the two same contractors again tendered, but this time, in order that other people may not tender at a lower price, public tenders were not called for.

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called on this matter not by people who want to play politics, but by people who want that justice be respected and applied.

The minister would be wrong in seeing in that any kind of political considerations, because the person who first has brought this matter to my attention, Mr. Thibault of Thibault Lumber, does not belong to my political party. In fact, he is well known in Liberal circles and I think the minister knows him too.

Financially responsible companies, such as Thibault Lumber and others—not only this one but others also—could have saved the Department of Public Works about $50,000 according to their own statement, in the demolition of the old National Printing Bureau.

Mr. Speaker, it is against this injustice, against this apparent collusion between a few important companies wishing to assume "control" of the contracts which the government or the Department of Public Works wishes to grant, or must grant, that I raise my voice. I ask the minister to keep a close eye on the tenderers in future, so far as government contracts are concerned, whether for demolition or construction works.

We do not have the right to play with the Canadian taxpayer's money, with the people's money. We must operate economically and allow contractors and businessmen to have an chance before the law, before the government and particularly before the Department of Public Works.

I rise to protest against such things, Mr. Speaker, and I call the minister's attention to these anomalies which lead some newspapers and even some radio stations to accuse the government of favouring collusion between some companies trying to "fool" the government instead of serving the Canadian people.

[*English*]

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of attention to the hon. member for Villeneuve on the subject of awarding contracts for the demolition of the Roxborough apartments and the old printing bureau. I should like to point out one fact in respect of his earlier remarks. The two contracts were not comparable because of the nature of the structures, and that element of demolition contracts regarding the amount of material capable of being sold at the site. In respect of the Roxborough contract this element was an important factor, whereas in the case of the old printing bureau it was a very small factor, if a factor at all. These facts relate to the entire remarks of the hon. member.

The hon. member for Villeneuve then referred to the method of calling for tenders from a selected list. In respect of the Roxborough it is interesting to note that as a result of the first public call for tender the lowest tender was $138,000 and the highest was $169,000. Because of the fact that even the lowest tender far exceeded the estimated cost of the job the contract was not awarded and tenders were again called. The specifications were changed slightly in respect of two things.

As a result of the second public advertisement calling for tenders, we received 14 bids varying from $19,000 to $88,000. It was clear that the $19,000 bid was not realistic. Therefore the contract was awarded to the second lowest bidder. That contract was never fulfilled. Because the job was partly under way, and in an effort to terminate it, bids were invited from a list of contractors to complete the job. The low bid was $29,985. That was the actual cost of that particular job.

Tenders were invited from six firms in respect of the old printing bureau demolition job. This occurred because the time available was exceedingly short and the job had to be done quickly to provide space for the centennial exhibition to take place at Nepean Point and Parliament Hill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. I regret to have to interrupt the hon. minister, but the time alotted to him has expired.

[*English*]

HOUSING—INQUIRY AS TO POSSIBILITY OF MEETING ECONOMIC COUNCIL TARGET

• (10:10 p.m.)

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, for months now people interested in meeting the needs of housing in this country, newspapers in every city including those which support the government, such as the Toronto *Star*, have been devoting pages almost every day to the tremendous housing crisis which our country is facing. The chairman of the Economic Council, Dr. Deutsch, when appearing before the parliamentary committee dealing with prices estimated that this country needs to build houses at the rate of 170,000 per year in order to meet its minimum requirements in this field.

A few days ago I asked the Minister of Labour (Mr. Nicholson), who is in charge of housing, how close we would come this year to meeting the target suggested by Dr. Deutsch. The minister replied that we were now building homes at the annual rate of 170,000. It was only when the leader of the New Democratic Party asked a supplementary question as to how many houses it was expected would be completed this year that the minister admitted that the number of houses completed this year would be between 150,000 and 155,000; in other words, between 15,000 and 20,000 less than Dr. Deutsch said we needed.

This is not a new situation. In early March, Central Mortgage and Housing reported that housing starts had sagged by 38½ per cent. They said that in the month of January the number of single, detached dwellings started had dropped by 38.5 per cent compared with the same period last year; that apartment starts in January had decreased by 17 per cent; that row housing had decreased by the fantastic amount of 78 per cent. Of course the minister has been telling us that things are getting better, but the Toronto *Telegram* reported on April 15 last that housing starts in Toronto in the month of March went down by 33 per cent compared with the year before. It is not surprising, then, that one reads the kind of report which appeared in the Winnipeg *Free Press* on March 14 last, which says:

> Half the families in greater Winnipeg are living in houses or apartments that are overcrowded, or substandard from the point of view of construction or sanitation.
>
> Or else they are living doubled up—two families in a dwelling designed to be used by one family; or they are paying more for their shelter than they can afford.

This article in the Winnipeg *Free Press* goes on to illustrate the tremendous shortages in housing which have arisen. The Minister of Labour has been so busy with labour problems that he has had little time, if any, to devote to housing. The minister was responsible, for example, for the increase in the interest rate being charged on houses. This policy was intended to enable more houses to be purchased, but it ignored completely the fact that the increase in the interest rate has increased the cost of housing. For example, a house selling for between $20,000 and $25,000 will cost the purchaser, over 25 years, an additional $2,000. The result is that it is becoming increasingly impossible for people, not only in the low income bracket but in the middle income bracket, to purchase houses.

When one looks at the statistics published in the annual report of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, he sees that the number of houses purchased by people with an income of up to $7,000—and the vast majority of people in this country do not earn $7,000 a year—amounts to only 20 per cent of the total number of houses purchased through N.H.A. financing.

What is required is a government and a minister who realize that housing is important, that it is not something which can be turned on and off like a tap simply because we need or do not need jobs. What is required is a housing policy which has an objective of building houses for the people who need them. I hope the government will agree shortly to the proposal which has come from all sections of the country and from all groups interested in the needs for housing, namely that we have a minister of urban affairs, one of whose major concerns would be the provision of adequate housing for the people of Canada. I would hope that such a minister would get on with the job of providing public housing apartments, row and low rental housing which the ordinary people of this country can afford.

In every city of this country it is easy to rent an apartment if you are prepared to pay $200 or more a month. But for the ordinary people who earn $60 or $70 a week this kind of rent is completely impossible. For them the minister and the government have done virtually nothing. We need to get on with the job of urban renewal.

There was nothing more depressing for me than to attend the conference on housing called by the minister, held in my city of Winnipeg, and to hear the minister excuse the fact that he has done so little in housing by saying that of course we cannot expect the moneyed people of this country to put their money into housing when they could make more money building factories and high rise office buildings on which they could charge a very substantial rate and make much greater profits. That is the kind of program which has led to disaster, up to now.

Mr. B. S. Mackasey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg North. I think he will agree with me that the problem of housing is world-wide. Let me point out that in the great socialist haven of Sweden one has to wait six years if he is

lucky and has enough influence, to find a home of any size or dimension.

Dr. Deutsch set a target of 170,000 starts in this year. I am sure that the latest statistics which I have been able to procure from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation will be of encouragement to the hon. member, who is so objective. As I have only three minutes I will simply point out that the number of starts will reach 170,000 by the third quarter of this year, and there is a very good indication that this rate will continue to rise. In other words, by the third quarter of this year the housing starts in Canada will have reached the target set out by Dr. Deutsch and recommended by the Economic Council of Canada.

The question of low rental housing, as is known to the hon. member, who belongs to a party which respects the constitution of this country, comes under provincial jurisdiction. The housing act puts housing at the disposal of the municipalities and housing corporations of the different provinces, and it is up to the provinces to show a little more initiative and to take advantage of the very enlightened legislation which is available, and the huge sums of money which go untapped and unused year in and year out because of the lack of initiative on the part of the provincial authorities.

In so far as the interest rates are concerned, I think again the hon. member will be pleased to know that it has been reduced from 7.25 to 7 per cent.

In conclusion I wish to say that I am very proud of the fact that because of a series of circumstances, the initiative of the minister in generating spring starts by providing 20,000 loans, the reduction in the interest rate from 7.25 to 7 per cent, and the initiative of the government in permitting the banks to re-enter the mortgage field, we will meet this year—not at the end of the year but at the beginning of the third quarter—the target which, as stated by Dr. Deutsch, is in Canada's best interests.

• (10:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—QUEBEC—PROTEST RESPECTING PROPOSED REDUCTION OF SERVICE

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, the question I raised today is not new, as I dealt with it when the minister introduced in the house the new bill concerning the transport commission.

[Mr. Mackasey.]

If I am renewing my attempt today, it is because since this new bill was passed by the house, immediately afterwards—and I could say even before it was passed—the Canadian National Railways applied to the Canadian Transport Commission for permission to discontinue its passenger service between Quebec and La Malbaie. This service has existed, as the minister knows, for about 50 years. It began during difficult times in order to meet the economic needs of our area. Now, the Canadian National Railways are applying to the Canadian Transport Commission for its discontinuance.

Obviously the minister is not at fault but since he assumed his office, my area suffered from certain decisions of the Department of Transport.

Hon. members will recall that last year, I also raised a question concerning the discontinuance of cruises by Canada Steamship Lines between Montreal, La Malbaie and the Saguenay. I had asked the then minister to intervene, to bring pressure to bear on that company in order that that service be continued. The minister may have made representations, but the company nevertheless discontinued its service between Montreal, the north shore and also Pointe au Pic in my riding, and that brought about a loss of employment for 200 persons and caused significant losses to the tourist industry.

This year there is another problem: the C.N.R. has decided to discontinue its passenger service between Quebec city and La Malbaie.

I must tell the minister that his decision raised a wave of opposition and protests from businessmen, boards of trade, intermediate organizations and pressure groups; immediately, the county councils met with all mayors sitting on the county councils to hire economists to study the situation. Municipalities of eastern Quebec were also called upon. The minister should know that Quebec city passed a resolution calling on the Department of Transport to exert pressure upon the Canadian National Railways so that a decision may not be rendered by the Board of Transport Commissioners. The authorities of the cities of Villeneuve and Charlesbourg, near Quebec, have done the same.

Recently, and this was the subject matter of the question I put this afternoon, the Quebec legislature passed a resolution asking the C.N.R. to abandon the proposed elimination of the passenger service between La Malbaie and Quebec.

The minister, with such data, can appreciate, I believe, the fact that all these people who have their hearts set on the economic development of this particular area, stood up and asked him, as well as the Canadian National authorities, to endeavour to study the matter more closely and to postpone the abandonment of the passenger service between Quebec and La Malbaie.

Evidently, the minister will tell me that a deficit exists. There is a deficit, no doubt. However, I am personally convinced that a public service is not a company that must register profits, but rather an organization that must serve the population. That, to my mind, is public service.

If the Canadian National Railways want to talk about losses when it comes before the Board of Transport Commissioners, we will also talk about the tremendous profits it made with its freight train between La Malbaie and Quebec city.

Mr. Speaker, ours is part of an area which has been designated, which is under-developed. Now, nothing is more important in such an area than adequate means of transport or communications.

The C.N.R. has done everything possible to prepare the abandonment of passenger service between Quebec city and La Malbaie. Rusty old cars were placed at the disposal of the public. The service was not publicized, and the hours were not adapted to the needs of the travelling public.

Today, of course, after five years of study, we are told: There are deficits. If the C.N.R. has deficits it is simply because it planned that deficit to be able to go before the Board of Transport Commissioners and say: There, gentlemen, we have no more money and we have to give up the service.

I make a very special plea to the minister. Our area has economic problems. It has a historic past. Particularly during centennial year, when we expect to welcome a great number of tourists, which will help considerably our tourist industry, I think it would be economic ruination if the minister did not recommend to the C.N.R. to give up its idea to discontinue its passenger service between Quebec city and La Malbaie.

I think the minister is aware of the problem, because he has the picture. I trust his sense of fairness and I thank him for having come this evening to listen patiently to the grievances of people who claim to be distressed by that decision of the C.N.R. I am convinced that in the face of all those facts, the minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix): —will honestly appeal to C.N.R. authorities and ask them to give it a try for at least two more years, to adjust the schedules—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The time allotted to the hon. member has now expired.

[*English*]

Hon. J. W Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I can very well understand the feelings of the population served by the railway between Quebec city and Murray Bay, which feelings have been put so feelingly by the hon. gentleman. He knows what the population there perhaps do not all know, namely that this is a matter that parliament saw fit to appoint a board to consider. I have no doubt that the board will consider all the representations that have been made by the municipalities, by the legislature of Quebec, by the city of Quebec and by all those other interested parties.

I can assure the hon. gentleman that I will draw to the attention both of the C.N.R. and of the board the representations that he has made this evening. He will realize of course that it would not be proper for me personally as minister to attempt to bring any pressure on the board one way or the other. There is an appeal from the board to the governor in council, and it would be inappropriate for me to take any part in this process, when later on there might be the need to exercise judgment upon the judgment of the board.

However, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I have every sympathy with the sentiments expressed by the hon. gentleman, and anything I can properly do I assure him I will do.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.31 p.m.

APPENDIX

REMARKS BY PRIME MINISTER AT THE INSTALLATION CEREMONY OF THE GOVERNOR GENERAL, THE SENATE APRIL 17, 1967

Your Excellency, it is my privilege as Prime Minister, and it is indeed my pleasure, to extend to you on behalf of the people and the government of Canada our warmest good wishes as you assume the high and honourable office of Governor General of Canada.

May I respectfully request, Your Excellency, as your first official duty as the Queen's representative in Canada, that you convey to Her Majesty a message of loyalty and devotion from the Canadian people. Please assure her how delighted we are that our Queen and the Duke of Edinburgh will be with us on the 1st of July to celebrate the centennial of our Confederation.

You begin your office, sir, at an historic moment. Throughout the one hundred years of our history as a Confederation, the post of Governor General has been filled by men of distinction who have all contributed significantly to the development of Canada and to the achievement of the proud position which we are celebrating throughout this centennial year.

(*Translation*)

We have been made more aware of the opportunities and the burden of your great office by the unexcelled contribution which your immediate predecessor made to the lasting benefit of all the people of this land. His memory will be treasured and his service to Canada will never be forgotten and I am sure that his life and work will be an inspiration to you as you take up your heavy duties.

(*English*)

We all realize, sir, how especially heavy these duties are in our centennial year. It is yet another evidence of your willingness to serve your country that you readily consented to become Her Majesty's representative in Canada knowing that you and your wife would immediately be faced with a most demanding programme of engagements. We have no doubt, sir, that you will meet the challenges of this great office with the same skill and wisdom and calm good humour that you have met the other challenges that have faced you throughout your varied career; even, if I may add, going far back into the years when I used to pass a puck to you on the right wing, or was it the left wing, and you were expected to score a goal.

We remember well your distinguished performance when you occupied the chair in that other place and "never sold the truth to serve the hour". Although tradition will now bar you from attending there, I assure you, sir, that your reputation is secure as one of the very best and most honoured of our "first commoners".

You were, of course, no stranger to public service. It has been in the tradition of your family. Your father is remembered as a member of this very Chamber where we are now gathered. You yourself, until a few days ago when you received the Queen's summons to represent Her Majesty in Canada, were serving half way around the world as the High Commissioner of Canada to India. There you have been able to test the strength and fabric of our Commonwealth of Nations. At the same time you were the Canadian Ambassador to Nepal and in the clear light of the far Himalayas, you may have seen your country, its problems and its future in a new and different perspective.

Tennyson's lines, I believe, fit well your career,

> "Much has he seen and known; cities of men,
> And manners, climates, councils, governments,
> Himself not least, but honoured of them all".

Through all this you have been accompanied and aided by your wife whose qualities of heart and mind have earned her an enviable reputation and the esteem of all who know her.

Your Excellency, you begin your term of office as Her Majesty's representative in Canada with the best wishes of us all. We welcome you with great goodwill. Que Dieu vous garde. May God's grace and help be with you.

REPLY OF HIS EXCELLENCY THE RIGHT HON. ROLAND MICHENER TO THE ADDRESS OF THE PRIME MINISTER IN THE SENATE CHAMBER ON THE DAY OF HIS EXCELLENCY'S INSTALLATION AS GOVERNOR GENERAL OF CANADA, MONDAY 17TH APRIL 1967

Prime Minister,

So quick has been my transition from New Delhi to Ottawa that I have the sensation of having run all the way, and arrived here amongst you, somewhat out of breath—but as you can see, that does not leave me speechless. On the contrary I am full of ideas and emotions some of which I hope to be able to express to you at least in a preliminary way.

First, I am filled with gratitude for the generous words with which you have welcomed me and my wife and with appreciation for your earlier words, even more consequential, in which you gave to Her Majesty the advice upon which she acted in naming me as her representative in Canada. The honour is great and greatly valued, however awesome the responsibility.

[*Translation*]

Notwithstanding your encouraging expression of confidence that my wife and I will be equal to the task, I am all too well aware, and here I speak for myself alone, of the gap between my qualifications and the potentialities of the office of Governor General. These potentialities have been amply demonstrated by my predecessors. The Right Honourable Vincent Massey, the first Canadian Governor General, gave the office a new significance for Canadians. Their Excellencies the late Georges Vanier and Madame Vanier in the last seven years have so fully represented all that is good in the whole Canadian community, that they have justly won the respect and affection of everyone. His courageous efforts to complete his task in failing health confirm his place among the noblest of our public men.

With other Canadians we have mourned his loss and offered our sympathies to Madame Vanier with a full realization that no other couple would be able to begin at the high level of excellence and esteem to which they had elevated their public responsibilities.

[*English*]

However, we are greatly heartened in entering upon our term of office by the thought that the Governor General has come to represent the Canadian people as a whole and that in addition to his necessary and important constitutional functions he now symbolizes for Canadians the stability and continuity of their national life and institutions. In consequence all Canadians have a personal interest in the office and in helping the incumbent to reflect their hopes and aspirations for the future. Already we have been encouraged by the good wishes of many of those whom we shall serve, and we hope to earn and deserve such encouragement from all. It will make our task possible and our lives happy. In any event, Prime Minister, I shall not fail through lack of effort nor of will to serve.

I gladly undertake to assure at once to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth of Canada, as you have requested, the loyalty and devotion of the Canadian people and our delight that she and The Duke of Edinburgh will soon be with us to join in our Centennial celebrations. May I add to this message my own humble duty to our Queen and my profound gratitude for the trust which she has entrusted in me.

[*Translation*]

Canadians look forward as well to welcoming other royal and distinguished visitors from Commonwealth and friendly nations who will be honouring us with their presence during this momentous year. We are grateful for their esteem and respect which will remind us that our birthday celebrations have significance beyond our own boundaries. 1967 is a time to assess our past achievements in the society of nations and to seek means of extending our contributions to the peace and happiness of the whole family of man.

To my friends in Quebec I should like to say that we look forward very much to the pleasure of living amongst them for a time each year at The Citadel. From there my wife and I shall be able to look down the river to the Ile d'Orleans where we have spent many happy days.

[*English*]

We now see in French Canada a renaissance of that creative vigour and intellectual brilliance which have long been a mark of French civilization. All Canadians may well take pride in the achievements which are taking place in Quebec for they will stimulate and strengthen Canada as a whole. We are fortunate to possess two mighty currents of civilization: French and British. To these first mainstreams of our national existence have been added the diverse and notable contributions of settlers from other lands and races who have ventured to our shores. They have

provided Canada with additional sources of strength and richness.

We look forward, in due course, to visiting all of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific and Arctic, not forgetting Alberta, where I was born and raised, Manitoba my wife's birthplace, and British Columbia, her former home, as well as Ontario, the centre of my public and professional activities.

Having set ourselves the goal of representing what one Canadian has called "la collectivité entière qu'on appelle le Canada", we shall seek to meet and know Canadians in their home communities. In Government House we hope to welcome Canadians of all walks of life, to provide a neutral and friendly environment for the discussion of differing points of view, and a centre for the encouragement of excellence in all worthy fields of Canadian endeavour.

In concluding, may I add my prayer to that of the Prime Minister that God's grace and help may direct us all in our common efforts to sustain and strengthen Canada, our Home.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, April 18, 1967

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF PARLIAMENTARIANS FROM FINLAND

Mr. Speaker: May I be permitted to bring to the attention of hon. members the presence in the Speaker's gallery of a group of distinguished parliamentarians from Finland.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: On behalf of hon. members I wish them a pleasant and interesting visit to Canada.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ALLOCATION OF TIME FOR CONSIDERATION OF DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENTS

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the report of the business committee on the question of allocation of time on the committee of the whole stage and all remaining stages of procedure on Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof, as amended, which was referred to the business committee on Thursday, April 13, 1967. The report is as follows:

Pursuant to the order of reference on Thursday, April thirteenth, 1967, your committee has considered the question of allocation of time on the committee of the whole stage and all remaining stages of procedure on Bill C-243, an act to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof (as amended). I now report that the committee has been unable to reach a unanimous agreement on the question referred to it.

Mr. Speaker, I give notice, pursuant to the provisions of standing order 15A, that on Thursday next I will move that an order be made allocating the time on the committee of the whole stage and all remaining stages of procedure on Bill C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof, as amended, being government order No. 107 on this day's order paper. My motion will provide that two days shall be allocated for the completion of discussion on the committee of the whole stage on Bill C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof, as amended, and that one day shall be allotted for the completion of the third reading stage on the bill. Perhaps I should add so that hon. members will understand—

Mr. Diefenbaker: We understand it perfectly well; the axe.

• (2:40 p.m.)

Mr. McIlraith: —that the motion can only come before the house on Thursday, not tomorrow. It provides for the time indicated in addition to the time that will have been spent between now and the adoption of the motion. At that time we will have had at least 13 days on the committee stage in addition to the time provided for in the motion.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

DAIRY POLICY—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 26

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Chapleau (Mr. Laprise), the adjournment of the house under standing order 26 for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance, namely the government's dairy policy, which is now arousing the ire of all Canadian dairy farmers, and for the purpose of arriving at some early solution to that thorny problem.

Mr. Speaker, the urgency—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Would the hon. member send me a copy of this motion?

The hon. member knows that the debate must deal only with the urgency of debate and not with the urgency of the motion. I would therefore ask him to make the remarks he deems necessary on that point.

Mr. Caouette: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The urgency of debate is obvious, because right now the farmers, the dairy producers, not only in one but in several provinces, are organizing to march on Ottawa. They are unhappy with the recent dairy policy laid down by the government and announced by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene).

The farmers feel that it is very urgent to review the dairy policy so that they can get the minimum price they asked for, that is

$5.10 per hundredweight of manufacturing milk.

Mr. Speaker, I also feel that the following reasons militate in favour of a debate on a definite matter of public importance and urgency, namely the new dairy policy of the government.

Whereas the amount of money made available to the Canadian Dairy Commission is inadequate;

Whereas the dairy policy does not meet with the satisfaction of the producers of manufacturing milk;

Whereas there is no guarantee that the subsidy will be maintained regularly at $1.11, due to the fact that the export premium of 10 cents per hundredweight is not sufficient and that the Canadian Dairy Commission will have to deduct the necessary amounts from the $1.11 subsidy;

Whereas this means that the $1.11 subsidy will be liable to readjustment because of shipping costs;

Whereas the surpluses of dairy producers, namely grades 2, 3 and 4 fluid milk, are not entitled to subsidies;

Whereas cream producers do not receive any special subsidy;

Whereas there are rumours that a group of over 10,000 dairy producers are organizing a march on Ottawa in protest against the present dairy policy;

Whereas there is talk of a general strike amongst dairy producers in the near enough future to slow down the overall economy of this country;

Whereas a ceiling has been put on dairy production and that beyond a certain quota, namely that of last year, dairy producers receive no subsidy to encourage greater production;

Whereas it is proved that our agriculture is now, and has been for several years, in such a state of stagnation that our farmers are dismayed and discouraged;

Mr. Speaker, for those reasons and many others, I feel that this is a matter of urgent public importance which should concern all members as elected representatives of the people.

It has become obvious that farming is no longer economic. On several occasions, farmers have expressed their wishes and their needs. They have written briefs; they have brought pressure to bear on their members of parliament and they have even marched on Ottawa.

But it remains, nevertheless, that farmers have always had to cope with the rising cost of living and yet their income has not increased proportionately.

Without the farmers, urban citizens and factory workers, members of parliament could not live.

A farmer's farm is an urgent matter, it is a private enterprise. Do we want to destroy or to save it?

I feel it is time, Mr. Speaker, to discuss that urgent matter, so that we may clearly establish that Canadian farmers, Canadian dairy farmers will be treated more fairly than they have been up to now by the Department of Agriculture, by the Minister of Finance and Receiver General (Mr. Sharp) and by the government as a whole.

Such is, in my opinion, the urgency of the matter. That is the reason for my intervention today on behalf of the farmers and, to prove how urgent the matter is, I suggest that the Minister of Agriculture bring it before the house so that a free vote may be held and, if it is necessary to put the existence of the government at stake, let nothing stop us, but let us respect Canadian farmers.

This is how urgent my question is.

[*English*]

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent (Ont.)): Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to add my wholehearted support to the proposition put forward by the hon. member in requesting an adjournment in order to debate the very serious problem today facing a great segment of our agricultural industry. It is true that normally we would wait to debate this matter on interim supply and at that time would put the proposition before the government, but I think the problem is far too urgent to brook any delay in such a debate. The farmers of this nation are very much concerned about this problem. Meetings have been held of all the large farmers' organizations and the farmers of this country have come to the conclusion—and the government was duly notified of this—that anything less than $5 per hundredweight for milk would not be acceptable.

I think the government should be endeavouring to save this industry. We find the dairy farmers are talking about strikes, the destruction of dairy products and holding them back from the market. Nobody wants to see this type of action take place. On the

other hand the dairy farmers have to find some means of bringing this most important question before the people of this country. Surely it is urgent that we as members of parliament, accepting full responsibility for this problem, take every opportunity to place this proposition before the government and see if by such a debate we can bring to their attention the real urgency in the matter. We should try to see if through such a debate we can bring to the attention of the government the real urgency of this problem and bring about an equitable solution so these farmers will not be forced from their lands and will not be forced out of the dairy business, and so Canada will not be placed in the position of having to import dairy products.

• (2:50 p.m.)

I should like to emphasize with all the force at my command that now is the time to solve this problem. A debate at this time would give us an opportunity to put before the government the very real problem with which the dairy farmers of this country are concerned. I do not feel that a delay of one, three or five days will serve any useful purpose. We should have the opportunity to debate this problem now in the house.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the house leader had to go out so I will say just one word on the subject; that is that the announcement by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture was made at least two weeks ago. Therefore it seems to me that the subject matter, important and urgent as it is to the farmers, does not fall within the class of subjects as to which there is urgency of debate. There might have been a case to be made on the day or the day after the Minister of Agriculture made his statement, but to suggest that something new has happened between yesterday and today to make this matter sufficiently urgent to interrupt the regular business set down for this day would, I suggest to Your Honour, be to make a mockery of the rather narrow provisions of the standing order. For that reason it seems to me that the motion should not be considered to be in order.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if ever there was any doubt that the motion was proper, the Minister of Transport has removed it. He stated that there would have been urgency and this motion would have been justified if made two weeks ago, but because it was not made two weeks ago but only today there is not sufficient urgency to bring the motion within the rules of the house.

Mr. Speaker, the motion could not have been made two weeks ago because people did not realize what a mishmash had been made of the dairy policy by the government. Only in the last two or three days has the realization come to all parts of this country that the dairy industry—

Mr. Pickersgill: That is an insult to the farmers.

Mr. Diefenbaker: When I speak of mishmash I sometimes think of my hon. friend.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The very fact that such interruptions are taking place indicates that my argument is well founded. The dairy farmers have been crucified by this government, and they realize it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I wish some of the farmers could hear the Liberal members opposite jeering at that observation. Today in every part of this nation it is recognized by almost everyone, except those who sit opposite, that the situation is serious and that delay cannot be permitted. It might be said that this matter could be discussed when the interim supply motion is before the house. However, even with closure applied to the defence debate that would be a delay of two weeks. That is too long a time. The dairy industry cannot be sacrificed through delay.

I suggest therefore that a good case has been made. If it had not been for the assistance of the Minister of Transport when he said this would have been a perfect motion two weeks ago, I might have had some doubt. No longer am I in doubt.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I was going to remind the minister that he has already spoken on the subject, but I understand he is rising now on a point of order.

Mr. Pickersgill: I suggest it is in accordance with the rules to make a correction after an hon. member has spoken who has misrepresented what I said. What I said was that there might have been an argument. I did not say it was a perfect case.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: I said there certainly was not a case two weeks later. It does seem to me, sir, that we should decide the question of urgency and not permit debate—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I remind hon. members that contributions at this stage should be to enlighten the Chair. It is getting dark.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): It seems to me that the argument advanced by the Minister of Transport indicates the seriousness of the matter that has been raised by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette). The matter of urgency seems to stem from the decisions that have been taken by the farmers in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario after they have had an opportunity of examining the various aspects of the program that has been announced. So far as parliament was concerned, when the announcement was made the situation was that there had been consultations with the provinces and the various farm organizations. There was some reason for believing that the farmers were in agreement that the $4.75 guaranteed by the federal government would eventually become $5.10 with the addition of provincial subsidies.

The farmers have now had an opportunity of examining the program and are aware of three particular aspects in which it is lacking. The first is that the $4.75 for industrial milk is the full price paid f.o.b. factory. This in turn raises two problems with which the farmers are concerned at the moment. One of them, of course, is the transportation policy, and I am sure all hon. members are aware of that. Transportation was not considered in the announcement, though I believe the farmers thought it had been.

In addition, meetings have been held with the provinces which indicate that the $4.75 includes the provincial subsidies. For a considerable length of time farm organizations in general have considered $5.10 the absolute minimum to ensure efficient farm operation. We are now importing butter; because of this program our butter supplies are becoming short. For these reasons it is my opinion, and I believe the opinion of the farmers, that rather than have a strike of farmers across Canada this parliament should consider the situation and attempt to find a remedy in order to avert a calamity.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that there are reasons why this motion is in order today. In spite of what the Minister of Transport has said to the effect that the matter should have been raised several days ago, I say there was some confusion with regard to the practical application of the provisions announced by the Minister of Agriculture a few days ago. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it was not clearly understood by the members of this house or by the dairy farmers of Canada what would be the practical application of this announcement.

After a few days of consideration it has been found that the program announced is wanting in many respects so far as the dairy producers of Canada are concerned. I draw Your Honour's attention also to the fact that we have just ascertained that surplus fluid milk is going to be withdrawn from the subsidy as a result of the minister's announcement. This was not well understood when he made the announcement a few days ago. I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to citation 100, which is the one that deals with standing order 26, which says that the subject matter must involve the administrative responsibility of the government. I suggest to Your Honour that the motion by the hon. member for Villeneuve meets this requirement. The federal government pays a subsidy to the dairy industry. The Minister of Agriculture and government of the day are directly involved in these payments; therefore, as I say, that requirement of Beauchesne's citation 100 is met.

• (3:00 p.m.)

If Your Honour would now turn your attention to paragraph 2 of the same citation, it is there stated that the matter must be so pressing that the public interest will suffer if it is not given immediate attention. I suggest to Your Honour that the public interest is suffering at the present time, and that it will continue to suffer, unless this question is given immediate attention. As has been pointed out by a number of other hon. members, there is a great deal of unrest among dairy farmers with regard to this matter, and there have been indications that they are making plans to take some drastic action. In the meantime they are suffering from an economic depression that is well known to all hon. members who have studied the situation. So I suggest that this motion meets the conditions laid down in paragraph 2 of citation 100.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the matter that is probably paramount to your decision is dealt with in paragraph 3, namely the urgency of debate. As Your Honour well knows, urgency of debate applies when the ordinary opportunities

provided by the rules of the house do not permit the subject to be brought on early enough and the public interest demands that discussion of the matter take place immediately.

In this regard, if Your Honour were to look at the orders of the day you would find no opportunity provided in the rest of this session to discuss the subject matter contained in the motion of the hon. member for Villeneuve. Some special motion or provision would have to be made by the government before a debate on this matter could take place during the remainder of this session. Therefore I suggest to Your Honour that the condition laid down in paragraph 3 as to urgency of debate is also met.

If we do not discuss this matter under the provisions of standing order 26, Mr. Speaker, there is no other provision that would enable us to discuss the matter during the balance of the present session. In other words, this question would have to be put over until the new session if it were to be discussed at all by this parliament.

Last, but perhaps not least, paragraph 5 provides:

> The adjournment of the house cannot be moved with reference to critical conditions generally prevailing in certain parts of the country.

This motion does not refer to critical conditions prevailing in certain parts of the country, Mr. Speaker; the motion refers to critical conditions prevailing in the dairy industry all over the country. Therefore I suggest to Your Honour that the motion of the hon. member also meets the condition laid down in paragraph 5 of citation 100.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be far more useful to spend today debating this issue and if possible finding some solution to a very serious and critical agricultural problem in this country than to spend the day in repetitious debate on Bill No. C-243, a debate which is going to come to an end in a few days anyway.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to second the motion of the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette), requesting an urgent debate on the government's dairy policy.

I believe sincerely that there is urgency in the matter. Everybody knows that the government house leader (Mr. McIlraith) has given us notice that a motion will be put to the house within two days and that the meaningless discussion on Bill No. C-243 will go on for the two next days.

On the other hand, a motion has now been put by the hon. member for Villeneuve, proposing a debate on the dairy policy of this government.

What, Mr. Speaker, and this is an important question which must be decided today, is the most urgent problem we have to discuss at this time? Is it national defence? In view of the motion presented by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. McIlraith), will a debate on this subject produce a concrete solution today or tomorrow? Obviously, the subject matter of the motion presented by the hon. member for Villeneuve is of greater urgency. The business on the orders of the day is futile and useless, in view of the motion presented by the hon. Minister of Public Works at the beginning of this sitting. On the other hand, a discussion on the subject matter of the motion presented by the hon. member for Villeneuve could produce results beneficial to many Canadians, that is, the farmers and the milk producers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, not only is there urgency in relation to the other business of the house that we will consider this afternoon, but there is also urgency with regard to the impending demonstrations which the farmers are preparing to carry out throughout Canada. And there is also urgency with respect to the disaster entailed by a farmers' strike. We have seen recently the consequences of such demonstrations in the United States where there were many injured and large quantities of milk were dumped in the sewers and in the streets. Well, Mr. Speaker, such a disaster is imminent and the farmers are getting more angry to see that the federal government, with its dairy policy, is forgetting them. It is urgent, Mr. Speaker, to take the necessary steps to avoid such a disaster.

Mr. Speaker, there are some precedents on which we can base ourselves. For example, the railway strike. We had been told that there was no urgency just before the strike broke out and then there were losses of several million dollars each day. Another precedent: the strike in the ports on the west coast. The adjournment of the house had been asked to discuss that matter, but we were again told that there was no urgency. Now, some ten days later, financial losses of about $1.5 million daily were being incurred. We were told then that this was an emergency and that not an hour, an hour and a half or two hours

were to be lost before discussing the problem. There have also been other precedents—for instance the longshoremen's strike on the Montreal waterfront.

Therefore, a number of precedents prove that if we do not debate these urgent matters before the strikes or demonstrations take place, then it will be too late, for when you are in the midst of demonstrations by strikers or farmers, there is no time left for discussion.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I say that it is urgent to meet the situation, that we must not wait until we are faced with incalculable daily financial losses because, with the present government, we must debate these subjects, since the government is unable to face them with its own understanding and counsel.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that a number of farmers are now thinking about leaving their land, seems to me another reason for the urgency of this debate.

Furthermore, the fact that a certain number of people have to suffer daily from such dairy policy also proves the urgency of the debate.

Mr. Speaker, when we consider that the debate on national defence which will take place this afternoon is thoroughly futile and useless and that, on the other hand, the debate suggested in the motion presented by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) might help to find a solution to a problem liable to prove very serious, the cogency of the motion will be recognized as well as the urgency of discussing it this afternoon.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I have only a few short remarks to make on the suggestion of my hon. friend, the member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette).

It will probably be noted with surprise that, for once, I agree with my hon. friend from Villeneuve. Generally, my views are completely opposed to his, but I feel it is urgent to deal with this problem and to find a solution, since considerable discontent is being caused among the farmers and it is a constant source of complaints.

A few weeks ago at most, a large number of Quebec farmers came to Ottawa to ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene) to take into consideration their urgent needs and the situation in which they find themselves.

Every day, farmers, particularly dairy producers, find themselves in an ever tightening squeeze. On the one hand, they are faced with a constantly increasing cost of production and, on the other, with an unprofitable sale price for their products.

Mr. Speaker, it has often been said in this house that we should try to solve the problems involving this nation. Well, this question of the dairy industry, to my mind, is one deserving of our immediate attention.

I will not detain the house any longer but I fully support, like my colleagues in this party, the demands made by the farmers. In fact, we have often called the minister's attention to the importance of the dairy industry and to the advisability of taking the necessary measures to ensure a reasonable price for the dairy producers. I support the motion submitted by my friend, the hon. member for Villeneuve, and I shall make every effort to ensure that farmers actually get what they are entitled to.

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, I do not have very much to say following the claims and the explanations relating to the dairy policy of the government. However, the member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) stressed the usefulness of the debate. I should say that it is not only useful, it is also necessary in the circumstances.

The member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) quoted the 100th comment of the fourth edition of Beauchesne's parliamentary rules and forms to indicate that it could be detrimental to the public interest. Mr. Speaker, I think we have only to refer to the situation prevalent a few weeks ago in the United States to refute his argument. Indeed, the situation of our neighbours to the south was identical to ours today, and it proved so disastrous for their dairy industry and for the American economy on the whole, that the United States Congress was forced to take action.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the point I emphasize is the urgency of the debate. We are faced at the present time with a threatening strike. We have had strikes in the past and we have had enough in one year, in one session. We always waited for the problem to fall on our heads and on our shoulders before making any move. For once, the farmers and their associations all across Canada have demonstrated explicitly that the government dairy policy is not beneficial nor acceptable. It has to be given a second sober thought here in the house otherwise they will take exceptional measures, they will go on strike and destroy their production if there is no improvement in the situation.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian economy cannot afford another strike of that kind. I think that the debate is urgent and that it is our duty to discuss the matter today and without any further delay.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. I hope I may be allowed to suggest to hon. members that I be given an opportunity soon to rule on the motion. I do not wish to cut off discussion as a few hon. members apparently wish to contribute further. I hope the debate will not continue too much longer and that I shall have an opportunity shortly to give an expression of opinion.

Mr. H. A. Moore (Wetaskiwin): I just wish to add a few words in support of the motion of the hon. member for Villeneuve, because nothing could be more urgent at this time than the matter he has raised. Dairy farmers are still quitting in alarming numbers. For that in many ways the new policy of the government is responsible. Furthermore, discrimination has been practised against fluid milk shippers, who received some subsidy last year but no subsidy this year.

It is said that fluid milk shippers are under provincial jurisdiction. I think it is ridiculous for a province to be asked to subsidize the portion of surplus fluid milk sold as manufacturing milk when it does not subsidize manufacturing milk sold by those who sell no fluid milk for distribution. That sort of thing makes no sense.

Nothing can be more urgent or of more importance to our country at this time than the matter raised in the hon. member's motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, being one of the sponsors of the adjournment motion moved by my friend, the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette), I should like to make a few observations concerning the urgency of this debate.

All the members who spoke before me recognized such an urgency. On the government side everybody remains silent, which is proof of the urgency of the debate, for none of them opposed it except the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill), who was not too sure about it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit the urgency of debate exists. In 1966, Canadian dairy producers got rid of 86,000 milch cows and we have now reached the lowest level in 46 years as regards dairy cattle.

This is one of the points proving the urgency of debating the whole question. The government should assume its own responsibilities and grant dairy producers a fair price for their products. We also note that in addition to the march the farmers intend to make on Ottawa soon, a number of them are planning to give up dairy production, if the government does not take immediate steps to enable them to get a reasonable price for their farm products.

Such is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, on the urgency of this debate.

[*English*]

Mr. Lee Grills (Hastings South): Mr. Speaker, I wish to add a couple of words; I shall take a minute only. Last week I raised a question dealing with the support for surplus milk. I asked why the support was removed from the surplus milk shipped by fluid milk shippers of this country. The only answer I received was from the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, that this matter came under provincial responsibility. In 1966 it was recognized that it came under federal responsibility; why should that have been changed in 1967. The effect is to depress farmers' incomes.

That farmers have threatened to dump milk right across the country is a deplorable state of affairs in a hungry world, and I hope the threat is never carried out. If it is, the government will be held responsible for ignoring the pleas of farmers and others supporting them.

The shippers of manufacturing milk will not receive $4.75 a hundredweight, as has been suggested, because the export subsidy or export charge is subtracted from the amount paid, reducing that figure. Cream shippers are in an even worse position. The quota system, as has been suggested by the dairy commission and some persons in the Department of Agriculture, is most confusing and entirely unsatisfactory to meet the needs of farmers. In fact everybody is confused, and the milk shippers are in a furious state about present day conditions. I agree with the hon. member for Villeneuve.

• (3:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. May I draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that I am now in a position to make a ruling. I know that contributions made at the beginning by

hon. members are made for the purpose of enlightening the Chair and of making it possible for the Chair to arrive at a ruling. As I have reached a conclusion, I believe it would not be necessary to carry on with the debate.

Some hon. members mentioned the fact that what the Chair must consider is the urgency, but more particularly the urgency of debate. I am the first to recognize that there is a matter of great importance, a matter of urgency, I would say, but what I must consider, first and above all, is the urgency of debate. In the present circumstances, should there be an adjournment of the business of the house, as listed on government orders, to debate another matter, namely that suggested by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette)?

The matter is not easy to settle and I am grateful to hon. members for their remarks which undoubtedly helped me to reach a decision. And I want to remind hon. members of citation 100, paragraph 8, of Beauchesne's fourth edition, at page 94, which reads as follows:

> I do not think that, under the standing order of 1882, a motion on a subject of this kind, having such a very wide scope, was ever contemplated. What I think was contemplated, was an occurrence of some sudden emergency—

It seems to me that this is the main point: Is there a "sudden emergency"? I remember that over the last few weeks several questions have been asked about that problem following a statement made in the house by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene). That matter was dealt with a few times on the adjournment motion. I do not feel therefore that this is a "sudden emergency" which would justify the adjournment of the house at least today under the present circumstances.

[*English*]

It has been pointed out by some hon. members that there will be an opportunity for a full fledged debate on this very important matter when we reach interim supply. It is difficult to determine whether this would be soon enough to meet the necessities and requirements of the situation, but I would judge that in the present circumstances the matter might be left in abeyance, and I suggest that there is not sufficient urgency of debate today to accept the motion moved by the hon. member for Villeneuve.

[Mr. Speaker.]

CANADIAN CENTENNIAL

SUGGESTED INVITATION FOR VISIT BY PRINCE CHARLES

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have spoken to the Prime Minister with reference to the question I am about to ask. In centennial year has the government given consideration to inviting Prince Charles, the Prince of Wales, to visit the senior of the realms he will serve as monarch in the years ahead, it being particularly appropriate that he see this country during centennial year? In any event, would the Prime Minister give consideration to extending an invitation through the proper channels for the attendance of the prince in company with his father, Prince Philip, at the pan-American games in Winnipeg?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the possibility of the Prince of Wales and Princess Anne visiting Canada during our centennial year was canvassed some months ago, and it was indicated to us that there was some difficulty in the minds of the royal family in asking the Prince of Wales and Princess Anne to take on official duties at this stage in their lives. It did not seem desirable to pursue the matter at that time in an official way with regard to an official visit.

The right hon. gentleman has suggested that perhaps the same consideration would not apply in respect of a visit by the Prince of Wales with his father to the pan-American games. I recall, as I am sure the right hon. gentleman does, that the Prince of Wales and Princess Anne both went to the British Empire and Commonwealth games in Jamaica. They had such a good time there that perhaps they would be glad to repeat the pleasure in Winnipeg. I shall be glad to look into the matter.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION AT DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Speaker: The right hon. member for Kootenay West.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to address a question to the Prime Minister, and I would like the house to know that my questions all originate in the minds of the people. In view of the great inconvenience suffered by

Canadians in general, particularly those engaged in transportation, farming and travelling, with the present constitutional but illogical arrangements for the establishment of daylight saving time, would the Prime Minister consider placing this question on the agenda for the next federal-provincial conference with a view to establishing daylight saving time on a nation-wide basis as the result of an agreement between the federal government and the provinces?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was good enough to give me written notice of this question as coming from "a member in the twilight of life".

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: If there were anything I could do by extending daylight saving time or in any other way to extend that twilight I would be delighted to do so. I think the proposal that we should have uniformity on the matter, if possible, is a very sensible one, and perhaps this could be taken up at the next federal-provincial conference.

[*Translation*]

GRAIN

QUEBEC—INQUIRY AS TO LEASE OF ELEVATOR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Transport.

Could the minister tell the house whether it is true that the National Harbours Board has leased the Quebec grain elevators to the Bungee Company of New York for a ten-year period at a cost of a million dollars a year?

Did that transaction take place between the National Harbours Board and the owners of the grain elevators?

[*English*]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I indicated yesterday in reply to a question put by my hon. friend from Quebec South that the government had approved a proposal by the harbours board that the grain elevator at Quebec city should be leased to the firm which had submitted the highest bid, and that bid was from the firm mentioned by the hon. gentleman. I also indicated that certain very stringent conditions were attached to this transaction with respect to the handling of domestic grain. As for the precise amount of the lease, I have not got it under my hand at the moment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

Could the hon. minister or the government not find someone in Canada instead of granting a lease of that kind to people outside Canada?

Mr. Speaker: The question is controversial.

Mr. Gustave Blouin (Saguenay): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Now that the grain elevators in the port of Quebec have been leased by the National Harbours Board to a grain company and that this company has cancelled what plans it had of building in the Sept-Iles harbour, does the Minister of Transport plan to make a comprehensive survey, jointly with his colleague the Minister of Public Works, of the tremendous possibilities the natural deep-sea harbour of Sept Iles offers large industries?

[*English*]

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, to deal with the last point first, the government did not authorize this lease until it had been fully assured that the company would not have proceeded with its project at Sept Iles whether or not the lease had been consummated, because we did not want to appear to prevent this project going ahead. I did meet with the mayor and other members of the council of Sept Iles, who were brought to my office by my hon. friend, and they asked me if I would speak to my colleague the Minister of Public Works with a view to having a comprehensive study made of the possibilities of the development of the port of Sept Iles. That study will be made just as soon as it can possibly be done.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a supplementary question.

Is the rental involved in the lease greater or lower than the income the port brought to the Quebec grain elevators?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is asking for statistical information. The question is therefore out of order.

[*English*]

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary

question. Is there any change in policy in so far as the operation of other grain elevators by the National Harbours Board in other parts of Canada is concerned?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is a matter of policy. It is a matter of looking at each individual situation with a view to attempting to operate the elevators in the best interests of the producers, sellers and consumers of grain, and in the national interest, with some consideration for the treasury of Canada.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): From what the minister has said may we take it that the National Harbours Board and the department are reviewing the situation in so far as other grain elevators, particularly at Saint John and Halifax, are concerned?

Mr. Pickersgill: That is quite correct.

Mr. D. V. Pugh (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, the minister mentioned that a study is being made of the whole subject. Is it the intention to sign the present lease before the study is completed?

Mr. Pickersgill: I think the hon. gentleman has misunderstood me. I was talking about the study of the port of Sept Iles.

EDUCATION

REPORTED REQUIREMENT THAT SCHOLARSHIP RECIPIENTS SWEAR ALLEGIANCE TO U.S.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. M. Brand (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Is the Prime Minister aware that Canadian graduate students accepting scholarships at some United States universities must now, in order to accept such scholarships, swear to bear true allegiance to the United States of America, with the oaths being administered by a consular or embassy officer of the U.S.A., thereby placing in jeopardy the Canadian citizenship of the students concerned? Will the Prime Minister approach the United States state department to seek a reversal of this gross interference with Canadian nationality?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any such stipulation. I will be glad to inquire whether in fact it does exist.

[Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert).]

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. When the Prime Minister is making the inquiry will he find out why it is that scholarships issued through the instrumentality of the department of health, education and welfare, office of education, in Washington require that Canadians should in effect disavow their allegiance in order to be awarded scholarships of this kind? I know the Prime Minister will agree that this does not look like the kind of co-operation one would expect and certainly it is contrary to any reasonable attitude between our two countries.

Mr. Pearson: I will inquire concerning whether that report is accurate. I do know that a good many Canadians who have held scholarships in the United States have never been asked to meet any such conditions.

Mr. Brand: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Prime Minister doubts the accuracy of the statement, will he be willing to receive a photostatic copy of the form of declaration which has been sent to such students?

CRIMINAL CODE

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT RESPECTING BREATHALIZER TESTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. Could the minister say whether the Department of Justice is giving consideration to the recommendation of the committee on justice and legal affairs for the provision of mandatory breath tests and, if so, when a decision might be reached?

Hon. P.-E. Trudeau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, this matter has been considered by the Department of Justice. I will be taking up the matter fairly soon, along with other possible amendments to the Criminal Code, with my cabinet colleagues. I cannot say at the moment when a decision will be taken.

FINANCE

REGULATIONS UNDER DEPOSIT INSURANCE LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Minister of Finance in the absence of the minister. Could the minister tell the house

when he will recommend to the house that bylaw No. 1 passed as order in council No. 1967-579 dealing with regulations under the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act will be referred to the committee on finance, trade and economic affairs?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Acting Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this question as notice.

HUMAN RIGHTS

REPORTED RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN REQUESTS TO MANPOWER OFFICES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Is he now in a position to make any report to the house with regard to the inquiries which he yesterday said he was prepared to make? In particular, can he tell us whether the instructions are clear that the manpower offices are not to deal with employers who lay down any discriminatory conditions?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre asked me whether instructions of the former national employment service dealing with anti-discrimination rules in the employment offices were transferred and have been in effect since the service became part of the Department of Manpower and Immigration. The answer to this question is yes.

May I add, to answer the supplementary question raised yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition, that anti-discrimination instructions were first distributed to all federal employment offices in July, 1941. These were subsequently incorporated in the revised manual of June, 1949 and reconfirmed in circulars dated November 1953, May 1954, June 1959 and December 1963. As recently as March 7 of this year our regional office in Toronto re-emphasized to all our manpower centres in Ontario the department's anti-discrimination policy.

With regard to the request by the hon. member for York South that further instructions be issued, I should say that a new operations manual is now under preparation and will, of course, include a strong statement on non-discrimination. In addition, special instructions will immediately be sent to all Canada manpower centres to insist on the implementation of non-discrimination.

Inquiries of the Ministry

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

REQUEST FOR CONFERENCE ON NATION-WIDE ANTI-CRIME PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

Hon. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice or possibly the Solicitor General. In the light of the report of the Ontario crime commission concerning the extent of the penetration into various organizations in Canada by crime syndicates, will the Minister of Justice give urgent consideration to the convening of a conference of ministers charged with responsibility for the enforcement of the law across Canada to lay the foundation for the necessary practical measures and possible amendments to the law in order to co-ordinate an effective anti-crime program on a nation-wide basis?

Hon. P.-E. Trudeau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I missed the first part of the question. I will take it as notice and answer it tomorrow or some other day.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, in view of the urgency and national importance of the need to co-ordinate measures against crime on a national scale I should like to ask the minister whether he will treat the matter a little more urgently than his casual answer would seem to indicate.

[*Translation*]

WINTER WORKS

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PERIOD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Because of the very cold weather and very long winter we have experienced, especially in northwestern Quebec, would the minister agree to reconsider the requests originating from all quarters for an extension of the winter works program to May 15?

Mr. Speaker: Order. That question has been asked several times in recent days.

[*English*]

FISHERIES

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—PAYMENT OF SUBSIDY ON BOAT CONSTRUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Melvin McQuaid (Kings): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of

Inquiries of the Ministry

Fisheries. Has the minister received a copy of the resolution which was passed unanimously on April 13 by the Prince Edward Island legislature urging the federal government to honour its commitment to pay the 25 per cent subsidy to the fishermen who built boats in the 35-45 foot class? If he has received this resolution, and in view of the expressed hope of the premier of Prince Edward Island that in due course every claim will be paid by Ottawa, does the government now intend to pay this subsidy on the basis of the applications which have already been received?

Hon. H.-J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I received such a letter yesterday and I replied this morning to the effect that all applications received will be dealt with as quickly as possible and that all those meeting the criteria established by the federal Department of Fisheries will be paid without delay.

HOUSING

TORONTO—INQUIRY AS TO ACTION TO RELIEVE SHORTAGE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Stanbury (York-Scarborough): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. In view of the now daily expressions of mounting public concern about the housing shortage in metropolitan Toronto—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Stanbury: It is a concern which is not the exclusive province of any political party. In part, though not exclusively, it is a matter for federal action. Is the minister ready yet to inform the house what steps are being taken to relieve this situation of urgent national importance and, if so, what if any effect such measures have had to date?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question put by the hon. member is, of course, of great importance to all members. I have the impression that this subject has been raised on a number of occasions during the last few days, and I wonder whether the hon. member feels there is justification for asking it again today.

Mr. Stanbury: Mr. Speaker, I hope it is not suggested that this matter is in order when raised by hon. members opposite but not when raised by interested members on this side.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. Member: Put it on at ten o'clock.

[Mr. McQuaid.]

TRADE

CONSIDERATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFFS FOR LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of President Johnson's offer to grant preferential tariffs to developing countries in Latin America, is the Canadian government considering the implementation of a similar policy to assist these nations in the development of their economies?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we have for some time and are at the present time considering with the United States and other governments the best way of assisting underdeveloped countries. As my hon. friend knows, we have had discussions at various international meetings on this matter. The suggestion made by President Johnson at the recent conference involves only one method of assisting these countries. There are other ways in which this can be done. These matters are now being considered with the United States and other governments.

HONOURS AND AWARDS

ORDER OF CANADA—REPORTED CHANGE IN MOTTO

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Prime Minister tabled certain orders in council, one revoking P. C. 7964. Order in council P.C. 1967-389 provides for the setting up and establishment of the Order of Canada. Attached to it was the constitution of the Order of Canada. In the copy which has now been delivered to me by the Clerk I find in paragraph 27 that the motto of the order shall be *"Desiderantes Meliorem Patriam."* When was the substitution made of the one now before me for the one that was tabled yesterday, a copy of which was given to members and in which reference was made in brackets to the scriptures from which the quotation is taken, namely, Hebrews 12:16? When was this change made in the document filed yesterday which was so different from the one produced to me today?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to deal with this important matter. The document filed

yesterday was the only one of an official character and it included only the motto in paragraph 27. There was later typed another edition of the constitution of the order, because it was felt that it would be helpful to my right hon. friend and to members of the press to identify the source of this particular motto. Unfortunately there was a misprint and the figure "12" should have been "11". My right hon. friend, with his deep knowledge of the Scriptures, could have been expected to notice this misprint, and he did in fact spot it immediately.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I thank the Prime Minister for that reference but I ask him now, when did the change or removal take place in that portion of the constitution which was filed yesterday?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, nothing was removed from the document that was tabled. This addition was made to the document that was circulated for the information of the press.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, if this scriptural reference was made for the edification of the people of Canada, the Prime Minister has certainly edified them.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

MEDICARE—POSSIBLE AMENDMENTS TO PERMIT RECONCILIATION WITH PROVINCIAL PLANS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I intended to direct my question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare but in his absence I shall address it to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that at least one provincial government has expressed its inability or unwillingness to meet the conditions of the federal medicare plan and that other provinces have indicated that the interpretation of the act will be very difficult to reconcile with their own plans, does the government intend to propose any amendments in order that the medicare plan can be reconciled with provincial plans?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Health and Welfare is at the moment discussing this and related matters with provincial ministers of health. Perhaps he will have a report to make after the discussion is complete. I cannot assume that any amendment to the act will be required.

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

AMALGAMATION OF NAVY, ARMY AND AIR FORCE

On the order:

Government orders—The Minister of National Defence—House again in committee of the whole on Bill C-243, an act to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof (as amended).

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the house do now proceed to order No. 134, namely second reading of Bill C-278, an act respecting the occupational training of adults.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the house will allow the Chair a moment or two for consultation in order to ascertain the number of the standing order which is thought to be relevant to the present situation.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Order, please. I am now prepared to make a ruling on the motion presented to the house a moment ago by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. It has been brought to my attention—and I am sure hon. members realize the difficulty with which the Chair is faced in connection with the motion presented by the hon. member—that the order of business is according to our standing orders, proposed by the government itself. I draw the attention of hon. members to standing order 18 which reads as follows:

(1) All items standing on the orders of the day, except government orders, shall be taken up according to the precedence assigned to each on the order paper.

(2) Except as provided in standing orders 43 and 56, government orders may be called in such sequence as the government may think fit.

An order has been called by the government today, and the only way we could proceed in accordance with the motion presented by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre would be by suspending, with unanimous consent, the provisions of standing order 18. That can only be done by unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There appears to be some doubt whether there is unanimous consent. I would ask the house whether there is unanimous agreement to suspend the provisions of standing order 18 so that I may put to the

house the motion moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent. Before proceeding with my ruling I should also bring to the attention of hon. members a decision which is in point. I refer to a ruling by Mr. Speaker on Monday, May 14, 1956, as follows:

> May I point out to the hon. member for Kamloops that I cannot accept his motion because the order that is now before the house is a government order, and the other order that the hon. member now considers we should proceed with is order No. 12, which is another government order, and government orders may be moved only by the leader of the house. I would refer hon. members to standing order 18(2).

That is the standing order to which I have just referred.

> There is also citation 136, which reads:
> "All motions referring to the business of the house should be introduced by the leader of the house."

Therefore the Speaker considered that the motion could not be moved.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, we are faced with a very difficult question here.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Lambert: I realize that this is not supposed to be a debatable motion, but I think Your Honour might take under advisement the fact that standing order 15-A did not apply in 1956. The government has availed itself of the provisions of standing order 15-A by appointing a day certain for the termination of this debate and therefore has preempted any question of the continuation of the debate at this time. In effect the government could have indicated not next Thursday but the Tuesday following or any day subsequent to next Thursday for the termination of the debate or how long it should continue. I am sure Your Honour realizes that when citing precedents they must be on all fours with the question under consideration. Unfortunately for the judgment that Your Honour has rendered, I would submit that 1956 is not today and that standing order 15-A was not then in force.

Mr. Speaker: The point raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West is interesting, but even without the precedent to which I have just referred, which to my mind is certainly relevant, there is standing order 18(2) which specifies that government business is in the hands of the government house leader. We cannot suspend the provisions of that standing order without the consent of the house. Therefore, orders of the day having been called—

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I should like to raise a point of order. It so happened that on April 3 it was moved that the house go into committee to consider Bill No. C-243 and the opinion of the house was called for. The yeas and nays were called and there was a recorded vote. Why, then, cannot that be done on this occasion and on any occasion when an order of the house is called? May I call for the yeas and nays on the movement of the house into committee on this bill.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On that point, Mr. Speaker, is there not a difference between the situation of April 3 and today? On April 3 we had the first motion that the house resolve itself into committee of the whole on this bill.

Mr. Starr: We have to do that every day.

Mr. Knowles: No, we are not resolving ourselves into committee. We are again going into committee of the whole, the resolving already having been determined.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to hon. members that there should not be further discussion. I bring to the attention of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre that standing order 53 is in point. I think the argument raised by the hon. member of Winnipeg South Centre has been adequately answered by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. Orders of the day have been called and I have no alternative but to leave the chair.

The house resumed, from Monday, April 17, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof—Mr. Hellyer—Mr. Batten in the chair.

The Chairman: Order. When the committee rose last evening clause 2 was under consideration.

On clause 2—*Canadian forces, Canadian armed forces.*

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, when this debate was adjourned last night I had just finished explaining why it was necessary for

us to continue the debate in the hope that the public would become aware of the issues involved and would bring pressure to bear on government supporters so that we might stop what I consider to be a very foolish move by the Minister of National Defence. In addition to having the right to continue the debate in the hope that we will persuade the public to bring pressure to bear on the government on this question, I believe it is perfectly proper, technical procedure to point out the kind of arguments used on the other side of the chamber and the fallacy of some of the points raised in the general tenor of the argument.

In this connection I referred to the lead editorial which appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* of last Saturday and pointed out that, the editor ignored the facts and copied hon. members opposite in some of the arguments they have used in this debate. Many of the arguments they use have been repeated and repeated throughout the country and are repeated no matter how many times they are disproved by the evidence given before the committee. For instance, we heard the minister and his supporters suggest that the military wanted to control and run things instead of the government. The evidence given before the committee has made it perfectly clear that this argument is completely contrary to the facts, but that does not stop government supporters repeating it time after time.

We have heard the minister repeat from time to time that what the government is now trying to do by the unification bill was explained and spelled out in the white paper. The minister has said this despite the fact that every senior military adviser who was with him at that time said they had no such understanding and certainly it could not be taken from the white paper in any manner, shape or form.

• (4:00 p.m.)

One of the most important facts that the minister keeps distorting is the meaning of integration and unification. The argument put forward by the minister and his supporters is that integration and unification are a package deal, just one scheme, and that unification is necessary in order to complete the integration process. Of course that has been disproven by the evidence before the committee and even by the minister's own chief witness, the chief of the general staff, General Allard. I believe it is proper debating technique in the house to quote the evidence before the committee proving how wrong these arguments are. Of course the purpose of doing this, if government supporters insist on using almost exclusively arguments which are obviously contrary to the facts, is to prove by the facts that the government has a very weak case. This is the situation today. If we take away all their fallacious arguments the government has nothing left on which to pin its support of unification.

I have often thought that the meanest and dirtiest argument used by government supporters is that those who are opposed to unification are opposed to progress. This has been echoed by various members in the house. In the Ottawa *Citizen* of last Saturday there was an article on the editorial page written by Charles King, the associate editor, which repeats what I would call a typical example of the technique of the big lie. I am sorry that my copy of that issue of the *Citizen* is missing because I would have liked to quote a paragraph or two from the article. However, I think I am being fair to Mr. King when I say that the purport of his article was that those who oppose unification—

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order which I will state very quickly. My point of order is that the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona has over the past few days, both in the House of Commons and out of it, repeatedly used the word "lie" in connection with another member of this house. I call the attention of the house to citation 145 on page 126 of Beauchesne, fourth edition, which reads as follows:

> It has been formally ruled by Speakers in the Canadian Commons that a statement by an honourable member respecting himself and peculiarly within his own knowledge must be accepted, but it is not unparliamentary to temperately—

I wish to emphasize the word "temperately"

> —criticize statements made by a member as being contrary to the facts; but no imputation of intentional falsehood is permissible. B.352, 365. A statement made by a member in his place, is considered as made upon honour and cannot be questioned in the house or out of it.

I repeat the words "in the house or out of it". We know what has been said in the house over the past few days by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona, and I will refer to a clipping from the Winnipeg *Free Press* of Thursday, April 13, which quotes what the hon. member has been saying outside the house and is therefore relevant to citation 145 which I just read.

It reads as follows:

> Terry Nugent, Conservative member of parliament for Edmonton-Strathcona, Wednesday kept a

promise to Defence Minister Paul Hellyer by repeating outside the Commons, an accusation that the defence minister used the "big lie" system developed by Adolf Hitler.

The next paragraph reads as follows:

Wednesday, Mr. Nugent took up the challenge—twice. Early in the day he repeated it to Winnipeg broadcasters, making it clear that he was reading from *Hansard*, the official record of the Commons.

Further down it reads:

He (Mr. Hellyer) has opened his mouth and put his big foot in it again.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deachman: I gather from the applause of hon. members opposite that they concur in the use of this kind of language by an hon. member and they believe this is the way in which members of the house should behave both in and out of it. I say, shame on them. I continue to read from the same article:

Mr. Nugent said he meant every word when he said Mr. Hellyer was using "big lie" tactics. He said proof of the technique is in *Hansard*. "The biggest lie is more defence for more money"—

Farther along the article reads as follows:

Mr. Nugent said the defence minister says those opposed to unification are against progress. This is a "big lie".

He also said Mr. Hellyer's report that admirals were trying to run the department was "a big lie"—

Farther down it reads:

Can you wonder why I refer to the term of "big lie"? He received a standing ovation from the 150 party supporters—

They were Tories.

—when he pledged that if he has his way, unification will be achieved only "over my dead body."

On the front page of the Winnipeg *Tribune* of April 13 the following appeared:

During his 30-minute speech he employed the contentious phrase "the big lie" seven other times. In addition he called Mr. Hellyer a "blockhead".

All this may appear very humorous to hon. members opposite. Perhaps it is their belief that this is parliamentary language and that this is the way in which hon. members in the House of Commons and out of it should conduct themselves toward each other. I say this is unparliamentary language. It is a violation of the long-standing customs of this house. It is a violation of the customs of the British house and of parliaments everywhere. It is not the kind of language which hon. gentlemen everywhere who respect themselves, their persons or their parties should use. It is despicable language, it is dirty language and it is language for which the hon. member should apologize. We are here to reason together.

Mr. Nugent: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Deachman: We cannot conduct our business by such language. I say that the language which the hon. gentleman has been using is unparliamentary and out of order both when the hon. member uses it in the house and elsewhere. It is filthy language which should be retracted.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary for me to reply to the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): On a point of order Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: I understand the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona is speaking on a point of order. When he has concluded his remarks I will hear the hon. member for Cape Breton South.

Mr. Nugent: The intemperate language used by the hon. member when he told me that my language is intemperate should be answer enough. The manner, conduct and behaviour of the hon. member in the house are usually such that he is the last person on that side from whom we should expect such language. I know that several of my friends wish to bring the behaviour of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra to the attention of the committee but I do not think anything can be gained from it. Certainly the hon. member is one week late. I used the phrase "the big lie technique" exactly a week ago today. Of course it would take him that long to wake up and act on instructions from the minister.

The particular falsehood which annoys me the most in this big lie technique is the one which perpetrates the idea that those who are opposed to unification are opposed to progress. This was the sum and substance of the argument advanced last week by the hon. member for Leeds. I thought that rather than bandy these words about today it would be more worth while to give a solid illustration of how far away these arguments are from the truth. It may be that hon. members have not heard or read the evidence of the witnesses. It may be they are unintentionally slandering the officers to whom this country owes so much for their long period of service.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Deachman: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, at the moment there is a point of order before the house regarding the use of parliamentary language both in and out of the house. I believe the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona is neither objecting to nor discussing the point of order. The hon. member is reverting to his speech and is again using the very words to which I called the attention of the Chair. With respect, sir, I should like a ruling with regard to the use of such language against other hon. members in this chamber.

The Chairman: Has the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona completed his remarks on the point of order?

Mr. Nugent: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: The hon. member for Cape Breton South.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): The hon. member has raised a question with regard to the use of words in this chamber. I say to the hon. member that when members on this side are asked to withdraw true statements because of the rules, then it is time the rules were changed. In so far as the word "lie" is concerned, that word was bandied around by the Minister of National Defence the other evening as can be ascertained from checking *Hansard*. He accused members on this side of the house of repeating lies. I see no difference between what the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona is doing now and what the Minister of National Defence did last Monday evening. I would draw the attention of the Chair also to the fact that the hon. member who is now raising this point of order based on the rules did not use the technique of the big lie but used the big lie itself. I say to the hon. member who raised the question that he deliberately lied to this house on March 3, and I refer to page 13702 of *Hansard*.

The Chairman: Order, please. I must say to the hon. member for Cape Breton South that he surely does not want, even on a point of order, to accuse another hon. member of deliberately lying. This would be completely unparliamentary language.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): The hon. member raised this question and I intend to prove the statement fully by reference to *Hansard* for March 3, page 13702, and the March 3 proceedings of the defence committee, page 1960. The hon. member who is now making reference to lies is the very person who came into this house and reported that something had happened in the defence committee which never did happen.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege—

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Your question of privilege was raised.

The Chairman: Order, please. The Chair is already listening to a point of order raised by the hon. member for Cape Breton South. If the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra has a question of privilege, I will hear him next.

Mr. Deachman: I have two points of privilege in respect of this matter.

The Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member for Cape Breton South.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I should like to call the attention of the committee to the question of privilege raised on March 3 when members on this side stood up and denied that there had been a show of hands called for in the committee on that particular occasion.

The Chairman: Order, please. I recognize the point the hon. member is attempting to make. The question before the Chair is one concerning unparliamentary language and I suggest to the hon. member for Cape Breton South, as well as to other hon. members, that if this point of order is to be placed before the Chair we should discuss the question of unparliamentary language.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): To that I can only say that the matter should have been raised by someone in whom we could believe. The hon. member has raised a point of order based on the fact that the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona said that the Minister of National Defence was using the big lie technique. I only wanted to bring to the attention of the house that the Minister of National Defence used the same word. This hon. member is the last man who should stand up and point a finger at anybody. The proof of that statement is in the record of this house. I repeat that if any member of this house has to withdraw a true statement because of the rules, then it is time the rules were changed.

I point out too that the Minister of National Defence used the same word. He can get up

now and deny it if he wishes but in his last speech he said that members of the opposition were repeating lies. Why did the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra not raise a point of order at that time? Why did he not refer to the rule book when he came into the house on March 3 and lied to the house? This is a true statement and can be substantiated by reference to *Hansard* and the evidence of the defence committee. It is a true statement and one that no rule can make any member back up from. If we have to back up from the truth, then it is time the rules were changed. It is certainly time the rules were applied to an hon. member who gets away with lying in this house.

Mr. Deachman: On the point to which the hon. member for Cape Breton South has just referred, I may say that this matter of privilege was brought before the house and dealt with by a ruling of Mr. Speaker. What the hon. member is doing now is reflecting on a ruling of the Chair which tossed out that particular case. There is no case of any kind here because the matter was dealt with by the Chair. In this house one does not reflect upon the rulings of Mr. Speaker. This is clear.

Might I say further, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentleman is still addressing himself to the very point of order I am raising, the use of the word "lie" in this chamber as has been done by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona, supported by the hon. member for Cape Breton South who has used the same word. Incidentally, this is nothing less than a revolt against the rules of decency which govern this chamber, a revolt by hon. members opposite against the rules of decency which govern debates in this parliament.

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Chairman, in spite of all the desk slapping that has been going on on the Liberal side I should like to deal strictly with the words which have been used in this debate. I should like to refer you, sir, to page 14786 of *Hansard* for April 11. I am quite sure the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra was in the house at the time this statement was made but I did not hear him raise a point of order with regard to unparliamentary language. May I quote to you exactly what was said and by whom it was said so you may take these facts into consideration in case you feel there should be some condemnation of the use of these words. The pertinent part reads as follows:

Mr. Hellyer: And yet the Leader of the Opposition repeats the lie—

Mr. Diefenbaker: You should never talk about lies.

[Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South).]

Mr. Hellyer: —as his followers have on numerous occasions during the course of this debate.

I say to you, sir, that it would have been rather nice if some Liberal had stood up and condemned the Minister of National Defence for this effrontery. No point of order or question of privilege was raised at that time. It seems to me that what is fair for one side certainly ought to be for the other side. In so far as the point of order is concerned, the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona is in the course of developing an argument. It is an argument which has been made before within and outside this house. I feel that the house is entitled to hear precisely what he has to say. He is bringing forward something which many members have stressed during this debate. It is a point which I feel is well taken. Certainly the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona is quite capable of taking responsibility, either within the house or outside it, for anything which he cares to say.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Chairman, it is clear that in the course of any debate over any length of time things will be said which will be regretted by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the house. That is something that tends to happen.

Mr. Nugent: Speak for yourself.

Mr. Matheson: When I rise I usually try to prepare myself and to conduct myself when on my feet as a gentleman. I try very hard to do that. It is not very easy because my instincts are not always gentlemanly. However, may I say this. When a matter is raised as a point of order, as it has been, it is incumbent on the Chair, with respect, to make an adjudication. It is clear that in the course of this debate no challenge has been made to such remarks. I think the point has now come when we must make such a challenge and from now on guard ourselves against untimely, improvident and ill-considered remarks, which are clearly out of character with the traditions of this chamber. I suggest it serves no useful purpose to review every development of the past days or weeks. What we are concerned with here is the matter which was raised a few moments ago. I think we are entitled to a ruling from Your Honour on this point for guidance in future debate.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Chairman, I rise on the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra. The hon. member referred to a question of privilege which was raised on March

3 and indicated that the Speaker had made a decision at that time on the matter. I would draw the attention of the hon. member, and also the minister if he will listen for a moment, to the fact that we had no way in which to support the argument put forward by members on this side of this house on March 3 because the evidence which supported our argument was not available at that time. It was quite some time later that the evidence of the defence committee was found to substantiate the claims that we on this side of the house were making.

The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra suggests that, the Speaker having made a decision on the matter, we should forget it. This is not the first time, that a question of privilege has been raised in this house with respect to the hon. member's actions in committees. The evidence is now available, and despite what he or anybody else says about forgetting the matter the fact remains that *Hansard* for March 3 and also the evidence given before the defence committee on March 3 indicate that the hon. member did lie to this house.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, if I may speak further to the question of privilege, I think that somewhere along the line credibility has to be considered. I remind the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, through your good offices, Mr. Chairman, that not only are hon. members opposite filibustering this afternoon but as reported at page 14613 of *Hansard* for April 6, half way down the left hand column of that page, the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, speaking to a motion for papers during private members' hour, said:

> Mr. Speaker, just before I rose to speak I was listening to the words of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) and I noticed something very peculiar in the chamber. Finally it became apparent to me, after looking around, that the trouble was that we were not graced with the presence of a single Tory.

The Chairman: Order. Surely what the hon. member is saying now is a little removed from the point of order that has been raised. The question before the committee is—

Mr. Forrestall: I was speaking to the question of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: The question before the committee is whether or not the language used by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona is or is not parliamentary. That is the question that the Chair has to decide. If hon. members have completed their remarks the Chair is now prepared to make a ruling.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: If hon. members wish to continue I shall hear the hon. member for Halifax.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, I am not speaking to the point of order but am rising on the question of privilege. I thought we were speaking to a question of privilege. I thought Your Honour was going to deal with the question of privilege which was raised by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra subsequent to the point of order. I am talking about credibility. This is a matter of privilege, and if it becomes a matter of my raising it that is indeed what I will do.

I quoted the comments of the hon. member during private members' hour. As reported at page 14636 of *Hansard* for the same day, the right hand column near the bottom of the page, the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra said:

> I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. At one stage of the committee procedure—

He is there referring to the earlier session of the committee during the afternoon.

> —we could not find a Tory in the whole house, so I do not think there is anything wrong with a member of the cabinet discharging his duty outside the house.

My question of privilege is that the hon. member is now rising on a point of order having himself been guilty less than ten days ago of exactly the same indiscretion.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra was instructed to become as excited as he did, but if he had bothered to listen to what I said yesterday he would have heard my explanation as to what is meant by the technique of the big lie. As reported at page 15022 of *Hansard* I illustrated the context in which I used that phrase in this house. I said:

> To begin with, to understand what I mean by the technique of the big lie, it is not necessary for someone to tell a direct lie. In fact some of the most skilful methods employed in the technique of the big lie do not use a lie at all, although certainly they use half truths. The whole idea of the technique of the big lie is to make sure the facts are hidden, or at least to make sure that if the facts are revealed they are either confused or swamped under false arguments.

The hon. member's point of order is that this is unparliamentary language. I have not

used the word "lie" or suggested that someone has lied, as the Minister of National Defence had the temerity to do the other day, at which time the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra raised no objection. I understand the sensitivity of the hon. member opposite because he recognizes in the technique I have described something that hon. members opposite have been following which the hon. member hoped they could keep hidden. He hoped that the kind of methods they employ would not become obvious.

The truth may hurt, Mr. Chairman, but I suggest that there has been no bending or breaking of the rules in this case. It is simply a case of the sensibilities of hon. members opposite being offended, as they usually are when something does not suit them or flatter their point of view.

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Chairman, on the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, who for a time was chairman of the defence committee, may I say first of all in defence of the hon. member that from the time he took the chair he endeavoured to work toward a solution without the committee taking a recorded division. He attempted to have matters resolved without a vote being taken. No vote was taken at any time up until the committee began to deal with the bill clause by clause. I realize that I am not as articulate as some of the lawyer members opposite. However, I feel that this is an important matter and the charge that the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra has misled the house should not be allowed to go unchallenged.

• (4:30 p.m.)

I now wish to refer to proceedings that took place in the house on March 3. The hon. member as found on page 13702 of *Hansard*, pointed out that he had endeavoured to determine the consensus of the committee regarding sitting on the afternoon of March 3. The hon. member said:

> I am as willing to admit, as are some hon. members opposite who were in the room this morning, that there was some confusion about whether a motion had been put. I certainly am right, however, in saying that I suggested—

The hon. member did not say he put the question.

> —we meet at two o'clock, following which there was some dissension in respect of the idea of meeting at two o'clock, and then I pleaded with the committee to meet this afternoon in order to further the business of the committee. Finally, as the bells were ringing, I asked whether members were willing to meet this afternoon and hands were raised indicating willingness to meet this afternoon.

There was a show of hands.

An hon. Member: No, there was not.

Mr. Byrne: I am sure that at least four members, myself included, raised their hands to show they were willing to sit that afternoon.

An hon. Member: What about the others?

Mr. Byrne: The chairman did not say that a vote was taken. He asked for an indication of the consensus of the committee and he determined that a substantial group was willing to sit in the afternoon. He simply ruled on that consensus. He did not mislead the house in any way on March 3.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: I think the Chair has heard enough to rule on the question.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, arising from the statement made by the hon. member—

The Chairman: Order, please. I must point out to the committee that an allegation of fact does not constitute a question of privilege. A question of order is before the committee and I hope that the committee will allow me to rule on the point of order and make a few comments.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Before any ruling is made I wish to call on the written record to answer the hon. member. As found on page 13702 of *Hansard* of March 3, the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra said during the course of his remarks:

> —I said we should meet this afternoon at two o'clock. There was some dissent and I asked for a show of hands—

May I now turn to the proceedings in the defence committee on March 3 as recorded on page 1960 of the committee reports.

> The Chairman: Now, we must get on with it. We will meet this afternoon at two o'clock. I think that would only be fair.
>
> Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, that is your decision now, autocratically arrived at.
>
> The Chairman: I am always at the—
>
> Mr. Churchill: No. This is the Chairman's decision. I want that on the record.

The Chairman: I am always at the disposal of the committee and I will call for a vote on that from those who will meet here this afternoon.

Mr. Churchill: No, no, you cannot call for a vote, sir. You have to have a motion.

An hon. Member: I move that we adjourn until 2 p.m.

Get a load of this:

The Chairman: We have a motion. Now gentlemen, we have business to do. I have no motion in front of me, gentlemen—

First there is a motion, then there is no motion. I continue reading:

An hon. Member: You have a motion.

The Chairman: —and the bells are ringing. We have been meeting regularly at this period and we should be here this afternoon—

Mr. Churchill: That is your decision.

The Chairman: —at two o'clock to deal with this.

Mr. Churchill: That is your ruling arbitrarily arrived at.

Mr. Lambert: It has not been the regular practice to meet Friday afternoon, although there has been the odd meeting. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, what you are doing is asking those people on this side of the chair to absorb the brunt of what happened yesterday afternoon, the long division bells.

The Chairman: Gentlemen, the House of Commons itself was involved in that. Gentlemen, two o'clock.

One can go through the proceedings and nowhere on March 3 will one find anything to corroborate the statement made by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra when he lied to the house that day by saying, "I asked for a show of hands." The evidence does not support that. Now the hon. member for Kootenay East is supporting the same lie supported by the Minister of National Defence.

Mr. Knowles: Order, please.

The Chairman: Order, please. Sufficient has been said for the Chair to rule on the point of order. Far be it for the occupant of the Chair to lecture the committee on parliamentary language, but I suggest to the committee, and this applies to all parties, that more care ought to be taken in confining language to those statements and phrases usually considered parliamentary.

May, seventeenth edition, says at page 455:

Allegations against Members.—Good temper and moderation are the characteristics of parliamentary language. Parliamentary language is never more desirable than when a member is canvassing the opinions and conduct of his opponents in debate.

With reference to the point of order now before the committee, citation 154(3) of Beauchesne, fourth edition, says:

The imputation of bad motives, or motives different from those acknowledged, misrepresenting the language of another, or accusing him, in his turn, of misrepresentation, charging him with falsehood or deceit; or contemptuous or insulting language of any kind; all these are unparliamentary and call for prompt interference.

Citation 154(5) says:

It is not unparliamentary to say that a statement is untrue, but it is unparliamentary to say that it was untrue to the knowledge of the member addressing the House.

I say to the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona that the Chair and the committee would be appreciative if he could co-operate and use language more within the confines of that considered to be parliamentary.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, I am always willing to co-operate with the Chair. The entire purpose of my speech today is to point out the reliance of the minister and his supporters on arguments which have been disproved by facts.

An hon. Member: Boloney.

Mr. Nugent: I trust that the sensibilities and sensitiveness of hon. members on the government side will restrain them while I remind them of certain things. I wish to read from the Ottawa *Citizen* of last Friday, April 14. An article by Charles King is headed, "It's Time To End The Row On Unification." Under the subheading, "They're Reactionary", Mr. King says:

There is no doubt—there never has been—that a great many serving officers, and perhaps some of the men they order about in feudal fashion, don't like the assignment parliament is giving them.

That is too bad. It would be nicer to think that they were behind the government on this, recognizing the inevitability of change, and the supremacy of parliament in these matters.

But the army and the navy, and to some degree the air force as well, have always been somewhat reactionary in their attitudes, leaning heavily toward tradition, pomp, and regimental finery.

I would think that the members of the defence committee as well as the Minister of National Defence might rise in wrath against such an article. The allegations against those who testified before the committee—Generals Moncel and Fleury, Air Marshals Miller and Annis, Admirals Landymore and Brock, etc. —are clear. But I did not hear any annoyance expressed on the other side of the house at these gentlemen being so insulted. Members who sat on the committee will recall the

testimony of General Moncel about how enthusiastic they were about integration, how many plans were drawn up, and how they were pressing on with integration. In this connection I think I shall read from the committee evidence to show the attitude of some of these gentlemen.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Committee report No. 35, page 2290, illustrates the attitude of Air Chief Marshal Miller who was chief of staff until just six months ago and is now being subjected to this sort of statement which is supported by members of the Liberal party. As recorded at page 2290 of the proceedings Air Chief Marshal Miller said:

I do not think anybody is ever completely satisfied with an organization. We made very many changes in our first integrated organization we set up, I imagine that they are still making changes. However, the large basic organizational frame is there, and I think it is a good one as far as an integrated defence staff is concerned.

Here we have Air Chief Marshal Miller praising the steps taken to date. This does not sound like somebody who is reactionary. A little farther down on the same page he is recorded as saying:

I certainly believed what was in the white paper, which said that integration was the first step. I had never heard, during my tenure, all the implications on unification spelled out. It had been something that was held up as the end result, but in my understanding of it, there was no particular hurry over it, and the important thing was to get the integration organization going, and that we would then have a chance to look at integration in a more leisurely better organized way.

I do not know how anyone can suggest that this is a reactionary attitude. At page 2291 of the proceedings Air Chief Marshal Miller said:

On the principle of integration, my own feelings about it are that it might very well be the end result.

I believe the word he meant there was unification.

I do not think it is timely now. I have felt that the problem of integration and getting the organization, if you like, was the area where the biggest return in manpower savings and in effective control of military lay, and it was important to get that right before we had ventured into the areas of unification.

The area of unification is a very sensitive one, as you well know. It strikes at the traditions and the feelings of a lot of people. I did not see, up until the time I left, that the return from pressing the unification sign was commensurate with the disruption and the great concern to the man in uniform that would result from it.

[Mr. Nugent.]

That is the attitude of Air Chief Marshal Miller and I suggest it shows the falseness of the argument in Mr. King's article. Mr. King started his article by stating that he did not have much experience in this field, and I am sure he has been led astray by the arguments of the minister and his supporters.

The attitude of Air Marshal Annis can be found in volume 23 of the committee proceedings at page 1378:

While I do not think there is yet sufficient favourable evidence to justify totally abolishing the three services, I do believe integration is the right direction in which the service should be moving and pressing their research to move further.

What nonsense is this spouted by the hon. member for Leeds who says that people who are against unification are against progress? Can the hon. member tell us he has read that evidence and similar statements by other witnesses who were pressing on with integration and trying to make it work? For a man to stand up in this house and say such a thing is not being fair to these people. He is even dishonest when he suggests that those who oppose unification are against progress.

As recorded on the same page Air Marshal Annis said this about unification:

I think that unification, certainly at this stage, without a lot more preparation, could be achieved but it would mean destroying most of the combat capabilities and versatilities now, or at least until recently, existing or inherent in the Royal Canadian Navy. I think it would mean destroying in the longer term the ability of the unified force to retain a meaningful air combat capability or, in fact, any significant combat capability except for ground attack.

His attitude can be seen in other comments. I quote from the bottom of page 1382:

—I would suggest that we experiment thoroughly with integration of the supporting forces including performance tests—and I could talk about that for quite a while because it is very important. And having experimented thoroughly with how far one can go with integration of the supporting forces and whether or not in an integrated form they can give adequate response to the chief of naval, army or air, in their combat roles, then make a decision of whether to go on to unification. I still think unification might be possible—it could very well be—but we do not know.

Can you ask for a fairer attitude, Mr. Chairman? How can you have anything more dishonest than the argument that a gentleman who is using that sort of language is opposed to progress because he is opposed to unification? What he is saying is, "We want to make integration work, but to do our best unification right now is wrong." He gave us his reasons, and they were very honest reasons, when he appeared before the committee.

Then there is the attitude of General Moncel. Certainly very few officers coming before us had greater qualifications than he. We were all impressed by his useful attitude and his willingness to experiment. He was the man who had drawn up practice plans for unification if required. In volume 22 of the committee proceedings, as recorded at page 1312, his attitude is shown in answer to a question I asked him. I quote as follows:

Mr. Nugent: I know that question sounded silly but it bore some relation to the minister's statement that the end result of integration is unification. I wanted to try to indicate that although integration is a progressive performance, and you can find many places where it operates, that does not necessarily mean that integration works everywhere or that it has no other logical end but unification?

Mr. Moncel: Precisely; and as I tried to explain to one of the other inquisitors this depends entirely on your commitments. Give me a pencil and a scratch pad and I will write you a commitment for the country which will generate the need for a unified force. It is very simple. But with your current commitments you do not want one. In fact, it is better that you do not have one.

All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that if those senior officers had shown before the committee such a lack of honesty as Charles King's argument shows, none of us would have been impressed, as we certainly were, with their dedication to this country. I am not blaming Charles King particularly. As he pointed out in his own article, he does not know much about the matter. I know who has been misleading him. It is not a coincidence that he happens to be working for a Liberal rag.

Then there is the attitude of General Fleury, as recorded at page 1490 of committee proceedings No. 24, when he said:

I myself held an integrated position in headquarters for just under a year, from the fall of 1965 to the summer of 1966. There had been over the years a good deal of consideration—possibly more consideration than action—toward integration. I had always felt that the armed forces would benefit by a much greater degree of integration than was the situation in 1964. I think it would not be unfair to say that I was a supporter, maybe even an enthusiastic supporter, of the principle of integration.

These are the people Mr. King and the minister's supporters label reactionary. These are the people they say are opposed to progress because they are opposed to unification. Some annoyance has been displayed about language and imputation, but surely there should be some show of anger or annoyance by anyone who believes that people who have given the public service of this country their entire adult years and to whom this country owes so much should not be treated in this way. We believe these people are honest and decent gentlemen and we resent very much this sort of article and slanders of this sort against these gentlemen.

Can we not call a spade a spade and say that when people go so far as to ignore the facts and distort the truth there is only one argument that can be used? This is a perfect and classic example of the technique of the big lie, and I do not care whether it is based on the ignorance of Charles King or on political necessity as in the case of some of my hon. friends opposite. When it is used it is unfair, it is dishonest, and it is typical of the arguments that are advanced to support unification and the minister's move to bring about unification now.

• (4:50 p.m.)

It is certainly part of fair debating technique to talk about the qualifications of witnesses, their manner, bearing and deportment, and whether we should listen to and believe them. It is not, I submit, fair to twist the record. I challenge the hon. member for Leeds, or any hon. member on that side of the house, to take the evidence of any of the witnesses who appeared before the committee and point to questions and answers which will substantiate the statement that false and malicious charges have been made on this side of the house by those who are opposed to unification or opposed to progress. In fact, much of the evidence indicates that many of those who are opposed to unification are opposed to it because they believe it will interfere with integration, a process which they believed was making progress.

The entire point of this exercise, of course, is to remind members of the house that those who have already said they will support this measure have said that they will rely on the facts. This reminds me of the statement by the minister that it was not necessary for this matter to go to the committee. I say that any man who believes the facts will support him should want those facts revealed. I do not know of any one who believes this who would not want the facts stated accurately and truthfully so that the accuracy of his statements would stand out and support his argument. It is my opinion that the only people who use this sort of argument are those who realize they do not have a case and that there is no evidence to support their case.

It is my hope that the people of this country will come to realize this. If hon. members opposite, for their own particular reasons, insist on taking the stand they do, probably

they will soon feel the weight of public opinion and perhaps a little common sense will then appear and this measure can be stopped before irreparable harm is done to the country and to its defences.

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Chairman, since this debate started it is safe to estimate that some two million words have been placed on the record covering unification. As a result we have heard considerable urging from hon. members on the government side of the house that we should terminate this discussion and get on with the business of the house. At one stage in the debate I would have agreed with that point of view. However, as the debate continues it is amazing to note the change of viewpoint of the Canadian people toward this important matter. Therefore I think it is only fitting that I, as the member for Queens-Lunenburg, an area which had a high rate of enlistment during the first and second world wars, state my views on the bill now before us.

I think it is only proper that I should establish my credentials first before I become too deeply involved in the subject matter of the debate. I was not a member of the committee on national defence but I followed quite closely the reports of the evidence given before that committee. I do not consider myself an expert on military affairs, having volunteered and served during the second world war in the Royal Canadian Air Force which, after all, is only one branch of the Canadian armed forces. My lack of information in respect of the other branches of the services, especially the navy, has been redressed greatly in recent months. One can readily understand the source of my information when I tell the house that in my riding there reside presently three admirals who recently retired from the armed forces.

Mr. Byrne: Presently raising cattle.

Mr. Crouse: There was an interjection by the hon. member for Kootenay East which I did not hear.

Mr. Byrne: Raising cattle.

Mr. Crouse: Some of them are raising cattle. Others are still deeply interested in matters pertaining to Canada's armed forces.

I point out to the Minister of National Defence that in Nova Scotia we are not called "Bluenosers" without just cause. Along the eastern seaboard where Canada meets the sea, Atlantic rollers surging toward the shore beat a rhythm which seems to make the blood

[Mr. Nugent.]

tingle and calls forth hardy men to sail on the bosom of the deep. There is a love of the sea and its traditions among maritimers which can never be fully appreciated or understood by those who have never sailed upon the broad Atlantic or never have watched a sunset at sea or white water cresting mountainous waves. As a Nova Scotian I sometimes find myself getting homesick for the sight, sound, and smell of the sea. Only after I return to my home in Lunenburg is the balance restored. My remarks, therefore, concerning this bill will be general in nature and specific only in respect of Canada's navy and the effect of this bill upon the men who enlisted in and are devoted to this service.

We were first made aware of the plans of the government and the minister for unification when the white paper on defence was tabled in March, 1964. This loosely worded document stated:

> The objectives of Canadian defence policy, which cannot be dissociated from foreign policy, are to preserve the peace by supporting collective defence measures to deter military aggression; to support Canadian foreign policy including that arising out of our participation in international organizations, and to provide for the protection and surveillance of our territory, our air space and our coastal waters.

These, Mr. Chairman, are policies which I can support. We need collective measures for the maintenance of peace and security as embodied in the charter of the United Nations. We need collective defence as embodied in the North Atlantic Treaty. We need and must retain our partnership with the United States in the defence of North America, and we need national measures to discharge our responsibility for the security and protection of Canada.

At the beginning I was in favour of integration which I construed to mean the combining of the headquarters and the field commands of the three services, thus effecting a saving in defence dollars. To the thrifty, hard working, independent people in my riding this type of thinking made sense. They said that here at last we have one minister in this spendthrift government who knows the value of a dollar. Unfortunately their joy was short-lived, for it now has been admitted that the steps in the reorganization made possible under Bill C-243 will not lead to savings of any account. In fact, when one checks the blue book of estimates which has been tabled for 1967-68 one finds that the estimates for national defence have increased by some $115 million.

I said that originally I favoured integration. I have not changed my opinion. Very few people will oppose integration of the pay corps, the medical and dental corps, the chaplain service, the victualling depots, clothing, communication and transportation services. This certainly seems to be the most economical way to provide these services. However, I believe these changes can be achieved with the three services retaining their uniforms and ranks under specific commands.

Up to this point I believe the Minister of National Defence and I are in agreement, but our agreement ceases when he states that integration is only the first step toward establishing a single unified defence force for Canada. I believe that the minister's proposal to place Canada's armed forces in one green uniform will destroy morale. This is an intangible weapon whose force knows no boundaries in any fighting unit. According to all reports, morale is at its lowest ebb today in Canada's armed forces. This is due to the fact that many service personnel are deeply disturbed by the uncertainty which now exists in regard to a service career, and they are unwilling to accept reorganization as they now see it.

• (5:00 p.m.)

I said that morale is an intangible thing and I can cite many examples to prove it. During the second world war it was an easy matter for airmen to get into a first class row with army or navy personnel when they got together. Whether in a restaurant or at any other gathering all they had to do was start singing softly:

> Wings over the navy,
> Wings over the sea.
> We're the top of the service,
> The navy's cavalry.

They seldom got beyond that point before a good row was under way with either the army or navy personnel present. This indicates pride of service and uniform. These very people were the first to applaud when the going got tough and the fly-boys came over and gave them cover. At these times they worked together and fought as a unit.

I think the statement by Admiral Mountbatten, when he was asked to express his opinion about a single uniform and rank structure, is worthy of repeating. He said:

> In the British reorganization care has been taken to preserve esprit de corps and morale and those traditions which help to maintain this in the services and fighting units.
>
> It has been accepted that to achieve this the three services must retain their uniforms and ranks with an identifiable professional head of their service. The idea of a single uniform and rank structure was also rejected as undesirable and unnecessary.
>
> There was some talk of taking the uniform and ranks of one service and imposing this on the others but the idea of a man in say army uniform with an army title arriving at a foreign port in command of a warship was generally felt to be so ludicrous that it was not pursued.
>
> The general cut and colour of naval uniforms are internationally so well known that a sailor from any one country can readily be recognized as a sailor in any other country.
>
> Sailors the world over take great pride in this and so in their own services do soldiers and airmen. No compensating advantage could be seen in attempting to impose so unpopular a change.

These are the words of a great British admiral. Surely the minister cannot throw them lightly aside.

Coming closer to home, I should like to quote the words of a gallant rear admiral, now retired from the Canadian navy, on the matter of a single uniform for all three services. On July 8, 1966, Rear Admiral H. F. Pullen wrote to me as follows, and I quote only part of his letter:

> It is of the utmost importance that the officers and men in our navy be recognized as members of a naval force wherever they go in the world. The rumours, half-truths, etc., emanating from Mr. Hellyer's office, or from these anonymous spokesmen at national defence headquarters, that suggest the abolition of the present naval uniform and its replacement by some abomination in bottle green, are causing a very great deal of distress, misgiving and uncertainty. Of this I am well aware, and I can produce evidence if necessary.
>
> You and your colleagues will earn the undying gratitude of all of us who have served, and are serving Canada at sea, if you can defeat and destroy the evil designs of Mr. Hellyer and his team.

Those words are not very complimentary to the minister but they are the strong beliefs of a former admiral and I endorse them. I ask hon. members, can all these men be wrong and only one man, the defence minister, right?

I think it is significant that not one of the recently retired senior officers of our three forces has supported the program of unification which will come into effect if this bill is approved. I think it is also significant that everyone of any stature outside the services or the government, whose military opinion could command respect and who testified before the defence committee, has expressed criticism or reservations on the proposed reorganization of the defence establishment.

In all honesty we must ask ourselves who is advising the minister on the course he is

presently pursuing. His critics have all been brushed aside, and at one time or another the minister has called them emotional, unreasonable, disloyal, destructive, obstructionists, politically-motivated or lacking in responsibility. I ask the minister if it would not be equally as fair to say of this large body of Canadians who hold views contrary to his own that they do so because of their knowledge, their experience, their convictions and their sincerity. Surely the testimony given before the defence committee by so many men of such high calibre, who have given such outstanding service in war and in peace, has a ring of truth about it which cannot be ignored by the minister and the government. In my opinion, if we follow through with this bill we will destroy the effectiveness of Canada's armed forces who are charged with the responsibility of protecting this nation in time of war.

Let us return to the white paper on defence of 1964. At the top of page 14 the minister stated:

> The major threat to North America at this time is from the air, and it is in the field of continental air defence that co-operation with the United States has assumed the largest proportions.
>
> The future of continental air defence, therefore, is obviously of great concern to Canada, both because of the sizeable resources devoted to it, and because of the question of nuclear warheads. While a downward trend in continental air defence forces seems likely, yet, short of total disarmament, one cannot foresee the day when Canada will not be directly involved in some form of air defence operations.

Those are the minister's words and I ask him, does he believe them? If so, when he was making such drastic cuts in the effective strength of our forces, which today number less than 104,000 men or 20,000 less than on March 31, 1963, why did he fire by the device of premature retirement 287 senior R.C.A.F. pilots? Granted, these men were all within three years of compulsory retirement age, but they included the most senior and capable men the R.C.A.F. had flying. What happened as a result? The air force was left short of senior instructors, pilot leaders and instrument check pilots. Our transportation command with its world wide commitments was severely hit by the minister's arbitrary action. Today there are barely enough pilots left to man the planes we have.

The minister may say: "So what? I made one blunder." This brings me back to my original question. Who is advising the minister? By dismissing these pilots he acted contrary to his own statement in the white paper

[Mr. Crouse.]

regarding the importance of air defence. Surely the sensible thing to do would have been to approach these pilots on an individual basis and give them the opportunity to leave the service or stay on for an additional period, thus giving the nation the benefit of their extensive knowledge acquired through a lifetime of service. We are often told we cannot be wasteful of our resources without suffering the consequences. I believe this is equally true of our human resources. Yet this is exactly what the Minister of National Defence did when he prematurely dismissed these Royal Canadian Air Force pilots.

A similar situation with regard to morale and personnel has developed on the east coast in our navy. The great exodus of naval personnel from the service of this country does not seem to worry the minister. This may be due to the fact that in his subconscious mind he really believes that the major threat to North America is from the air and therefore we no longer need to attach any great importance to retaining a strong navy. However, this is not supported by known facts.

I believe it is safe to say that any future confrontation in which Canada may be involved will be with the communist-dominated countries controlled by the Soviet union. For this reason we have joined NATO and NORAD, and up to the present time we have made a military contribution to these organizations for the collective defence of Canada. The minister has stated that in the event of aggression against Canadian territory Canada would rely on the active support of the United States. He also stated that in Canada's national interest certain matters must come under our control.

In this regard he lists on page 13 of his white paper these items: the ability to maintain surveillance of Canadian territory, air space and territorial waters, the ability to deal with military incidents on Canadian territory, the ability to deal with incidents in ocean areas off the Canadian coasts, and the ability to contribute within the limit of our resources to the defence of Canadian air space. These are worthy objectives, Mr. Chairman, but in view of what is happening to our armed forces we cannot help but ask the question, can we live up to them?

• (5:10 p.m.)

Let us examine the statement by the minister, for example, that the major threat to North America at this time is from the air. Who is advising the minister? From whom is he getting this information? In the

January-February issue of *Aerospace-International* published for the leaders of the free world by the United States Air Force Association, there is an authoritative analysis of the size, organization and equipment of the armies, navies and air forces of 49 major powers. This analysis covers the free world, the communist bloc and the non-aligned nations and is presented by special arrangement with London's Institute for Strategic Studies. I commend this magazine to the minister for his week end reading. It will give him a better idea of the military strengths and weak points of his friends and the enormous combined strength of his potential enemies.

It is not my intention to burden the committee this afternoon with all the figures of the combined strength of the communist bloc or of the potential power of the Soviet army or air force. However, I wish to place on the record a list of the surface ships and total seapower of the Soviets, which is awesome in its threat to the peace and security of the free world. I quote from the magazine in question. It lists under "Seapower" the following:

> The strength of the Soviet navy and naval air force is 465,000 men. In total tonnage, it is the second biggest navy in the world, and its main strength lies in the submarine fleet. An unusually high proportion of the fleet is kept in commission. There are indications that the naval air force and the missile bearing submarines have an increasingly important role in Soviet strategy.
>
> There are now some 350 conventionally powered and 50 nuclear powered submarines. (Nuclear submarine production appears to be at the rate of at least five a year.) About 15 of the nuclear and 25 of the conventional submarines can fire ballistic missiles and carry an average of three missiles each; 12 of the nuclear and 28 of the conventionally powered submarines are equipped with cruise missiles which have a range of between 300 and 500 miles; they are thought to carry an average of four missiles each. The remainder are training vessels or attack submarines equipped with torpedoes. The four submarine fleets are distributed approximately as follows: 75 in the Baltic fleet, 175 in the Arctic, 45 in the Black Sea, and about 100 in the Far East. The missile carrying submarines are mostly divided between the Arctic and Far East fleets.
>
> Seaborne missiles. It is now believed that the Soviets have successfully developed submerged firing of the Serb missile, which has been shown on Moscow parades. It is probably being gradually introduced into service, but its range may not be much greater than 650 miles.
>
> Tactical missiles. Some ships and submarines are known to be fitted with cruise missiles which are intended primarily for antiship use. However, these might also be used against shore targets and, in the case of submarines, would be fired from the surface and from fairly long range.
>
> Naval air force. There are no aircraft carriers in the Soviet navy. The land based naval air force comprises about 500 bombers and 350 other aircraft. Most of the bombers are based near the northwestern and Black Sea coasts of the Soviet Union.

Under the heading "Surface Ships" the article says:

> The surface ships of the Soviet navy consist of the following:
>
> 20 cruisers, of which one carries surface-to-air missiles.
>
> 105 destroyers, of which 25 carry surface-to-air or surface-to-surface missiles.
>
> 100 other ocean going escorts.
>
> 300 coastal escorts and submarine chasers.
>
> 350 fast patrol boats, many with short range surface-to-surface missiles.
>
> 300 minesweepers.
>
> 200 landing ships and landing craft.
>
> 1,050 other vessels.
>
> Some adapted trawlers are used for electronic intelligence.
>
> A proportion of the destroyers and smaller vessels may not be fully manned.
>
> The cruisers are of three different types.

Then it lists the cruisers and destroyers and their names. The article continues:

> Recent Soviet comment has indicated a renewed interest in amphibious forces. There is a small marine corps of perhaps 3,000 men, units of which are stationed with the Baltic, Black Sea, and Pacific fleets.

Against this threat—and in this magazine Canada's total forces are listed—we are shown as having a population of 20 million and total armed forces of 107,100 men. Our total navy strength is listed as 18,100 men, one light aircraft carrier, 23 destroyer escorts, six other escorts, three submarines, including one British under Canadian operational control, and two support ships, CS2-F2 Tracker aircraft and Sea King helicopters, the article says, are embarked in the aircraft carrier, and Sea King helicopters in some of the destroyers. Our naval reserves total is listed as about 2,500 men.

The Canadian people are asking, who is advising the minister? We have obligations to NATO and to NORAD and these obligations can only be fulfilled if our forces retain their own uniforms, their own individualities and their own traditions. We must be in a position to work in co-operation with our major allies, the Americans and the British, so that our armies, navies and air forces can work together in harmony. It is vitally important that we retain our navy and that we place greater emphasis on its over-all role in our national defence.

In view of the figures which I have placed on the record with regard to the strength of our potential enemy, I believe it is almost mandatory that we give deeper consideration

to restoring our naval strength. An inconspicuous fishing trawler or a high-speed submarine with a mine-laying configuration could effectively seal Halifax harbour to all shipping for an indefinite period of time. There would be virtually nothing the Royal Navy could do about it at the present time because of the ludicrous mine warfare policies which have been adopted by this minister and the government. In my opinion, if the present attitude toward our navy is maintained by the government, prior to any obvious act of war a foreign naval power could stop almost completely the movement of every commercial or war vessel in or out of Canadian waters. With our ships bottled up in harbour, North American defence on our seacoast would have to be taken over by the American navy, which hopefully would not be faced with a similar problem.

In view of the Soviet military might which I have cited, it is evident to me, if not to the government, that Russia has not altered its objectives. The detente at present being experienced in Europe is indicative only of the fact that the Soviets have altered their timetable.

While I realize it may be unwise to consider defence spending as an essential component of economic activity, I would also point out to the minister that the economic results of defence spending cannot entirely be overlooked as a means of helping to restore the great economic imbalance that exists between the Atlantic provinces and the more prosperous parts of Canada.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I believe that we must reassess our military thinking, as well the stand taken by our external affairs department toward our position in NATO. In my opinion, a nation of 20 million people living in a country the size of Canada must depend upon the support of its allies in time of war for the collective defence of this country. In the course of next year Canada will be reviewing her military commitments under NATO, and common sense alone tells us that we should delay any major revisions of our defence forces at least until these revised undertakings become known. I hope the minister will follow this course in the best interests of all Canadians.

• (5:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Chairman, Bill No. C-243 which has been before us for several weeks has obviously raised great interest among the Canadian people as a whole.

The government claims that we have spoken enough on that legislation and that we should now vote on it. But before doing so, I think that we, as members of the opposition, must ask ourselves certain questions. We must first ask ourselves whether we should let the government take its responsibilities and accept the judgment of the population for the errors which, in our opinion, are contained in this bill on unification.

We know that in a democracy, the official opposition is formed by the party having the greatest number of seats in the house of commons, and that that political party will be called upon eventually to replace the government in office. In fact, as a wise politician once said: When we are sitting in the opposition, we are headed for power but when we are in power, we are headed for the opposition. You might tell me that this is self-evident but if the minister fails to be more co-operative in this legislation he has introduced, I am convinced he will be co-operating more with the Canadian people, so that his government and his party will sit in opposition after the next election while we, on this side, will take over.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to pursue further the discussion of this most important legislation which will have grave consequences for the organization of our armed forces, it is because the members of the opposition in the last few days, have put certain questions to the minister and asked him to supply to the house the information required to understand the bill now under consideration. We must regretfully state that the minister has neglected, refused or deliberately avoided supplying to parliament, the representatives of the people, the necessary information to enable them to take a decision and to vote on this bill.

I compare a piece of legislation brought before the house to a case a lawyer has to plead before a court and, of course, when appearing before the court, it is necessary to prepare it properly in order to win. In the present case, namely the measure before the house, that is Bill No. C-243, I must say that the minister has failed to prepare his case, because if he did, he made a botch of it or he has been ill-informed about the object of the bill under study.

When a bill is first brought before the house, the onus of proof as to the aims of the bill lies with the minister of the crown, just as the burden of proof lies with the lawyer

appearing before the court, who must submit all relevant information. Since the onus of proof lies with the petitioner, as with the minister who brings a piece of legislation before the house, we must know about all the elements likely to enlighten us as to the merits of this bill.

We often wonder whether the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer) is really the author of the bill. He never said so very clearly. We do think that he was informed by his department officials but we would be interested to know who is really the author, who was the mind, the brain behind Bill No. C-243 and who built the structure now before us.

Hon. members opposite hold us responsible for the delay in passing the bill. Therefore, I take the liberty to make a suggestion to the Minister of National Defence, as well as members of the government. If they want this bill passed as soon as possible, they should tell the minister to give at once a clear answer to the important questions which we, on the opposite side, have asked him on several occasions, during this debate.

For instance, we have asked him this question: Why did 40 odd senior officers of the army, navy and air force say "no" to unification?

• (5:30 p.m.)

We had, of course, the privilege and opportunity to read the evidence of those officers when they appeared before the committee on national defence, but we would like to know why some 40 senior officers who had not yet reached the age of retirement have chosen to retire prematurely rather than to follow implicitly the views and ideas set forth by the Minister of National Defence on unification.

In one case at least, the minister has shown no patience with his senior officers, has not respected, in my opinion, their freedom of speech and has even contributed to their premature retirement.

I feel that some very important matters have been raised in the house concerning our commitments to NATO. We all know that our commitments to NATO are of a military nature, just as we know that the member states of NATO are going through a deep crisis at present. We are also aware that since the French government demanded that the military forces of NATO member states leave French territory, this organization has been undergoing a complete military overhaul, since it is first of all a defence organization against possible aggression by the other block.

Now, since we are members of this international organization, it would be a good thing to know whether the minister has consulted the military leaders of those other countries which adhere to NATO, in order to find out how this unified force which is being considered for Canada may serve efficiently within the framework of this international body.

Naturally, the ministers of the crown do not agree on this question. The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) told the house in a long speech that the unification of the armed forces did not change in any way our undertakings with regard to NATO.

On the other hand, the minister also seemed to say in a speech that the unification of the armed forces concerned only the United Nations forces. I think that these two ministers of the crown, who hold very important portfolios, should agree on our undertakings with regard to NATO, so as to determine whether the unification of the armed forces will be prejudicial to these undertakings and whether we should instead assume other responsibilities, so that the unification of our armed forces may be adapted to the present NATO defence system for our mutual defence.

We have also commitments to NORAD; unless I am mistaken, the NORAD treaty was signed in 1963. That treaty provides for the joint defence of the territories of Canada and the United States respectively. We would therefore like to learn from the minister whether the unification of our armed forces involves a revision of our commitments to NORAD.

I believe that those questions are most important, because we cannot state, from a military point of view, that we might proceed alone; here on the North American continent, as far as territorial defence is concerned, we are bound by the NORAD treaty, and at the international level, we are a member country of NATO.

So the minister should tell us whether that aspect of the question was looked at and whether our commitments to NATO and NORAD will have to be re-evaluated in the light of this new proposed legislation, namely the unification of our armed forces.

Obviously the minister will have to prove, as I said at the start, that the unification of the armed forces will also be effective for our military men who will have to serve in NATO as well as in NORAD.

Recently I met a number of students, who are rather concerned about their commitments to the armed forces in the future. Mr. Chairman, we know that many students signed written commitments with the armed forces and these young men often have to do military service during the summer holidays, in order to fulfil their contract with the armed forces. I am being told that these young students have asked the military authorities long ago whether the unification of armed forces will affect their commitments with the military authorities. It would be high time for the minister to give us information on that matter, because students must, of course, work during their summer holidays and they must know immediately, before the end of the school year, if they can depend on the enlistment contracts they signed with the armed forces.

There are also, in that bill, some disturbing provisions, especially clause 6 which gives the military authorities, under the guise of unification, the power to decree compulsory transfers from one service to another, be it the navy, the air force or the army.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, such compulsory transfer from one of the three services implies a degree of conscription in our armed forces. Of course, when conscription is mentioned, it always hurts our friends opposite and ourselves, the Conservatives, because we know what it has done to us in the political field in the province of Quebec since 1917, because our Liberal friends have always blamed the Conservatives for conscription which was put into force in 1917 by a Union government, in spite of the fact that it was made up of Liberals and Conservatives. The fact remains, however, that we have carried, since 1919, in the province of Quebec that burden of conscription which was forced on us by an act of parliament, as everyone knows.

I feel that the clause which provides for compulsory transfer from one military service to another is some kind of camouflaged conscription and I also feel that, under that bill, the minister has the power to call young men into the armed forces when the number of men needed to meet the requirements of the armed forces falls below the minimum. The minister claims that he will need 100,000 men in uniform.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Now, I am divulging no secret in saying that, from the time we began talking about unification, enlistment of our young people in the armed forces has gone down considerably. And this is readily understandable, for those young people must leave everything to chance when they enlist. Some would rather keep their freedom, meaning that they want to be free to choose the service in which they will enlist. Some of those young people would rather be sailors, while others would prefer to become airmen or yet soldiers. Now, of course, under clause 6, military authorities will be empowered to transfer recruits from one service to the other without even getting their previous consent. In my opinion, this power provided for in clause 6 is tantamount to conscription, a type of slavery which our young people fear. They want to keep their freedom. In enlisting, they want to be free to serve either in the navy, in the air force or in the army.

In the very beginning, when the minister brought down his white paper on national defence, here was some wave of sympathy. Admittedly, our population realizes that our governments are allocating too much money to national defence. The white paper, which the minister had presented, and his subsequent statement suggested that it was possible to save money for the taxpayers through unification of the armed forces and this, I suggest, was a very good asset for the Minister of National Defence.

But when the taxpayers studied the estimates for the coming fiscal year, they noticed that the estimates for national defence had gone up by $115 million. They wonder how the minister can possibly claim that he can save public funds through passing of the bill on the unification of the armed forces.

Mr. Chairman, considering that it will cost several million dollars in taxpayer's money to change the uniform, that is to give the same uniform to the three forces, we wonder how in the white paper and his speeches in the house and elsewhere, the minister could justifiably claim that passage of the unification bill would spare Canadian taxpayers considerable expense.

I say it again: this year, the budget exceeds that of last year by $115 million. And yet there are other problems far more pressing than just changing the uniform of our soldiers. We had obvious proof thereof this afternoon when an emergency debate was requested in order to help the farmers of eastern Quebec. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene) refuses to give the farmers a minimum of $5.10, which would represent an

outlay of some $30 million, while on the other hand $115 million more will be willingly spent on our armed forces during the coming fiscal year.

I wonder whether the present government has any common sense. This is not demagogy, it is irrefutable fact. Let the member who wants to interrupt me look up the estimates and he will see that the minister asks for $115 million more this year. Let him look then in the direction of our farmers: he will see that they need a higher income to make ends meet. And then we are told that the government is sensible.

Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member wishes to ask me a question, let him rise.

Mr. Béchard: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a question. What did the government of which the hon. member was a member do for the farmers between 1958 and 1962?

Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix): The Conservative government did more for the farmers than the present government ever did. I should add that the party that was in power at the time at least listened to the complaints of the farmer. In fact, they were not arrogant toward the farmers as the present government is.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Chairman, if the minister wants us to vote at the earliest possible time, he should first supply us with the information we have been asking for since the inception of this debate.

We have asked questions because we need the information. We are here to represent a certain area of the population and we have a right to all information in order to know just what we are voting on.

The minister also—

Mr. Béchard: Just one more question, Mr. Chairman, and not an embarrassing one this time.

Could the hon. member tell us how many hundred of letters he has received from his electors concerning the debate now going on?

Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix): All that my constituents tell me when I visit my riding is how can the government be sincere when it claims that unification of the armed forces will result in savings for the taxpayers, when in the present budget the appropriations for defence purposes will increase by $115 million. Therefore, I am wondering about the government's sincerity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix): It has also been suggested that morale was low in the Canadian armed forces. I am quite sure that the minister has kept information from the people involved with that unification. People do not know exactly where they are heading with unification and I can prove it. I met recently a young serviceman and I asked him what he thought about the unification of the armed forces. He answered: Sir, I am not too familiar with the subject, but all I know is that, in my case, perhaps it makes sense. I asked him why. He replied: We shall be on an equal footing with the seamen and the airmen —he was in the army. I then asked him to explain. He said: We had to take part in a march with airmen recently, and I was most surprised to find that since unification has been mentioned, we are given the same lunch as airmen. I asked him why. He told me: In the past, when airmen made such marches, they were allowed to bring bananas in their lunch box; now, since they began telling us about unification, they have been trying to treat us better, and that time soldiers also had bananas in their lunch box.

That goes to show that the minister has not given proper information for the military to understand the aim of his bill on the unification of the armed forces.

Mr. Chairman, I should also like to know whether this unification bill will give French Canadian members of the navy, the air force and the army the same promotion opportunities as those enjoyed by their English speaking colleagues. You know that in our various services, French Canadians have received somewhat less than preferential treatment with regard to promotions. Once in a while one of them gets a promotion.

• (5:50 p.m.)

However, in the past, French Canadian people, I think, have fulfilled their duty when the freedom of our territory and our citizens had to be protected. They have never been reluctant to perform their duty and to assume their responsibilities in this field.

In this bill on the unification of our armed forces, French Canadians who wish to join our Canadian forces should be assured they will have equal opportunities of success and promotion as their English speaking colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, those are the remarks I wanted to make during this debate. If the Minister of National Defence refuses to give us the information we have asked him for for

a long time, I think that the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Pearson), who is the leader of the nation, will have to come and tell the house what he thinks of this bill on the unification of our armed forces—if the minister stubbornly refuses to give us the necessary information.

I strongly urge the Prime Minister to clear up any misunderstanding within his cabinet with regard to the unification of our armed forces—he will have to tell the Canadian people what is meant according to him in this bill and if this bill, as claimed by the minister, will really be in the interest of all Canadians.

[*English*]

Mr. Leboe: Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to say that I believe there is unanimous consent to suspend the sitting until eight o'clock for a dinner hour. Since there are only a few minutes left before six I suggest we might rise now so as not to interrupt the next speaker.

The Chairman: Order. I should point out to the committee that there is already an order of the house before the committee to suspend its sitting from seven till eight. If it is the wish of the committee to do otherwise, this wish would have to be expressed with the Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Leboe: I think there is unanimous consent in the committee to rise at this time.

Progress reported.

Mr. Hellyer: I move that this house adjourn until eight o'clock, to resume its business at that time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Should the house wish to change the order of Thursday, April 6, unanimous consent will be required. Does the house give unanimous consent to suspending the sitting from now until eight o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Before adjourning I shall announce the proceedings on tonight's adjournment motion.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: The hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Schreyer), Agriculture—inquiry as to basis for fluid milk subsidy; the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette), Agriculture—inquiry as to new dairy policy; the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette), Transport—inquiry as to grade crossings policy.

Does the house agree to resume the business interrupted a few moments ago?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

AMALGAMATION OF NAVY, ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The house resumed consideration in committee of Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof—Mr. Hellyer—Mr. Batten in the chair.

The Chairman: Pursuant to the agreement just reached the sitting of the committee is suspended until eight o'clock.

SITTING SUSPENDED

SITTING RESUMED

The Chairman: When the committee rose at six o'clock clause 2 was being considered.

Mr. Bower: Mr. Chairman, I have had every intention of speaking on this most important piece of legislation since the moment of its introduction because on the validity of its proposals our very existence as a country may depend, and because it will govern the way that expenditures of a very large segment of our national budget are to be made. We must be right in the legislative road that we take on this matter.

Sir, although not a member of the standing committee on defence, I have, however, read the testimony of the witnesses who appeared before that body, and I have followed the speeches on Bill C-243 in the house and in *Hansard*, through its various stages to the present. I can assure you right away, Mr. Chairman, that I do not propose to participate now on the basis of an analysis of the testimony of the expert military witnesses before the standing committee on defence which, as might be expected, was conflicting, although on balance in my opinion the concept of unification was then definitely negated. Rather, it is what has not been said that disturbs me greatest—this along with what

would appear to me to be contradictions and violations of basic principles; the attitude of the government that parliament must swallow this whole bill on faith, and be damned quick about it. This is what forces me to my feet.

The Minister of National Defence stated last Tuesday, in what I took to be his peroration, that there were witnesses available favouring unification who were not called. Why not? Why the unseemly haste in getting the bill back to the house and securing parliament's approval of a process or policy admittedly calculated to take years to implement fully? Surely a week or a month more on a matter so vital, involving the expenditure of so many billions of dollars, and perhaps an irrevocable commitment, merits no short changing in the investigation of its validity. That statement of the minister in itself casts shadows of doubt. It smacks of the salesman of the gold brick or the Brooklyn bridge, with his admonition to "hurry, hurry, hurry, or you'll miss the opportunity of a lifetime." There is an odour here of super high-pressure salesmanship that shakes one's confidence in the proposition.

A great deal of the debate, it seems to me, has been on points peripheral to the basic issue. While not discounting, for instance, a weight to tradition, I cannot get worked into a frenzy as to whether uniforms are baby pink, green, blue, yellow or purple, and above all on the insistence that a single uniform is going to work miracles of efficiency and economy.

What is important in the unification issue is that basically we are dealing with a system of management and organization. That system should be calculated to provide an optimum defence posture for our country, taking due note, as I am sure does the groaning Canadian taxpayer, that the defence department will be laying out about 20 cents of every dollar of the estimates recently tabled in the house.

• (8:10 p.m.)

I cannot and I do not believe the people of Canada are persuaded that it is advisable to jump into something so fraught with awful consequences, just on slogans and assurances that because it is good, ergo it is good. Dr. O'Leary runs about extolling the use of L.S.D.—that it is just dandy; it is the latest. I wonder whether the public goes along with the high priest of hallucinations on that basis.

The minister's semantic juggling of integration and unification, with his invocation of cycles, suggests that perhaps he has in mind a bicycle, a vehicle used by the Bersaglieri of Italy in the first world war 50 years ago—very old hat indeed. But seriously, sir, I was disturbed by the minister's verbal acrobatics and analogy last Tuesday, likening integration and unification to the cycle of conception and childbirth. This left me aghast, for death is part of that cycle and that, sir, is disintegration.

This brief preface leads me to the fundamental point I wish to make and to which I referred in my opening remarks. In Bill C-243 we are dealing essentially with a management and organization problem, the correct solution of which is vital. While there seems to be near unanimity in respect of the benefits to be derived from integration in the defence department, I would call the attention of the committee and the country to the fact that there are places where effective and modern managerial and organizational procedures are of the essence. We have for example oil companies which are fully integrated on the multi-functional bases of exploration, producing, refining, transportation and distribution activities. The preservation of the integrity of these functional components is considered a must by men who are neither Liberals, Conservatives, Socialists, Social Crediters, nor any other political or ideological category, but who are swayed by and for their judgments on the best possible management of an entity—men who are every day seeking new things and who are charged with the responsibility to spend—and do spend—millions and millions of dollars on basic research. I am not speaking of old reactionary men when I speak of these men who have arrived at the conclusion that the integrity of the functional activity must be preserved in relation to the multibased activity.

To superimpose, cycle in, or otherwise clutter up the preservation of that integrity would be to violate the very rudiments of good management and organization. It would invite bankruptcy and the disappearance of the company as an entity. From this homely but practical analogy I submit that it is not in the interest of good management and organization recklessly to rush into, or go into at all, a process of making a hash of sea, air and land functions, any more than it would be to make a stew of geologists, drillers, refiners, pipeliners and distributors.

No, Mr. Chairman; hashed or stewed up, defence operations are not what the citizens and taxpayers of our country deserve.

Neither do I think that this is what the members of this house would wish to hand out to them. We of the official opposition certainly have made it abundantly clear that we do not wish to be so tainted. Mr. Chairman, what the Canadian people want and deserve is $1,700 million worth of defence and not $1,700 million worth of Hungarian goulash.

In trying to reduce this complex debate to graspable size, I might say I get the feeling of being at a town meeting where the mayor proposes doing something which is generally agreed to be logical and desirable, but then extends the proposal to a point where it becomes something he does not define, to take care of doing something he does not specify, with the evolving proposal in its entirety running through 20 per cent of the town's budget.

• (8:20 p.m.)

I submit there is not one ratepayer group in this country of ours which, if they saw it in this light, would swallow the proposition of unification. Since the bill was first introduced in the house it has become abundantly clear that to put it mildly, the minister does not have the enthusiastic support of his colleagues in the cabinet. Obviously they feel he has painted himself into a corner, and for some reason, perhaps self-preservation, they are letting him fight his own way out of this self-created situation. The minister in the last few days has been accused of being dictatorial and like Napoleon. Perhaps he is more like a Napoleon standing on the burning deck.

If one looks behind the sort of avuncular facade as reflected in the speech of the minister of external affairs, it appears that he did suggest some diversionary feints on peace keeping and peace restoring. He did make a very good case for the preservation and differentiation of the functional activities of the armed forces. This is precisely the point I am making, and it is the antithesis of unification.

The Minister of Transport appealed to the members as civilians to judge this bill on its merits and soundness of objective. The objective of the bill—and I presume the minister would agree with me—is to achieve maximum effectiveness of defence for a minimum of outlay. However, if the bill involves procedures which violate the practices followed by the management of large and complex organizations, then I submit that, as it has been concocted, it fails on its merits.

The idea of unification has been kicking around the defence departments of the world

for many years, so it is not a new idea. That fact pulls the rug from under the main support which the government benches have relied upon in pressing this legislation. Let the government withdraw the bill, go back and do its homework and then come forward with a new bill during the next session which will not strain the credulity of a practical minded public. I for one cannot support Bill C-243 which embodies a basicly wrong approach to obtaining a universally desired end.

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Chairman, this debate seems to have become nothing more than an attack on personality. Much of what has been said in the past two weeks has been about individuals rather than about the subject matter of the bill. Even during the defence committee hearings some of us were charged with the fact that we did not have military experience and for that reason should not be heard. Some doubt was cast as to whether or not we were eligible for committee membership itself.

In defence of my position I said at that time that I had offered my services, and was turned down. I remained active in an industry which concerned itself almost exclusively with the production of war materiel. As a result, I believe my health suffered even more than the health of most of the members of that committee. I certainly do not apologize for taking part in this debate. I am sure that the day will come when all the members of this house can say with pride they have no military wartime service. We hope war is a thing of the past and that wartime service will not be used in this chamber as a red herring.

Let me refer momentarily to a speech made by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona, which was unworthy of him and certainly unworthy of his constituents. I am sure they must have cringed with embarrassment, if they were unfortunate enough to have watched that television report which originated in Winnipeg. It was of very low quality and I am sure the hon. member's constituents will deal with him in an appropriate manner at the next general election.

Mr. Churchill: When are you going to get away from personalities?

Mr. Byrne: The hon. member for Bow River blew in yesterday for one of his one day stands. During the committee hearings that hon. member sought to discredit my capability. Certainly that would not be difficult. I am not an eminent lawyer like the hon.

member. I am not a graduate of the University of Saskatchewan. I graduated cum laude from the school of hard knocks. I do not pretend to be a lawyer who might qualify as a prosecutor or attorney for defence.

The hon. member for Bow River unwittingly put his finger on one of the most important pieces of evidence I wish to refer to this evening, and that is the evidence of Air Chief Marshal Miller. That gentleman appeared before the committee in opposition to Bill C-243 without having taken the trouble to read its contents. Surely that was an affront to the committee and its members. Surely he should not have taken that attitude in giving evidence in opposition to a measure which admittedly he had not taken the trouble to read, though it had been given first reading five months earlier. For this very reason I asked a series of questions of Air Chief Marshal Miller, because I wanted to bring this fact to the attention of the committee. I would have thought that even an unperceptive juryman would have seen what I was endeavouring to do, but obviously the hon. member for Bow River did not. I asked the following questions:

• (8:30 p.m.)

Do you consider that the prospects of unification held out to the public has been detrimental to naval or other recruitment, thus far?

Whether this is so is another question. An article appeared in the Toronto *Telegram* of March 25, 1967, which indicated that recruiting is reaching a relatively high level and that for two months the recruitment was 2,196; that there were 556 in the—

An hon. Member: How many people went out in that period?

Mr. Byrne: —navy, 752 in the army and 888 in the R.C.A.F. In reply to my question Air Chief Marshal Miller said:

I would be giving a "Blue Sea" opinion on that that I could not back up. I think it has, but there are so many factors involved in what persuades anybody to join the navy, that for me to say that this is a factor or not, is just a matter of opinion and I could not make that.

So that in his opinion there are a number of factors that influence recruitment, but the question of unification was no more important than the others. I then asked:

Then, do you believe that the implementation of Bill C-243 would result in significant demoralization of the various forces?

The hon. member for Bow River seemed to think that "demoralization" was not a proper word; at least, he was quite exercised about it. I took the trouble to look up the meaning of "demoralization", and I found that to demoralize is to weaken the morale, to destroy normal function, to throw into disorder. I wanted to establish whether Air Chief Marshal Miller was deeply concerned with the question of morale in the armed forces. His reply to my question was:

If rushed, I would think so.

That answer obviously means that he differs in the matter of timing; unification may be all right a year or two from now, but it is not all right at the moment. Then I asked Air Chief Marshal Miller this question:

You said at the outset—

Meaning the beginning of the hearing.

—I believe it was in answering Mr. Forrestall—

Actually, it was in answer to a question put by the hon. member for Vancouver East.

—that you have not had time to take a look at the bill? Do you know when this bill was given first reading?

This may go down in history as one of the most ludicrous pieces of cross-examination, as was suggested by the hon. member for Bow River; but I want to point out again that the purpose of the questioning was not to establish that unification had a demoralizing effect, but rather that the witness who appeared before the committee and expressed such great concern about unification had not taken the trouble to read the bill. We were in fact dealing with clause 2 of the bill which has the effect of eliminating sections 15 to 18 of the National Defence Act. Of course sections 15 to 18 of the National Defence Act deal with the structure of the forces. Therefore, in effect Air Chief Marshal Miller was appearing before the committee in opposition to the bill and was speaking on the specific clause dealing with unification, yet he had not taken the trouble to read the bill.

As further evidence that Air Chief Marshal Miller had not read the bill, and did not know of its contents, I wish to quote further from the minutes of proceedings and evidence of the committee hearing of March 20, 1967, page 2295.

An hon. Member: He would have been wiser if he had read the bill.

Mr. Byrne: The hon. member for Hamilton West asked this question:

What are you unhappy about, sir? Can you specify what aspects you are unhappy about?

Air Chief Marshal Miller: Unification is just a word and it has come to be associated with the uniform. It has come to be associated with a single uniform, but it is more than that—a lot more than a single uniform.

Are the people of the forces going to be compelled to switch from their present uniforms to this new uniform and, if so, when? Under what conditions are they going to amalgamate the people in the various trades in the various services? Are there going to be strictures on staying in one force or are the people going to be compelled to go into employment in what used to be the old force? I do not know.

Obviously he did not know because he had not read the bill, Clause 7 of which provides:

Except in an emergency, no officer or man who was a member of the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army or the Royal Canadian Air Force immediately prior to the coming into force of this part shall, without his consent, be required to perform any duty in the Canadian forces that he could not have been required to perform as a member of such service.

Air Chief Marshal Miller showed some concern, as did members of the committee, that units and elements of the forces were to be eliminated. Clause 5 (2) of the bill puts everyone straight in this regard. It provides:

The units and other elements of the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force existing at the coming into force of this part shall, subject to the provisions of the National Defence Act, continue to be the units and elements of the Canadian forces.

• (8:40 p.m.)

We have heard much about the many witnesses who appeared before the committee and spoke in opposition to the bill. It has been said that most of the witnesses who appeared before the committee were in opposition to the bill. I think this can be very easily understood. If one goes back to the proceedings of the committee he can find that on three occasions at least the steering committee recommended for adoption by the committee that no more witnesses be heard. However, upon the insistence of those who were opposed to the bill that more witnesses be heard, there was a disposition on the part of the chairman, whom I want to congratulate for his very fair and understanding conduct of the committee, to go back to the steering committee and return with the proposal that another witness chosen by those opposing the bill be heard. I believe this happened on three occasions at least. Those of us who are not opposed to the bill did not insist on further witnesses, although many could have been called and, as everyone knows, pressure was put upon us to report to the house before the Easter recess.

[Mr. Byrne.]

Surely if the witnesses who were in opposition to the bill were credible witnesses—and we do not doubt their credibility—then the serving officers who spoke in support of unification must not be doubted either. Obviously the serving officers and the witnesses who appeared in support of unification are as convinced as those who are opposed that the matter of unification is important and that it should be dealt with at this time. So in the words of General Allard, let us get on with it.

While the hon. member for Bow River and other members of the opposition feel that the questioning in the committee did not elicit substantial information to assist them, I am sure that at least one member of the opposition was quite satisfied with the replies he received from General Allard. I should like to refer for a moment to the proceedings of the committee meeting of March 2, 1967 at which time the hon. member for Vegreville was questioning the general. The members of the opposition had expressed considerable concern about the loss of identity in the services and, following a series of questions, the hon. member for Vegreville said:

You remarked, I believe it was today sometime, that you had considered placing an air force officer in charge of a brigade and you had also considered placing a navy officer in charge of a brigade.

General Allard: Not in charge of a brigade in the case of the navy officer, but in the case of the air force officer, yes. I considered this because it became very important for one role. If you have an air mobile group, there is no reason why it should not be commanded by an airman, but unfortunately the difficulty at the moment is that our staff duties are so different and the methods of employment are so different that he would have had some difficulties had he been deployed in some exercise, and he would have had difficulties in co-ordinating some part.

Further on General Allard went on to say:

I think he would have done a good job just the same, but this only highlights the point that we have a great number of officers in the air force today who could have a much broader employment field than they have now. The fact that they are restricted after a certain rank in the air force means they cannot benefit by the possibilities and, in fact, some of them if they were trained are excellent people—good fighters, excellent people—who could do a magnificent job, but this is impossible at the moment. It is impossible, but I considered this very carefully and discussed it with the man concerned. He would have been prepared to accept it, but I think it would have been just a wee bit premature for him, so we think we should take a younger officer, train him through our staff college system and then bring him along; give him a staff job somewhere, because there is such a requirement. The blending of the two is getting to be so great that there is an absolute

requirement for it. I see no reason on earth why, in a few years time, these people should not be exchangeable.

I suppose the word meant here is "interchangeable." The hon. member for Vegreville went on with his questioning and, following a reply by General Allard, he said this:

That is more comforting than the information we have been able to get so far.

After further questioning the hon. member for Vegreville again said:

I am very happy to have been able to have this information from you, general, and it is definitely something we have not had before. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

He also said, I believe, that he had been an officer for some 51 years and that his fears had been allayed by the evidence which had been given by General Allard.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Will the hon. member permit a question? Just now he referred to the evidence given by General Allard in answer to questions asked by the hon. member for Vegreville. Where in the evidence is there any indication that the hon. member for Vegreville, who had not heard the evidence before, approved it?

Mr. Byrne: I should think the words of the hon. member for Vegreville speak for themselves.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Would the hon. member read the words of approval? The words "thank you" need not necessarily be taken as approval.

Mr. Byrne: If the hon. member wishes to have a private conversation with the hon. member for Vegreville, I will have no objection.

It has been said that newspapers across the country are rising to the challenge, that they are suddenly becoming aware of the great danger that is facing the Canadian people and encouraging the opposition to oppose this measure. However, I am not one given to quoting editorials. As a matter of fact I consider it a breach of the rules of the house to do so, and I do not intend to quote them. I am sure hon. members have noted within the last several weeks, however, that most of the reputable newspapers across Canada are saying it is time that this debate was concluded, and that the majority in the house be given an opportunity to make a decision.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Mr. Churchill: Will the hon. member permit a question at this point? It is a very simple question with regard to concluding the debate. Can he explain to me why the government today would not allow this house to get on with other matters on the order paper rather than provide an opportunity for the hon. member to prolong this debate? We earnestly asked for a change in the business so we could do something else that is on the order paper. Why was the request not granted?

Mr. Byrne: Those who have said more than should have been said or than could justifiably have been said, now seem anxious to deny members on the government side an opportunity to speak. Of course this is another form of closure, in reverse. I am not too well aware of the rules of the house. I used to make a very concerted study of the rules, but I found that the opposition abrogated them so often that I lost interest. I just go forward now from day to day, since the opposition seems to make the rules from day to day. The question raised by the hon. member is one he should discuss with the house leader. If they come to an agreement that we should take a vote on this question tonight I will be happy to sit down at this moment. If debate is to continue, as it so obviously did this afternoon, I feel I should say a few words even if only in defence of myself if not in defence of the minister and his measure.

I regret very much having had to refer to the hon. member for Bow River at a time when he was not in the House. However, it is difficult to find a time when he is here. It has been said that we have been asked to accept this bill holus-bolus, that the minister is immutable and will not accept amendments. Surely if members take the time to look at the reprinted bill, as opposed to the bill which was given first reading on November 4, 1966, they will find a large number of amendments have been made to it. Surely it is rather too early to say that the minister will not accept amendments, that he is completely immutable while we are still discussing clause 2 of the bill. I believe therefore that this argument, if I may use an expression, has been shot down in flames.

Certainly there has been sufficient debate on this subject for one to say that it has been dealt with adequately. The standing committee on defence heard 41 witnesses. The testimony covered a total of approximately 2,000 pages; the total number of words spoken, about one million; total number of questions asked, 5,000; total number of sessions, 55; total number of weeks of hearings, six.

Then, we have further statistics here covering the discussions of defence in the house, and this includes the question and answer period, supply, interim supply, estimates in both special and standing committees, and the white paper on defence from March, 1964 to April, 1967, inclusive. We find the total number of words spoken amounted to over 3,100,000; the total number of questions raised, approximately 11,040—

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): How many answers?

Mr. Byrne: There were an equal number of answers, of course.

The Chairman: Order. I must interrupt the hon. member to advise him that the time allotted to him has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

The Chairman: Does the hon. member wish to continue? Does he have unanimous consent to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Byrne: We have obviously slipped away from the very strong feelings against one another, so I may say I deeply appreciate this consideration.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I should like to draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that this courtesy has always been available to hon. members on the other side, but not to members on this side.

Mr. Pilon: That is not true.

Mr. Byrne: I expected to hear from the hon. member for Cape Breton South. He never fails to get into a debate, one way or the other. The bill was returned to the house to be dealt with in committee of the whole. Up to April 17, there were 101 members who had participated in the debate. The number of words spoken amounted to 359,275. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre has spoken four times; the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona, five times; the hon. member for Halifax, four times; the hon. member for Edmonton West, three times; the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek—my home area—three times; the hon. member for Cape Breton South, three times.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Chairman, I rise now on a point of order.

Mr. Byrne: Adequate time, therefore, has been given for discussion of this bill.

[Mr. Byrne.]

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I should like to draw to the attention of the hon. member and the committee that I have spoken three times because, through the courtesy of hon. members on this side, members on that side were allowed extended time. Although I spoke three times I had less time for debate than the hon. members on that side who have been given the privilege of extended time. I spoke three times simply because I was refused the extra time allotted to the Liberals.

Mr. Byrne: It is hardly a point of order for the hon. member to point out that he had less to say than hon. members on this side of the house.

Mr. Kindt: I see the crocodile smiles on the faces of members in the second row on the government side. I hope they will laugh now, and also after I have completed my remarks. Ever since I had the opportunity of seeing Bill No. C-243 and to read it carefully and quietly, to myself, it has been my intention to speak on the bill. I feel that when $1.7 billion is involved, when the efficiency of our fighting forces is involved, any member in this house representing the taxpayers of this country should find sufficient time to speak on the bill and try to protect the interests of the people of Canada who are paying the money.

I was greatly interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Kootenay East. I did not interrupt him but remained quietly in my seat. I hope he will supply copies of his speech to his constituents. If he does, Mr. Chairman, I am certain that he will not be back in this house again.

• (9:00 p.m.)

I have nothing personal against my colleague who is in a constituency to the west of mine. We have worked together on many issues. Whenever a crucial matter arises affecting coal shipments to Japan—in the initiation of which I played some part a number of years ago—my hon. friend from Kootenay East seems to grab all the publicity; he is good at that. With the present Liberal government in office I have a hard time to get my proper share of the credit for coal shipments to Japan.

Be that as it may, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member commenced his speech by stating that he was not going to deal in personalities. Yet his speech dealt in personalities from start to finish. First of all he picked on the member for Edmonton-Strathcona. He seemed to find nothing good to say about any hon. member who had spoken in committee against

the policies of the minister, or against unification. He said they were all off beam and that he would set the record straight.

I have a lot of admiration for the witnesses who came before the defence committee to give evidence, Mr. Chairman. I have had the privilege of studying much of the evidence given, having read the reports of the standing committee so as to inform myself on this question. I attended meetings of the committee and was present when Air Chief Marshal Miller gave his evidence. I was especially disturbed by the remarks of the hon. member for Kootenay East about Air Chief Marshal Miller, who gave evidence that was acknowledged by all who heard him to be sound.

I should like to refer to an article in the *Globe and Mail* for Wednesday, March 22, which quotes some of the evidence of Air Chief Marshal Miller, and which is as follows:

> Air Chief Marshal Miller told the committee that unification, while it might well be the end result of integration would not at present be timely, that more time was needed for the orderly development of the integration process. "I felt that a lot of careful planning was necessary and probably time to educate people was required before the next step of unification". Implementation of the bill could seriously demoralize the forces if it were rushed, the loss of personnel so far had been bad for the forces—

Then he closed by saying that some key men have left.

The hon. member for Kootenay East seemed to throw cold water on the testimony of this witness, so I should like to read what Charles Lynch had to say about it. Charles Lynch characterized him as a most impressive witness. According to his article in the Ottawa *Citizen* for Wednesday, March 22:

> Of all the witnesses to oppose the armed forces unification bill, Air Chief Marshal Miller is by far the most impressive. His credentials render unthinkable any attack on his motives—

I should like the hon. member for Kootenay East to reconsider his remarks in light of the statement of one who takes an unbiased position, Charles Lynch. According to Charles Lynch:

> His credentials render unthinkable any attack on his motives, and render difficult any reflections on his professional judgment by either Mr. Hellyer or members of his current military entourage.

Later in his article Charles Lynch goes on to say:

> Despite the outward loyalty of the current team of top officers to Mr. Hellyer and his program, and despite the call of the current defence chief, General Jean Victor Allard, for speedy unification, there can be no doubt that there are grave misgivings inside national defence headquarters, and beyond that in the various services and commands.
>
> There is anguish right at the top of the military structure about the rigid positions that have been assumed, creating the impression, as set out in the bill, that the land, sea and air arms of the forces are going to be obliterated.
>
> The simplest solution, and the one that most likely would have been adopted had rigor mortis not set in as stiffly as it has, would be to amend the bill in a way that would preserve the army, navy and air force identities within the proposed unified structure.

With the material I have before me, Mr. Chairman, I have tried to nail to the cross the statements made by the hon. member for Kootenay East in his attempt to discredit Air Chief Marshal Miller, whose testimony was above reproach. He had no motives other than to speak the truth. I may tell the minister and also the hon. member for Kootenay East that my reading of the testimony given by people who were unbiased has convinced me that they, in turn, were speaking from the depths of their own consciences and in the best interests of the people of Canada.

There are others, including the minister, who have had more military experience than I, or more association with military forces. Nevertheless let me tell the minister, in justification of my position, that once I was a corporal. Indeed I became a sergeant and was promoted to lieutenant. I was with the 2nd A.M.R.—Alberta Mounted Rifles—as well as in the Canadian reserve for a couple of years. I was also with the Canadian Officers Training Corps for three or four years. All in all I had an opportunity to learn something, though grant you not too much, about military life. I have the feeling that because of their training in the army and the type of work they are expected to perform in the defence of Canada, those in the army are not suited to be members subject to transfer to the navy or air force, especially, against their wishes.

• (9:10 p.m.)

Also, personnel enlisting will not be able to join the air force, army or navy, which at present are separate services with a long tradition of growth over the years. All countries have separate services, therefore there must be some merit to their separate existence. When we join hands working with the forces of other countries, we fit in with their patterns of working. Other countries have separate forces. The minister intends to obliterate our three separate forces and bring in their stead one unified force. The effects of this must be looked at objectively.

The hon. member for Kootenay East praised the work of the committee. I can understand that; he was one of its members. Nevertheless there was so much bias shown in that committee—and this applies to nine out of ten committees of this house and the work they turn out—that, for the people of Canada, its work was almost useless. This parliament will never function properly until we have committees before which witnesses can testify properly and which bring in reports not biased politically.

Take as an example the committee on Indian affairs and northern development. All the minister had to do was say something ought to happen, pull his strings, and the Liberal members would support him. That sort of thing has happened again and again in our committees. The hon. member for Kootenay East may laugh, but he knows what I say is absolutely true. If parliament is to function properly, if we are to present before it important legislation, some means must be found to reflect in this house the feelings of our people. As matters now stand too much political bias enters parliament's deliberations.

I now turn briefly to other matters. I have already talked about the evidence concerning unification. That evidence shows that unification is not a good thing. By expunging the biased statements of the minister, the hon. member for Kootenay East and others like him, and reading the evidence of persons such as Air Chief Marshal Miller who were in the position to speak their minds, and did so, one will find that the weight of evidence goes against the minister. Unification of the armed forces is shown to be undesirable.

When the integration bill was introduced I said nothing against it, believing as an economist that certain benefits would flow from it. This is not so with unification, which is vastly different. It has taken us a long time to fathom what was in the minister's mind when he spoke of unification.

I believe firmly that the navy, the army and air force ought to be separate. All countries of the world have three fighting forces. So far, maintaining three separate forces has been found to be the most effective method of maintaining military strength. This minister, unlike defence ministers of other countries, is tampering with the defence forces of Canada. He wishes to obliterate the navy, army and air force by merging them into one hill of beans, with all personnel wearing the same type of uniform. By so doing the minister will destroy service traditions.

In former years people volunteered for the navy, army or air force because they liked the tradition of the service they were about to join. During the first world war I tried to join the 137th battalion from Calgary, but could not because I was not of age. The record of that battalion had attracted me, as it had attracted others. The same thing is true about the air force and navy. Some are attracted by their traditions, and join. If those traditions are lost, buried or obliterated, as the minister intends, then an irreparable injustice will have been done to the fighting forces of this country.

In closing, let me say to the minister that he should have conducted himself as the Minister of Transport conducted himself during the debate on the transportation bill. The Minister of National Defence ought to have kept an open mind and listened to the views of different people. Instead of that his mind has been closed. He has not yielded on one point. Personally, I think this bill ought to be sent back to the committee for amendment. No bill entailing the far reaching consequences of this one ought to be passed in its present form. It ought to be amended to preserve for the time being at any rate the army, navy and air force to protect the $1.7 billion our taxpayers are paying.

Unless the minister is prepared to make concessions by adhering to the will of the people of this country, he has no alternative but to resign.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Chairman, I have not been a member of the defence committee. I have not had the opportunity and privilege of hearing all evidence presented to that committee, nor has it been possible for me to read it all. There are various reasons for this, the main one being that as a fairly active member of the finance, trade and economic affairs committee which was considering the Bank Act over many months, it was impossible for me to absorb everything that went on in the defence committee. But despite my lack of technical study and knowledge concerning Bill C-243 I could not help over the last several weeks coming to certain conclusions.

• (9:20 p.m.)

I was in my constituency last week end, and on that occasion and previously had many conversations which indicated to me that the people are worried. They are inclined

to feel that the minister has gone too far too fast.

Originally when this debate commenced I had not expected to speak. I thought I would leave the speaking to those members with technical knowledge or experience, which to me would seem to be required if one were to make a worth-while contribution. But I now feel I should enter the debate and make my views known in the House of Commons, and I would point out this is the first time for me to speak on the bill.

Some news media have been proclaiming that we on this side of the house should turn over and play dead. They have been proclaiming that we should accept the word of practically one man, the minister, against the evidence of so many retired and discharged senior officers, concluding with the evidence of Air Chief Marshal Miller. They have been proclaiming that closure is justified in order to close the mouths of the official opposition. They have been proclaiming that the implementation of this unification bill is inevitable, so why not capitulate to the stubborn attitude of the minister.

Today we are faced with the house leader having moved closure. Sir, to me this is inexcusable. The defence of Canada is much too important to be decided by the government in this manner. Unfortunately the government has repeatedly shown its contempt of parliament. It is now continuing that contempt, and this time the government has chosen the most important issue we could be faced with, namely the defence of Canada. As I see this whole defence matter, we are taking one step further toward dependence on our great neighbour to the south. In the past the government has taken numerous steps toward republicanism; this step, as I see it, is the biggest and most dangerous.

I feel that certain news media which support the government have tended to confuse the issue by using the words integration and unification interchangeably. This should not be done. They are two different and distinct steps; they have two absolutely different meanings.

Integration has met with general agreement. In fact it was furthered by the government of which I had the honour to be a member. This step, however, does not completely do away with the army, navy and air force, as it is now proposed. That step is what unification means. Integration of certain services and administration facilities seems reasonable and sensible, but to take the big and dangerous step of completely unifying all our forces does not seem sound. This last move, Mr. Chairman, is against all the advice given by retired and discharged officers. They advised a period of a few years to have steps already taken shake themselves out before taking this last, irrevocable step.

Many times the minister has said that one of his reasons for this move is to save money. Anything to save money should be considered very carefully. Certainly the government has been reckless in its expenditures in all fields, and savings should be encouraged. But that is not what is happening. As has been pointed out on more than one occasion, this year's estimates for national defence are up by approximately $115 million. Evidence indicates that effective savings will not be effected by unification. I would suggest that we enjoy a pause in this headlong rush.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, the following are the main reasons why unification should not be proceeded with at this time:

The majority of people in Canada are not convinced the minister is right, in fact they are very sure he is wrong.

No other country in the world has dared to take this step. I am for progress, something which was urged by the hon. member for Leeds; but I do not consider this final step of unification at this time to be progress. I consider it foolhardy.

To continue the list of reasons:

Unification can only result in further dependence upon the United States in case of emergency.

There will not be the dollar savings that the minister has wanted us to believe there will be.

Doing away with the army, navy and air force can only cause frustration, discouragement and lack of direction for the soldier, the sailor and the airforce man; in other words, confusion, falling off in efficiency, and demoralization, all of which are dangerous to the security of Canada.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Another reason is that the minister has not answered the pertinent questions which were asked of him concerning the effect unification may have on Canada's commitments.

My last main reason is that the minister has admitted that the act will not be proclaimed for some months. I ask the question: Why, then, the urgency to shove it through in this manner?

Many other reasons have been brought to the attention of the house by other hon. members during this debate. Now we are to be forced by closure to accede to the government's whims. This step is wrong. Closure never should be forced on the House of Commons, least of all when our security is at stake. This is not right.

When I started out I stated that I intended to be brief. I will. I should like, however, to close by quoting from an editorial in the Winnipeg *Free Press* of yesterday—that Liberal paper which is so friendly to the government. This is what they say concerning this last unforgiveable step which has been taken by this government. I think this should be placed on the record.

> The federal government could be making a mistake—

Let us not forget that this is from yesterday's Winnipeg *Free Press*. They anticipated the possibility of what has happened today.

> The federal government could be making a mistake if, in its determination to impose unification on Canada's armed services, it should resort to some form of closure on Parliament.
>
> The government can argue that the unification bill has been through the legislative mill, including the defence committee, and that there is nothing of value to be gained by prolonging the discussion. In fact, not all witnesses who should have been heard were called before the committee. And in spite of all the talking that has been done, some major questions remain unanswered—notably those concerning the effect that unification may have on Canada's military commitments under NATO and NORAD. The suspicion is growing that the reason these questions have not been answered is that the government does not know the answers. If closure is resorted to, this suspicion will be strengthened.
>
> Unification is government policy, but it is a policy that has met vigorous opposition from many members of Parliament who must feel that they represent a substantial body of opinion. The government can press on; that appears to be its intention. But if it does so at the expense of cutting further debate, it cannot help but leave the same kind of impression that the St. Laurent government left when it used closure in 1956—that here is a government which has failed to convince the majority of the population.

On that note I shall sit down but I wish to say that I do feel this editorial sets out as succinctly as one could the position which the government has taken, the errors it is making and what it is doing to Canada by pressing forward with this bill at this moment.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I waited for some member on the government side to get up to address the house because just a few minutes ago the hon. member for Kootenay East said that we were trying to prevent their participation in this debate. Every opportunity was given to them, as people here will have noticed, and no one rose from the other side to support the Minister of National Defence or to enter into this debate. Earlier today two opportunities were afforded to the government to change from this particular debate, of which they are making much, and deal with, first, the dairy problem which is a serious problem in Canada. They refused to accept this opportunity which they had. A second opportunity was given to them to deal with the minister of manpower's bill on adult training. They declined that opportunity and said in effect that we must continue with the debate on the unification bill. Then they turn around and accuse us of prolonging the debate. We gave them every opportunity to get on with other business which appears on the order paper and they did not take advantage of the opportunity.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me ask this question: Who is prolonging this debate? Those on the government side. For what purpose? Solely so that the house today could hear the hon. member for Kootenay East, and what a treat that was.

An hon. Member: Did he speak?

Mr. Churchill: There was nothing in his speech worth any attention whatsoever. This is a peculiar way to operate the House of Commons when the government insists on going ahead with a debate which they have been telling us they wish to terminate. We gave them the opportunity today.

I intend to do something which I very seldom do in this House of Commons; that is, quote extensively from an author. In just a moment I will give the reason for this. The author from whom I intend to quote is Mr. Terence Robertson who is an author of distinction. He writes for the Canadian people and for international areas. He is called a military specialist and has been one for 20 years. I might mention two of his books; one is about Dieppe, "The Shame and the Glory" and the other is about the Suez crisis.

Mr. Robertson has an intelligent knowledge of the House of Commons. He made a speech to the Canadian Club of Ottawa on December 4, 1964. On page 8 of his speech he said this:

> If any government, no matter which party is in power, can get its own way simply because a debate is considered drawn out and tedious in some quarters then the two party system is already on the way out the window.

[Mr. Monteith.]

That was his observation of the House of Commons in 1964 and I am sure it would be his observation today with regard to this particular debate. We are entered upon one of the great debates of this institution. This is an historic debate and every member of this house should record on *Hansard* his opinion with regard to the policy of the government. This debate will be studied by an author like Mr. Terence Robertson. He will be writing a book about this debate and with justification because nothing is more important than a fundamental alteration in the defence policy of Canada. Every citizen of Canada has an interest in what is done by parliament, and some time next week I presume the issue will be decided. There will be a vote and the government, with the assistance of the New Democratic Party, the assistance of the Social Credit rump in the house and with the major assistance of the Créditistes led by a member who boasts of his lack of effort in wartime—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: —Canada's defence policy will be changed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) has no right to impute any intentions to me; whether or not I was a member of the Canadian army, that is none of his business.

I must tell him one thing, however; it is that I am as good a Canadian as he can be and that there are Canadians who can be excellent people and behave with dignity in Canada, without having been members of the Canadian army. I wish the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre would get that into his head from now on, for he seems to forget that one can be a Canadian without treading exactly in the somewhat doubtful footsteps of the hon. member himself.

And I want to tell him, still on the same point of order, that I am not to be taught any lessons by him and that I am welcome in the ten Canadian provinces much more than he is himself.

• (9:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: What is the point of order, Mr. Chairman? I suggested that the government will have the support of that hon. gentleman in this house and he now objects to this fact. This is known to everyone and it is with that support the government hopes to pass this bill. I hope the people of Canada realize that fact.

It has frequently been asked in this house why the Prime Minister does not participate in this debate. We have not heard from him. He neglects parliament in this regard. It has often been asked, as I have asked, what is behind his attitude. Why is the Minister of National Defence pursuing this course? There must be some undisclosed reason behind his attitude. Why does he want to destroy the Royal Canadian Air Force, the Royal Canadian Navy and the Canadian Army?

I believe I have found the answer to these questions in an article written by Mr. Terence Robertson which appeared in one of the supplements attached to the newspapers of this country. I regret that I do not know the exact newspaper to which this one was attached but it was published in 1966. Mr. Robertson is a great admirer of the Prime Minister, and in his book on the Suez crisis he pays him great tribute for his efforts on that occasion. Mr. Robertson has maintained an interest in military affairs. Last summer he wrote this article and perhaps someone can identify the newspaper company which published it. The title of the article is "The real reason for putting them all together". He was referring to all the members of the three services. Let me read some of the statements in this article. Mr. Terence Robertson states:

> There should be a sign outside defence minister Paul Hellyer's office saying "Keep Clear—Nationalists at Work". For behind all the uproar, all the insinuations and ill feeling that surround the future of our armed forces, lies the one big issue of Canadian nationalism.

Mr. Hellyer: Do you believe everything you read in the newspapers?

Mr. Churchill: The minister interrupts me and asks me if I believe everything I read in the newspapers. I do not attack the newspapers; I commend them for a great many things they have done. I read the articles written by Charles Lynch which deal with the Minister of National Defence to find some inkling of what he is like. I am inclined to believe that sort of article. I do have some confidence in the writings of Mr. Terence Robertson.

That hon. gentleman then states in this article:

> If any cabinet minister undertakes a policy that will politically justify replacing symbols of our past with new and distinctively Canadian ones, he can be sure of Prime Minister Pearson's wholehearted support.

Hellyer's defence policies are bang in the middle of this new tradition. He is trying to Canadianize the armed forces by ridding them of the trappings of "foreign" (British) origins.

An hon. Member: Good.

Mr. Churchill: Someone on the other side said "good". Just because my ancestors happened to come from Great Britain they suggest I should be ashamed of them and that I should deny my origin and have no pride in it. On the contrary, I have a great deal of pride. I hope those people whose origin is French will have pride in that origin. Apparently anything now that is British is foreign.

Mr. Terence Robertson then writes:

I believe this is far more important for the country, the government, Hellyer and for the forces themselves than any purely military argument on the merits of one service, three, or even a dozen . . .

According to Hellyer's plans, the front line formations of the navy, army and air force will function in the future much as they do today. But they will be the sea, air and land arms of the new service—not the Royal Canadian Navy, the Royal Canadian Air Force, the Royal Canadian Artillery, or the Royal Canadian anything else.

This is what is said by an observer who suggests that the real reason behind this whole program is a policy of the Prime Minister, supported by the Minister of National Defence, to do what Mr. Robertson calls Canadianization of our armed forces by getting rid of our traditions. These have been noble traditions.

Let me continue with Mr. Robertson's article as follows:

Uniforms are the most tangible trappings of any military structure . . .

No matter how much Hellyer integrates or unifies, he cannot succeed in Canadianizing the armed forces without first getting rid of the present uniforms for they are the ultimate public symbols of Canada's military heritage.

The most effective and economical way to Canadianize the forces is to put everybody—soldier, sailor and airman—into the same suit. This would have the effect of putting a single service on public display without actually creating one, and without imposing any fundamental disturbances on the existing military structure.

Apparently we should meld them together by dressing them the same and by getting rid of all our past traditions. In this way we might Canadianize the armed forces. Having served in the Canadian Armed Forces on a good many occasions over a good many years, let me say that neither I nor my friends had any doubt that we were Canadians and not anything else. We were never confused for

the British, Australians, New Zealanders, South Africans or United States soldiers.

Mr. Robertson then states:

When Hellyer took office three years ago, he was deliberately vague about the lengths he would go with integration. "Integration breaks new ground" he said then. "We don't know yet where it will end".

It's quite possible that he didn't really know himself—that though he knew of the Prime Minister's intention to Canadianize Canada, he hadn't worked out how the principle could be best applied to the armed forces.

He is still very vague and he still does not know where this is going to end. It will end in great confusion and will be a great disaster for Canada. Mr. Robertson then states:

Hellyer needed time, not only to learn about the entire defence organization, but also to assess where, and from whom, he might expect opposition. His most senior officers were relatively young. They had superb records in war and peace, and they controlled forces that enjoyed unexcelled reputations for efficiency and elan among NATO allies.

Those are the men the minister started to work with, and he paid them a great compliment.

• (9:50 p.m.)

The article continues:

Most of them supported the idea of integration from the outset, and Hellyer has said all along that he couldn't have got integration off the ground without their enthusiastic support.

These are the men that the minister threw out of office just a year ago, in the summertime. These were the young, able men with good records in war and peace who supported the minister when he commenced this operation of his, and he disposed of them last summer. That's gratitude for you. He could not have got his operation off the ground had they not supported him; yet he threw them to one side when they opposed some of his plans. This same author, Mr. Terence Robertson, writing a year earlier in "Weekend Magazine" of February 6 had this to say with regard to that assistance:

Hellyer readily admits even though he didn't reap a whirwind of protest, his revolution might have stalled at the white paper stage had it not been for the co-operation of the senior officers at defence headquarters. The chiefs of staff fell in behind him, decided among themselves to set an example to all ranks by avoiding controversial public debate and by declining to comment in the press.

The Minister of National Defence owes everything to those men. Mr. Robertson in that article of 1965 goes on to speak of some of them. Just listen to the names: Air Chief

Marshal Miller, Lieutenant General Geoffrey Walsh, Vice Admiral H. S. Rayner. Where are they now? They are cast off. They were useful to the Minister of National Defence when he was launching his plan. They supported him with regard to the white paper. They started off the program of integration. But having squeezed them dry, the minister discarded them. He used their ability, brains and assistance and was grateful for it at the time, and he said so; and the minute those men said, "Slow down. We are not yet ready for unification", he said, "Out". That is what this minister has done to the men who helped him in the days when he really needed help.

Who is helping him now? Not even the Prime Minister. I continue to quote from the article of 1966:

> By last July, four admirals, three air marshals and two generals had quit, some helped along with an early retirement bonus. With so many vacancies at the top, Hellyer was able to couple Canadianization with the appointment of a chief of defence staff. He was fortunate to have a widely respected French-Canadian officer, General Jean Allard, available for the job.
>
> Allard's views coincide closely with Hellyer's. He is reputed to believe that only regiments with pure Canadian origins should keep their identities because the others, those with foreign impurities in their histories, have nothing Canadian to lose through unification.

There is Mr. Terence Robertson's objective view of what is behind this program. He set it out. He is a man with years of experience, a man who has a knowledge of Ottawa, a man who is a close acquaintance of the Prime Minister, from whom he has high regard, a man who obviously must have had some conversations with the Minister of National Defence or certainly with his staff because he writes with knowledge of this situation. There he gives us the real reason behind this exercise of the Minister of National Defence.

The idea of the minister is to Canadianize our forces. He says: Dispel tradition; forget the past; forget second Ypres and Vimy Ridge; forget the landing on the Normandy beaches in 1944; forget Dieppe; forget Hong Kong—we are starting afresh. The minister says: Wipe out the Royal Canadian Navy; wipe out the word "Royal" wherever it appears. He says: Canadianize our forces. Yet, as I have said so often, this country has an admirable history, an admirable tradition extending over centuries. All national groups that have lived in this country have made a contribution to that tradition, the sacrifice that has gone into building up this country and maintaining our independence, the sacrifice that has gone into sustaining that independence and the freedom of the free nations of the world during this century. These things have been based upon the forces which the minister now wishes to change and for which apparently he has little respect.

This minister wants to wipe out most of the things that serving men have ever treasured with regard to the life they have lived. Why wipe out the Royal Canadian Navy or change the uniform of the men in the navy? After all, they are volunteering to sacrifice their lives in case of emergency. Surely they should be permitted, then, to retain those things which they consider to be part of their life. Is not the same true of the Royal Canadian Air Force, those men who volunteer and risk their lives. They die even in peacetime; I do not know how many pilots we have lost during the last 10 or 15 years. These men are ready to die in wartime. Why cannot they retain their title "Royal Canadian Air Force" and their uniform?

The same is true of the army and all our famous regiments. Forty eight Canadian infantry battalions fought at the battle of Vimy Ridge, which we were commemorating a few days ago. The famous 22nd regiment was there. There were 47 other battalions there, all of whom went over the top at Vimy Ridge in two waves, 15,000 in the first wave and 15,000 in the second. Are not those battalions entitled to maintain their traditions? Of course they are.

Sir, I have now placed on the record of this historic document of Canadian *Hansard* the real reason, according to Mr. Terence Robertson, why this unification program of the Minister of National Defence was started and has been carried through. Now we know why the Prime Minister has made this minister go ahead with that program; in fact, it is the Prime Minister's idea and it is with his approval that the Minister of National Defence is carrying on in the way he is.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I could ask whoever is leading the house whether we will go on with other government business tomorrow, or are we to provide another opportunity for government members to speak on the subject of unification?

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, we had hoped that all hon. gentlemen opposite would have had an opportunity by now to express their views fully and completely in respect of clause 2 of the bill. But in view of the fact that they apparently have not, we will carry on this debate tomorrow. I would hope, however, that very early in the day we could get on to another clause. Perhaps we could agree to stand clause 2 so that we could give adequate consideration to all the clauses in the bill.

Mr. Churchill: Thank you very much. I have another speech ready for tomorrow.

• (10:00 p.m.)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

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

AGRICULTURE—INQUIRY AS TO BASIS FOR FLUID MILK SUBSIDY

Mr. Ed. Schreyer (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I think it is timely that I should have listed for debate this evening after the ten o'clock adjournment the subject matter of the government's dairy policy. It is timely because, after all, it was this afternoon that one hon. member on this side of the house attempted to adjourn the house under standing order 26 in order to debate the urgency of the situation regarding the inadequacy of the government's present dairy policy. Of course it is not my intention at this time to go into any details regarding the many ways in which the present dairy policy is inadequate. Other hon. members in the course of the past week have advanced many reasons why the present policy falls short. However, it is necessary to point out with emphasis once again that the problem in the dairy industry has been growing in a very dramatic and alarming way in the past few months.

It is a long standing problem which this industry has faced, along with other sectors of agriculture, but it has been increasing to an alarming degree. Everything the government has said through its minister, and through other speakers today, has not offered a solution to the problem. On the one hand we have a minister who takes an attitude of almost complete indifference to a problem that is facing the nation, namely one of continuing low income among our food producers, a minister who is showing indolence and nonchalance, and on the other hand we have a minister who is trying to push through the house legislation unifying our armed forces, a matter which is of no urgency at all. The government is spending days and weeks ramming through legislation of no urgency, and yet the Minister of Agriculture, despite repeated pleas, refuses to give any indication that he will reconsider a dairy policy which is damned and condemned by all spokesmen of the dairy industry in this country.

I cannot understand the government's order of priorities and its poor sense of proportion with regard to problems that face our country. No doubt tomorrow the Minister of National Defence will again insist on the passage of this legislation, while the Minister of Agriculture might very well not be around to answer some of the pointed questions which will be put to him by members on this side.

The question I asked last Tuesday, as recorded at page 14765 of *Hansard*, dealt specifically with the jurisdiction and responsibility for price support on fluid milk. I must admit that the minister has stated repeatedly that under the new policy there will be a more clear division of responsibility with regard to the dairy policy, that the federal government is subsidizing manufacturing milk to a greater degree, which is a fact that no one disputes, and that therefore the fluid milk price levels will become the responsibility of the provinces. However, there is a flaw in the reasoning there because fluid milk in excess of the quota becomes surplus fluid, and in effect manufacturing milk, and the federal government therefore should not try to absolve itself of its responsibility in that field.

As I said on the day when the minister made his statement a few weeks ago, I think the federal government has made a great mistake in transferring to the provinces the control of price levels for fluid milk.

Other members have put this compelling argument to the Minister of Agriculture, and it is a very reasonable one. Since surplus fluid milk goes into manufacture, on what basis can the federal government withdraw its support? Under this new policy support has been withdrawn and this will mean that the shippers of fluid milk will find themselves in a much more difficult position financially. Statistical data put out by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and that compiled by the dairy, organizations themselves, has shown that in the last few years, despite the existence of a small measure of federal support for surplus fluid milk, there was a deterioration in the income position of fluid milk shippers.

Now that the federal government has withdrawn support, the problem becomes aggravated.

I must ask therefore the question I asked last Tuesday, and to which I received no reply. Was his decision to withdraw any degree of support for surplus fluid milk taken by the federal government unilaterally, or only after consultation with the provincial governments and perhaps upon their request? I would find it inexcusable, may I say in conclusion, if the decision were taken by this government in a unilateral manner without even acquiescence or a request by any provincial government. Time will find this out.

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): My presence here tonight is dictated by the fact that my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene) is in London looking after the interests of Canadian food exporters. His parliamentary secretary is out of town on government business.

The decision to apply federal dairy subsidies to shippers of manufacturing milk and cream and not to shippers of fluid milk, is a policy decision to avoid a conflicting jurisdiction of federal and provincial authorities. In this decision, the federal government is accepting responsibility for the returns to manufacturing milk and cream shippers.

The hon. member may recall that the province of Quebec has, for a few years, paid subsidies for manufacturing milk and cream, and that the Ontario government introduced such a subsidy last fall. In discussions with the ministers of agriculture of those two provinces last fall, our Minister of Agriculture undertook to recommend to his colleagues that starting the 1st of April this year the federal government, in its support program, would make up the amount of the subsidy paid by the provinces. At the same time, the ministers of agriculture of Ontario and Quebec undertook to withdraw on that date from the subsidization of manufacturing milk and cream. The federal program has of course gone well beyond meeting that commitment financially.

The economic situation of fluid milk shippers is of course subject to matters which are under provincial or local control, and over which the federal authorities have no jurisdiction. The two major factors in this are the fluid quotas and the price of fluid milk. These are determined locally within a province.

The decision to apply the direct federal assistance only to manufacturing milk and cream shippers is, therefore, an acceptance of responsibility for the basic returns to that part of the dairy industry whose product is used entirely for manufacturing purposes, while leaving to the provinces, who have the jurisdiction, the responsibility for the fluid milk side of the industry. This is a cleancut and desirable division of jurisdiction and responsibility.

I am sure the hon. member understands, of course, that surplus milk from fluid shippers does benefit from one phase of the federal stabilization program. That is the phase which supports the market price of major dairy products on all fronts and which establishes the basis of price for all milk used for the manufacturer of these products.

• (10:10 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE—CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST FOR HIGHER PRICE FOR INDUSTRIAL MILK

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, the new dairy policy of the present government is distinctly unfair to Canadian farmers and dairy producers.

First of all, because it does not meet the minimum goal of $5.10 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk, and second, because the amount of money put at the disposal of the Canadian Dairy Commission is insufficient. Indeed, a government that can make available to the Minister of National Defence an additional $115 million should surely be in a position, through the Minister of Finance and Receiver General (Mr. Sharp), to put another $60 or $80 million at the disposal of Canadian farmers.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, there is no guarantee that the subsidy will normally remain at $1.11 per hundredweight that is $1.21 less 10 cents for the export premium. If the amount allowed for export, namely 10 cents per hundredweight, proves insufficient, the Canadian Dairy Commission will have to deduct the necessary amount from the $1.11 subsidy; this means that the subsidy of $1.11 is liable to be lowered as a result of the export premium, quotas, etc.

According to the statement of the commission, each producer is allowed an individual quota equal to the amount produced last year. This means that greater milk production will not be encouraged in Canada. Quotas are not to exceed what they were last year.

Now, last year, because of bad weather, hay and feed crops and pastures did not supply quality feed, with the result that milk production went down.

Now, this year, there is no intention to promote or facilitate any production increase, although we are forced to import butter and other dairy products from foreign countries. There is no intention to help our Canadian farmers.

Surplus fluid milk of producers, namely milk of categories 2, 3 and 4, is not eligible for subsidies. Cream producers receive no special subsidy.

What farmers want is a minimum price, not an average national price. In 1966-67, prices varied from $3.74 to $4.44, including all federal and provincial subsidies.

Every member of the Ralliement Créditiste has asked for a better policy for Canadian farmers, and it is true that the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Schreyer) has just asked the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) has also asked the same thing. And this afternoon, when I moved the adjournment of the house, in order to discuss the dairy policy, not one government member from the province of Quebec had the courage to stand up to make his views known —including the hon. member for Lotbinière.

Mr. Speaker, last night on the national news, I heard the national president of the C.F.U., Mr. Lionel Sorel, state that members of parliament lag behind with regard to the dairy policy. Now, Mr. Sorel, for his information, if he is not intellectually dishonest, must admit that we took our stand on the side of farmers, of dairy producers in this country, and particularly in the province of Quebec.

Here, in the April 5 issue of *La Terre de Chez Nous,* a farm newspaper, we read:

> Under the circumstances, the C.F.U. leaders must come to the conclusion that the members of parliament, particularly those from Quebec, only tried to save their interests so as not to lose face.

And today, Mr. Speaker, we read in *La Presse* statements by Mr. Sorel and Mr. Harvey, president of the Canadian Farmers Federation. Mr. Sorel says:

> The farmers will attack the members of parliament in all ridings to make them aware of the farm problem.

Well, here I want to tell Mr. Sorel and Mr. Harvey: We never needed them to become aware of the problems facing the farmers, because I know those problems personally.

Hon. members, my colleagues of the Ralliement Créditiste know what those problems are in their respective ridings. We realize that hon. members from Montreal do not understand them at all, because they have never seen a cow being milked, but in the rural ridings, Mr. Speaker, we know the problems of the farmer and when we get the opportunity to move a vote of non-confidence, we will not hesitate a single moment and we are ready to face a general election on the specific problem of agriculture in Canada, and particularly in the province of Quebec.

However, as far as the C.F.U. is concerned, we are tired of hearing from people, such as Mr. Lionel Sorel, who have no idea of what is going on in the house. Those people think that a vote of non-confidence can be moved at any time of day. Unable even to understand parliamentary procedure, they start among the farmers rumours to the effect that here, in parliament, we have no feelings, we do not want to assume our responsibilities to the farmers.

There are farmers in my riding of Villeneuve. There are some also in the next riding of Pontiac-Témiscamingue, and I do not hesitate to take a firm stand for the farmers. But I distrust, for instance, some agricultural leaders of the C.F.U. who attempt to stir up the farmers by making representations which prove to be rather a storm in a tea cup. Let those people be honest with their members, and we, as members of parliament, will be honest with the farmers. And when I say honest with the farmers, I do not mean only honest with Messrs. Sorel or Harvey; it means honest with the farmers, the dairy producers of our country and of our province.

That is the stand taken by the Ralliement Créditiste, and I ask the government to revise its dairy policy; otherwise, one of these days, it will have to face very soon, as soon as possible, a non-confidence motion with regard to the dairy policy implemented at the present time by the Liberal government in Ottawa.

[*English*]

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I know that the hon. member will be kind enough to forgive me for replying in the only language I have a facility with. Had my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture been here tonight he would have used that happy facility in replying that I do not possess. As the hon. member knows, the Minister of Agriculture is attending the meeting of

Canadian and United Kingdom ministers in London and I have not been able to inquire of him the exact nature of any discussions which he may have had with dairy producers.

I would doubt, however, that he would have implied that if the $120 million allotted to the Canadian Dairy Commission is not fully expended at the $1.21 per hundredweight subsidy rate, any balance would be used to increase the rate of subsidy. The $120 million will permit the payment of the $1.21 subsidy on approximately 99.5 million hundredweight of milk. This also is approximately the quantity on which subsidy was paid to manufacturing milk and cream shippers in the year just ended, and is also approximately the amount required to meet domestic requirements for dairy products.

As has been announced, each shipper will be given a quota for 1967-68, which will be the amount of milk or cream on which he will be eligible to receive subsidy. The quotas will be related to each shipper's deliveries in 1966-67. If the quotas are not fully utilized, which would be the only circumstance under which there would be unexpended funds, I would think it more likely that the residue would be used to make any deserving adjustment in quotas rather than to increase the subsidy rate.

I understand that this, in such an event, would be the procedure which the Canadian Dairy Commission would recommend.

• (10:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

TRANSPORT—REQUEST FOR POLICY STATEMENT RESPECTING LEVEL CROSSINGS

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I should like, before entering into the heart of the matter, to explain to my hon. friend from Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) that if we did not ask for an emergency debate this afternoon, it is because we knew that the standing orders did not allow a debate of this kind under such circumstances. The Chair proved that we were right when he rejected the request. So,—

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Choquette: There is no point of order at this time.

Mr. Caouette: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Choquette: There is no point of order at this time.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, is it the hon. member for Lotbinière who will decide whether or not the point of order is well taken?

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. There is no point of order which can be allowed at this time, but I would suggest to the hon. member for Lotbinière that he should adhere to the question which he rose to ask and comment upon.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I should like to put to the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) tonight a question concerning a subject which I have already had the opportunity of raising in other circumstances in this house, that of grade crossings.

There is no need for me to repeat what I asked in the past, but I should like to call the attention of the authorities to a problem which is becoming more and more pressing, that of very fast trains, called turbo-trains, soon to be put into circulation.

It is extremely important that the government draw up a modern grade crossing policy taking into account the new needs which will arise as a result of the greater chances of accident attending the operation of these very fast turbo-trains.

That is why I believe some short term measures could be taken to meet this situation.

Mr. Speaker, there are things which are difficult to understand in the legislation. First, the contribution coming from the grade-crossing fund amounts to $15 million a year and that, up to a maximum amount of $500,000 for any project.

It is obvious that this is just nonsense, because works to be built at dangerous places—I think of Dorion in particular—would amount to several million dollars, and with a federal contribution of not more than $500,000, it is impossible to initiate such works unless the legislation is amended.

So, a first improvement is required.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is getting more and more urgent to increase the contribution of the grade-crossing fund precisely because of the new requirements due to the operation of new trains.

Money is requested often and everywhere, but this will show certain associations which sometimes make excessive demands, that the

administration is extremely difficult, because everyone is always asking for more money.

Another suggestion I would like to put forward is that I believe, Mr. Speaker, if we are to be guided by the reports of the Board of Transport Commissioners, they have absolutely no time to deal properly with requests connected with grade crossings.

For instance, I read in the 1965 report that the Board of Transport Commissioners has received 2,584 requests under various pieces of legislation they administer. They have issued 3,080 orders and two general orders.

It is obvious that the Board of Transport Commissioners is overworked and that applicants sometimes have to suffer from the delays in procedure and the slowness to make decisions. It is not intended to criticize the board, but to deplore a factual situation from which the board itself has to suffer. It is only through amendments to the legislation that we will be able to correct this situation.

As to the safety measures already suggested in the past, namely the installation of rotating lights on the engines or phosphorescent lines on every car, or still convex mirrors, a great many have been suggested in the past. I wonder how intensively they were studied by the Board of Transport Commissioners. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we realize regretfully at this time that the grade-crossing policy is not in accordance with the new modern requirements of very fast trains, that is turbotrains, that will be put in operation.

Therefore, I urge the authorities to act accordingly, so as to provide the public with maximum security.

[*English*]

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, first I should like to compliment the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) for the very forceful representations he made this evening and for the representations which he has made in the past. He has shown a very great concern in respect of this matter and I am sure this is not the last representation he will make to government.

As I am sure the hon. member will understand that, at the moment the question of grade separation is one for determination by the department of highways, or its counterpart, under provincial jurisdiction. It is for them to determine where and when a grade separation should be made. Then the federal government pays 80 per cent of the cost of the grade separation up to $500,000. The hon. member has said that $15 million in the fund is not sufficient. I have not heard, however, of any circumstance in which an application has been denied on the basis that there were insufficient funds. They have been denied by the board rather on the question of whether or not the facility so recommended is of sufficient importance to justify the cost.

Usually, of course, the railway company makes its recommendations based on the count at the crossing, and so on. No one of course can guarantee that an automobile accident will not take place; this is one of the hazards of the modern age. Just the other day in my riding a completely inexplicable accident took place on a straight stretch of road between two automobiles driven by responsible people. Seven persons were killed; no one survived. So, accidents do happen on the highways, certainly more frequently than at grade crossings. This is not a suggestion that we should not give this matter urgent consideration, particularly in respect of the high speed train program which is being developed.

There is no question but that high speed turbo trains must operate on a completely protected track. It is unthinkable that there would be a grade crossing where there might be a train travelling at speeds of 100 or 120 miles an hour. Even a bird could cause damage if it were to hit a train travelling at such a speed. A collision with a gasoline truck or a similar obstruction would simply mean that an entire train would be in flames in a moment. There is no question but that this policy must be reviewed and the government is giving it a great deal of consideration.

• (10:30 p.m.)

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.33 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, April 19, 1967

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

[*Translation*]

CRIMINAL CODE

AMENDMENT RESPECTING DISTURBANCES IN PARLIAMENTARY GALLERIES

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve) asked for leave to introduce Bill No. C-291, to amend the Criminal Code (Disturbance in Parliament).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, some time ago a visitor in the Commons galleries threw a number of tracts on the floor of the house, close to Your Honour's chair, thus disturbing the peace and order in the house.

Therefore, this bill provides that any person who, from any gallery, either in the Senate or in the Commons, breaks the peace of senators and members of parliament, is guilty of a punishable offence upon summary conviction.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

[*English*]

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

OPERATING COST OF CUSTOMS PORTS

Question No. 2,726—**Mr. Gray:**

What is (a) the total revenue (b) the cost of operation, for the period April 1, 1965, to March 31, 1966, for each of the following customs ports: Acton, Ontario; Bowmanville, Ontario; Galt, Ontario; Hull, Quebec; Ingersoll, Ontario; Lévis, Quebec; Newcastle, New Brunswick; Paris, Ontario; Port Credit, Ontario; St. Mary's, Ontario; Sackville, New Brunswick; Thorold, Ontario; Walkerville, Ontario; Wolfville, Nova Scotia?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue and President of the Treasury Board):

Statement of costs and revenue
Period April 1, 1965 to March 31, 1966

Customs ports	Customs revenue	Excise duty revenue	Total revenue	Cost of customs port operation
Acton, Ont.	$ 167,900	—	$ 167,900	$ 12,100
Bowmanville, Ont.	121,600	—	121,600	18,300
Galt, Ont.	4,527,400	—	4,527,400	94,300
Hull, Que.	106,000	161,100	267,100	50,200
Ingersoll, Ont.	335,900	—	335,900	16,900
Levis, Que.	573,800	—	573,800	39,200
Newcastle, N.B.	272,800	—	272,800	10,400
Paris, Ont.	774,300	—	774,300	19,800
Port Credit, Ont.	3,546,600	—	3,546,600	73,800
St. Mary's, Ont.	14,500	—	14,500	13,400
Sackville, N.B.	87,800	—	87,800	10,100
Thorold, Ont.	785,900	—	785,900	44,000
Walkerville, Ont.	3,275,800	15,810,000	19,085,800	114,600
Wolfville, N.S.	12,800	—	12,800	10,000
	$14,603,100	$15,971,100	$30,574,200	$527,100

Questions

Note:

All amounts have been rounded to the nearest hundred dollars.

Cost of operation in each case includes standard object expenditures such as salaries, travel expenses, telephone, supplies and equipment; cost of employee benefits; also cost of accommodation and financial services provided by other government departments.

Excise duty revenue at Hull and Walkerville is collected and controlled by excise duty surveys which are separate from the customs ports.

* GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

Question No. 2,755—**Mr. Herridge:**

1. What was the total of the gross national product for Canada in 1966?

2. What increase would be required in the personal, corporation and sales taxes to provide 1 per cent of the gross national product?

3. What increase would be required in the personal, corporation and sales taxes to provide 2 per cent of the gross national product?

4. What increase would be required in the personal, corporation and sales taxes to provide 3 per cent of the gross national product?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Member of the Administration): Mr. Speaker, the answer to part 1 is $57.8 billion.

The answer to parts 2, 3 and 4 is that it is difficult to relate increases in personal, corporation and sales taxes to percentages of the gross national product by reason of the fact that tax increases themselves have an influence upon the levels of the G.N.P. and thus upon revenues. However, $578 million is 8.5 per cent of the aggregate of the federal revenues, including old age security tax revenues, from personal income tax, corporation income tax and sales tax, twice $578 million would be 17 per cent and three times would be 25.5 per cent.

PAYMENTS TO BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM COMMISSIONERS

Question No. 2,771—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What is the total amount received to date by the commissioners of the royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism, and in each case what is the breakdown of the moneys received as between honoraria and expenses?

2. How much has each commissioner received that has been classified as tax exempt?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by Prime Minister's and Privy Council offices and by the Department of National Revenue as follows:

1. Since their appointment three years and nine months ago, in July 1963, the commissioners have received the following amounts:

	Honoraria	Travel and living expenses
Rév. C. Cormier	$26,600.00	$10,922.01
A. D. Dunton	44,800.00	4,150.70
R. Frith	40,300.00	11,011.51
J.-L. Gagnon	65,650.00	14,175.10
G. Laing	33,350.00	21,117.92
P. Lacoste	14,450.00	575.30
A. Laurendeau	74,100.00	13,903.40
J. Marchand	14,450.00	5,215.03
J. Rudnyckyj	31,800.00	15,099.87
F. R. Scott	32,850.00	7,206.99
P. Wyczynski	32,700.00	3,884.21

2. The amounts designated as travel and living expenses in part 1 are considered to be exempt from tax under the Income Tax Act.

RANDOM HOUSE (CANADA)

Question No. 2,809—**Mr. Barnett:**

1. To the knowledge of the government, is Random House (Canada) a subsidiary of Random House (U.S.A.)?

2. Is Random House (Canada) able to import for distribution in Canada books published in the U.S.A. without payment of tariffs or other taxes?

3. If so, what classes or kinds of books are importable without payment of tariffs or other taxes?

4. If not, what rates of tariffs or other taxes are collected on imported books?

5. Is there a price differential on books published in the U.S.A. when sold at the retail level between Random House (Canada) and Random House (U.S.A.)?

6. If so, are prices higher or lower in Canada than in the U.S.A.?

7. What, in absolute or in percentage terms, is the average difference in price levels?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Department of National Revenue as follows: 1. Information not available.

2. The Customs Tariff Act provides for the duty free entry of certain books. Any importer, including Random House of Canada Limited, is entitled to the duty free provisions.

3. The following books are entitled to entry at customs free of duty and sales tax exempt: Books in the curriculum of a Canadian university, college or school for use as text books

or as works of reference, not including dictionaries; books for use in intelligence testing; books for bona fide libraries, and being the property of the organized authorities of such libraries and not in any case the property of individuals or of business concerns; books for the promotion of religion, medicine and surgery, the fine arts, law, science, technical training, and the study of languages, not including dictionaries. These books are sales tax exempt provided they are not to be written or drawn upon and bear no advertising; books not including those to be written or drawn upon, printed in any other than the English language.

4. Other books, not to be written or drawn upon, such as novels, dictionaries and general encyclopedias are dutiable, when produced in and imported from the United States, at 10 per cent ad valorem. These books are exempt from sales tax.

5, 6, and 7. Information not available.

REVISED CUSTOMS ENTRY FORM

Question No. 2,813—**Mr. MacLean (Queens):**

1. What is the difference between the "Canada Customs-Entry for Home Consumption Form B-1 Rev. 11-63" and the revised "Canada Customs-Entry for Home Consumption Form B-1 10/65"?

2. Why was the introduction of the new form necessary?

3. Were stocks of the old forms destroyed and, if so, what was the estimated cost of the destroyed forms?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue and President of the Treasury Board): 1. The tariff item column was transferred from the extreme right of the form to an area immediately to the right of the description of goods column.

2. The previous location of the tariff item column interfered with the use, by industry, of electronic entry writing equipment. It also interfered with high speed coding methods employed by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

3. Yes, stocks of old forms were destroyed; estimated cost $2,100.

EXCISE TAXES ON SPIRITS AND BEER

Question No. 2,818—**Mr. Caouette:**

What was the total amount collected in excise taxes on the following products during the years 1965-66, 1964-65, 1963-64 in each province on (a) spirits (b) beer?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue and President of the Treasury Board): Under the Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1952 c.100, as amended, no excise tax is imposed on either spirits or beer. No breakdown is maintained by commodities of the amount of consumption or sales tax collected under part VI of the Excise Tax Act.

DISTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURES OF ARMED FORCES IN CANADA

Question No. 2,829—**Mr. Chatwood:**

1. What is the number of armed forces personnel stationed in each of the ten provinces and in the territories?

2. What is the total expenditure of the Department of National Defence in each of the ten provinces and in the territories?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Associate Minister of National Defence): 1. As at December 31, 1966:

Newfoundland, 678; Nova Scotia, 14,546; Prince Edward Island, 1,320; New Brunswick, 6,325; Quebec, 10,624; Ontario, 28,471; Manitoba, 7,757; Saskatchewan, 1,635; Alberta, 7,142; British Columbia, 8,781; Northwest Territories (including Yukon), 627.

2. Information is not now available to provide an accurate answer to this question, and the necessary expert staff is not available to undertake the large amount of work which would be required to gather the necessary information.

PROSECUTIONS FOR OIL SPILLAGE IN HARBOURS

Question No. 2,830—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. How many prosecutions have been initiated by the Department of Transport involving the escape or spillage of oil from ships in Canadian harbours in each of the past five years, and how many were successful?

2. With regard to such prosecutions, what were the totals for the five years in specific harbours, naming the harbours?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. 1962: seven, 6 successful; 1963: eleven, 10 successful; 1964: eight, all successful; 1965: eleven, all successful; 1966: fifteen, 14 successful.

2. New Westminster, B.C., 10; Montreal, P.Q., 9; Port Arthur, Ont., 7; Vancouver, B.C., 5; St. Catharines, Ont., 4; Nanaimo, B.C., 3; Sorel, P.Q., 3; Saint John, N.B., 3; Tahsis, B.C., 2; Quebec, P.Q., 1; Halifax, N.S., 1; Welland, Ont., 1; Chicoutimi, P.Q., 1; Port Alfred, P.Q., 1; Newcastle, N.B., 1.

Questions

Where an offence occurred in waters adjacent to a harbour, the case is identified with that harbour.

RE-EXAMINATION OF C.M.H.C. PROGRAMS AS TO BILINGUALISM

Question No. 2,839—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

1. Referring to page 32 of the 21st annual report of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, what was the nature of the re-examination by the corporation of its various programs to be assured that the objectives outlined in the Prime Minister's statement of April 6, 1966, on bilingualism are being met?

2. What were the programs so re-examined?

3. How was the re-examination carried out?

4. What was the result of the re-examination?

5. What action, if any, has been taken as a consequence?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.

Following the statement of the Prime Minister of April 6, 1966, the management of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation established staff committees to study the corporation's existing policies and practices relating to bilingualism. The terms of references of the committees specifically included programs relating to recruitment, staffing, language training and communication within the corporation and with the public. As a result of the committees' studies, the corporation issued a restatement of its policies and practices which would meet these objectives. The revised policies intensified the language training of corporation personnel in both French and English and the use of both languages in its internal communications. The practice of communication with the public in the language selected by the correspondent was continued. In its staffing, language training and recruitment, plans were made so that the various corporation functions would be adequately staffed with personnel qualified in both languages.

CAPE BRETON HIGHLANDS PARK—RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF CARIBOU

Question No. 2,844—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

With reference to question No. 1,349, answered on May 9, 1966, is the department concerned now prepared to re-establish caribou in the Cape Breton Highlands national park and, if not, for what reason?

[Mr. Byrne.]

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Yes, action is being taken to implement the re-establishment of caribou in Cape Breton Highlands national park.

PAY ADJUSTMENTS FOR ARMY DOCTORS

Question No. 2,849—**Mr. Noble:**

Will the medical doctors in the army receive a pay adjustment that would be commensurate to their skill and at least on the basis being enjoyed by the dental officers and, if so, when?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Associate Minister of National Defence): The matter has been referred to Treasury Board for consideration and a decision is expected shortly.

TERRACE, B.C.—DISPOSITION OF LAND

Question No. 2,855—**Mr. Chatterton:**

1. Did the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development sell or dispose of some 20 acres of land in Terrace, British Columbia, since January 1, 1967?

2. If so, what was the price and who was the purchaser?

3. Were tenders asked for?

4. If so, who were the tenderers and what were the amounts of each of the tenders?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. No.

2, 3, 4. Not applicable.

*REBUILDING OF HIGHWAY IN RIDING MOUNTAIN PARK

Queestion No. 2,859—**Mr. Forbes:**

1. Is it the intention of the government to rebuild and blacktop No. 10 highway through the Riding Mountain national park from the North Gate to Clear Lake?

2. Has provision been made for this in the 1967-68 estimates of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and, if so, when will tenders be called?

Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the answer to this question is as follows. Part 1, yes; part 2, no; funds have not been provided for this year. However, it is planned to provide for repairs to this highway within the next five years.

IMMIGRANTS ENTERING CANADA

Question No. 2,860—**Mr. Monteith:**

1. How many immigrants have entered Canada from January 1, 1946, to December 31, 1966?

2. For that particular period, what was the number entering per year?

Mr. J. C. Munro (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. 2,698,763.

2. 1946, 71,719; 1947, 64,127; 1948, 125,414; 1949, 95,217; 1950, 73,912; 1951, 194,391; 1952, 164,498; 1953, 168,868; 1954, 154,227; 1955, 109,946; 1956, 164,857; 1957, 282,164; 1958, 124,851; 1959, 106,928; 1960, 104,111; 1961, 71,689; 1962, 74,586; 1963, 93,151; 1964, 112,606; 1965, 146,758; 1966, 194,743.

MUNICIPAL ANNUITY PLANS

Question No. 2,863—**Mr. Madill:**

1. How many group contract—government annuity plans are there in municipalities in Ontario?

2. To the knowledge of the government, have any of these plans been replaced by OMER and, if so, how many?

3. Do any of these municipalities carry both plans?

4. If municipalities have a government annuity plan, are they compelled to pay into the Canada pension plan?

5. Is legislation anticipated to provide for the repayment of these frozen assets to those municipalities now entered in other plans?

Mr. B. S. Mackasey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): 1. 223.

2. 201 plans have been suspended or discontinued and it is believed that these have been replaced by OMER.

3. No information, but it is possible in respect of the 22 government annuity plans which are still active.

4. Yes.

5. No, because the annuity pension credits remain in force for the individual employees concerned.

Mr. L. M. Brand (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to bring to your attention the fact that I have had questions Nos. 2,532 and 2,606 on the order paper since January 26 and February 10 respectively. They are both simple and straightforward questions, and I see no reason why they could not have been answered by the government within a reasonable time.

[*Translation*]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, motion for papers No. 227 is acceptable to the government, subject to the usual reservations concerning privileged papers and authorization by the governmental authorities concerned.

Would Your Honour be so kind as to call notices of motions Nos. 221 and 223?

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining motions be allowed to stand.

[*English*]

FLOOD PROTECTION ON FRASER RIVER

Motion No. 227—**Mr. Deachman:**

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this house copies of all correspondence since May 1, 1963, between any department of the government of Canada and any department of the government of British Columbia relating to the raising of dikes, the building of dams on the upper reaches of the Fraser river and all matters relating to the protection of the flood plain of the Fraser river.

Motion agreed to.

AGREEMENT WITH QUEBEC RESPECTING ADULT TRAINING

Motion No. 221—**Mr. LeBlanc (Rimouski):**

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this house a copy of the federal-provincial (Quebec) agreement with regard to technical and professional training for adults, mentioning the date on which such agreement was signed, and a copy of all correspondence on the subject between the federal government and the government of the province of Quebec.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the department has communicated with the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. LeBlanc).

The papers which are requested by the hon. member deal with the agreement with the province of Quebec concerning grants for training.

There is no objection to tabling this correspondence, with the consent of the province.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations or conditions expressed by the minister, is it the pleasure of the house that notice of motion No. 221 be adopted?

Motion agreed to.

Inquiries of the Ministry

FEDERAL WITHDRAWAL FROM VOCATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAM

Motion No. 223—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this house a copy of all correspondence between the provincial governments and the federal government in respect to the decision of the federal government to withdraw from the technical vocational training program.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, if there is any doubt about this notice of motion perhaps it had better stand.

Motion stands.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

CONTINUATION OF OFFICER TRAINING CORPS IN CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. I would like to ask whether it is the intention of the government to discontinue the Canadian officers training corps in the universities of Canada, or has this already been done?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions with the universities as to what form our future co-operation with the universities should take. A policy paper has been prepared by the department. There has been some discussion which has not yet been promulgated. As soon as a decision has been approved I will make the announcement in the usual way.

Mr. Churchill: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Do I understand by that answer that objection has been raised by some of the universities of Canada to operating the Canadian officers training corps?

Mr. Hellyer: I could not say there has been no objection by individuals, because I would suspect there has been some although I cannot at the moment recall specific cases. But in so far as negotiation with the Association of Canadian Universities is concerned, it has been most harmonious and co-operative and they have been in the picture all the way during consideration of the new policy.

Mr. Churchill: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would it not be advisable to continue to draw officer personnel from students at universities, in view of the tremendous purge of senior officers that has been carried out in the department?

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The supplementary question is argumentative.

Mr. Hellyer: There will be continued provision, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

MEDICARE—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON MEETING WITH PROVINCIAL MINISTERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare and ask whether he can report to the house with regard to the meeting he has just held with the provincial ministers of health, with particular reference to the contention of the minister of health of the province of Ontario that if commercial insurance carriers fit into the category the provinces should be allowed to turn the administration of medicare over to such groups. I want to ask the minister whether he can assure the house that the government intends to adhere to the original definition which he gave, according to which the public administration of medicare would be handled by other than commercial insurance carriers.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the conference of the ministers of health which ended yesterday was very successful, especially in terms of the discussion of the Medical Care Act. It is my view that all the provinces will be participating in a medical care program at the time the federal contributions will be available. I think we have made great progress in this field, and the conference was very heartening and encouraging in that respect.

The role of commercial insurance carriers has been laid down in the Medical Care Act. It is within the jurisdiction of a province under the act to designate a private insurance carrier as an agent to collect premiums and pay benefits, but it will not be possible for such an agency to assess accounts or determine the amount of payments. This has been part of the act and there has been no change in the terms of the bill that was approved by parliament.

Mr. Douglas: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am sure all hon. members will share the minister's pleasure at the indication that there is every likelihood that all

the provinces will come under the plan by July 1, 1968. Do I take it from the minister's reply that the federal government intends to adhere to the original proposition that the administration of the plan must come under a public body appointed by the provincial government?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker. There is no change in that policy. There must be a provincial authority administering a public plan, and the roles of other agencies, such as private insurance carriers and plans sponsored by doctors, are laid down in the bill itself. There has been no change from that point of view.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen) concerning the recent federal-provincial meeting on health.

Can the hon. minister tell the house whether it has been determined that the provinces will be the ones to decide what further health services will be admissible to federal subsidies?

[*English*]

Mr. MacEachen: The method of adding further health services to the health plan has been set out in the bill. The attitude the government of Canada took at the conference was that when a consensus developed amongst the provinces as to the importance of further services, the government would consider adding those services to the plan. We have made no decision as to further services at the present time except the statement that has been made with respect to services provided by dental or oral surgeons.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Allard: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. At that federal-provincial meeting, was there any discussion about giving fiscal compensation to provinces not coming under the federal medical care insurance plan?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Does the hon. member not think that the question he has just put launches us in a debate and that, for this reason, it should not be allowed?

Mr. Allard: I do not, Mr. Speaker, because this question proceeds from the previous one.

[*English*]

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare whether he has had any requests from any of the provinces for an extension of services other than those which the government initially stipulated for the medicare program?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am very much afraid that the question asked by the hon. member is substantially the same as that asked by the hon. member for Sherbrooke.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In the light of discussions at the conference of health ministers during the past two days, is the government considering the possibility of advancing the effective date of medicare, as provided for under the Medical Care Act.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, this matter was raised at the conference but there was no request or disposition by any province to advance the date of medicare implementation. Accordingly the position of the federal government is unchanged. The starting date will be July 1, 1968, as provided for in the bill.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): A supplementary question. The minister said that there would be no advancement of the date from July 1, 1968. When pushing the legislation through the house he said the bill might be implemented on or before July 1, 1968. I ask the minister what happened to that "before".

Mr. MacEachen: That has already been answered.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Knowles: It was just window dressing.

[*Translation*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

QUEBEC—REASON FOR HIGH RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Since the minister has probably studied in detail the unemployment situation in Canada,

could he tell us why, every year, just like this year, the province of Quebec alone has 40 per cent of the total number of unemployed in Canada? What are the reasons for such a situation?

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me that the question is much too broad, much too wide. Therefore, the question as asked is not in order.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, for a number of years we have witnessed the same situation. My question is quite simple. Can the minister explain to the house the reason why Quebec always has 40 per cent of the total number of unemployed?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member that his question cannot be asked at this time.

[*Later:*]

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration on unemployment in Quebec.

I would like to know whether the minister intends to meet with the provincial authorities to discuss the measures indicated in an effort to reduce the unemployment rate in Quebec?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, if Quebec feels the need of our co-operation to combat seasonal unemployment, I shall be happy to meet the representatives of Quebec.

As far as my department is concerned, we are already taking measures to combat seasonal unemployment with, among other things, the winter works program undertaken jointly with the provinces and the municipalities. There are also other federal programs, but we have no objection to considering any other suggestion from the province of Quebec which is aware of such problems, if they indicate their interest in solving them.

Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix): I should like to put a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Apart from the winter works program, would the minister have any idea of other steps which should be taken in Quebec to reduce the unemployment rate?

Mr. Speaker: I think that this question is much too comprehensive. The hon. member is asking the minister for a statement normally made on motions.

[Mr. Caouette.]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question.

I would like to ask the Minister of Manpower and Immigration when his department will be in a position to cope with all the applications made by the unemployed in Quebec for retraining courses as a result of technological changes?

Mr. Marchand: We are ready to cope with all the applications of the provinces which are prepared to provide courses, teachers and facilities.

[*English*]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO INTERIM ADJUSTMENTS IN PENSION RATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and ask whether he has yet received the report of the committee studying the question of veterans pension rates.

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, I have not yet received that report.

Mr. Patterson: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister would now consider the advisability of further interim increases and the inclusion of dependants in such increases.

Mr. Teillet: Mr. Speaker, that is the purpose of this study, and as I have already indicated I hope to have this report as soon as possible. If there is undue delay, then certainly the matter will be considered.

CAMP HILL, N.S.—REPORTED LACK OF HOSPITAL ACCOMMODATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Veterans Affairs. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he is in a position today to reply to the recurring questions I have been posing regarding the availability of bed space for veterans at Camp Hill hospital?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Yes, I have had an inquiry made into this matter. The report I received enables me to assure the hon. member that no veteran has ever been refused hospitalization

for a pensionable disability. However, the time of admission may not always coincide with the veteran's own wishes. This decision is reached in the light of medical emergency factors and is made by qualified medical practitioners. In terms of the specific case to which the hon. member referred me, I will give him a private report.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I thank the minister for his reply. I know he can only be guided in the answers he gives by the information he receives from Halifax. With your permission, sir, I should like to debate this matter at the first opportunity on the adjournment.

INCOME TAX

ACCEPTANCE OF RETURNS BEARING DATE OF MAY 1

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address my question to the Minister of National Revenue. In view of the fact that the final date for the filing of income tax returns falls on Sunday, April 30, can the minister say if income tax returns filed or mailed on May 1 will be accepted as having been received on time?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue and President of the Treasury Board): I will take the matter under consideration.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, further to the question raised earlier by the hon. member for Wellington South, the final date for filing personal income tax returns will be May 1. Returns postmarked up to midnight of May 1, 1968—

An hon. Member: For 1968?

Mr. Benson: I beg your pardon; I should have said 1967.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Benson: Returns postmarked up to midnight of May 1, 1967, will be deemed to have been received on time, as provided for in the law.

SPORTS

APPLICATION TO HOLD 1970 WINTER GAMES IN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Can the minister inform the house if any decision has been made with respect to Canada being host to the winter games, including alpine and nordic events, proposed for Banff national park in 1970 by the Canadian Amateur Ski Association?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): I think probably the first part of the question should have been answered by my colleague the Minister of National Health and Welfare. However, I believe he will permit me to tell the hon. member that we have made a small grant to assist the ski association in making the application. At the same time because Banff was indicated as a probable site they have been told we would much prefer that no application be made in respect of the nordic section.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

IMPLEMENTATION OF REPORT ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Solicitor General whether his attention has been drawn to a statement by Professor Ronald Price, who was a member of the special committee of the Department of Justice which prepared a report on juvenile deliquency in 1965, in which Professor Price is severely critical of delays and failure to implement the report's recommendations. Can the minister advise the house whether the government has accepted the report and if any progress has been made in implementing its recommendations?

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for giving me notice of his intention to ask this question, which deals with a very important subject.

A study of the report is actively under way within the department with a view to revising the act. I cannot, of course, state categorically that we accept the report in full, because it raises a number of constitutional points. I should point out that the matter is complicated by the fact that the constitutional validity of the Juvenile Delinquents Act is now being questioned in the Supreme Court of Canada and, of course, any action should await the judgment of the court.

I should also add, Mr. Speaker, that at my request the report was discussed by the criminal law section of the conference of commissioners on uniformity of legislation in Canada.

Inquiries of the Ministry

REQUEST FOR CONFERENCE ON NATION-WIDE ANTI-CRIME PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet perhaps I might deal with the question that was raised by the hon. member regarding a conference of attorneys general.

At the last conference of attorneys general the date of a future conference was left in abeyance. The law officers of the crown have had some correspondence with two attorneys general regarding a conference to discuss law enforcement and other matters. This exchange of correspondence is continuing and the matter of the conference is under consideration in terms of an agenda and timing. The extremely heavy commitments of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in the centennial year is one consideration bearing on a date for such a conference.

LABOUR RELATIONS

RAILWAY DISPUTE—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. K. Andras (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour. Can the minister tell the house what progress is being made in connection with the contract negotiations with the brotherhood of railway trainmen?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the house that I have received the final report of the mediator, Mr. Goldenberg. The tentative settlement that he reported to me some time ago and which needed confirmation by the members, has now been confirmed by an overwhelming majority, some 75 per cent. Therefore this leaves only one of the major railway disputes outstanding, and the board of arbitration set up to handle this dispute will be meeting within a matter of a few days. This, of course, will be an organizational meeting. Hearings will follow.

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

SUGGESTED STUDY BY PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada.

[Mr. Pennell.]

In view of the statement made by the Quebec leader of the opposition, Mr. Lesage, as regards the necessity of modernizing our constitution, is the minister now willing to create a parliamentary committee on the constitution?

Hon .P.-E. Trudeau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I would say to the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi that the position of the government in regard to that question has not changed, that we still believe it is too early to set up such a committee.

[*English*]

HOUSING

REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW GOVERNMENT POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): I should like to address a question to our energetic Minister of Labour, who also spends part of his time looking at Canada's housing crisis. In view of the continuing housing crisis has the minister anything further to report on the statement by the Prime Minister that the government is considering new initiatives to meet the situation? If so, can the minister tell us what those initiatives will be?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Yesterday I refused to allow the question on these lines from the other side of the house. The question asked by the hon. member sins in the way the question asked yesterday sinned. It is too general and asks the minister to make a general statement. For that reason I do not think it can be accepted in its present form.

Mr. Scott (Danforth): By way of a supplementary question may I ask—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member cannot ask a supplementary question. He may ask a different question.

Mr. Scott (Danforth): I shall do that. Several weeks ago, answering a question of mine, the Prime Minister said the government was giving consideration to the creation of a national ministry of housing and urban affairs. Has such a decision been made. If so, what sort of decision is it?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I question whether the hon. member has quoted the Prime Minister correctly, but regardless of that, I wish to say that if and when the government has any

statement to make along the lines suggested by the hon. member it will be made by the Prime Minister.

Mr. Grafftey: It is too late for this year.

[*Later:*]

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): I have a question for the Minister of Labour in connection with the housing problem.

An hon. Member: "Crisis."

Mr. Prittie: "Crisis", my hon. friend says. I should like to ask the minister whether reconsideration is being given to the policy of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation of refusing to grant loans in connection with apartment buildings in metropolitan areas.

Mr. Nicholson: This matter is under constant study, but—

Mr. Grafftey: That is all you do; study, study, study, study. No action.

Mr. Nicholson: I cannot see any likelihood of the corporation having to make a change in its policy, because the indications are that the traditional lending institutions are now coming back into the field on a scale which should make up for the deficit experienced last year. The figures indicate this clearly.

Mr. Grafftey: A minister of studies.

Mr. Prittie: In view of the fact that most people in Canada cannot afford to buy through the National Housing Act because their salaries are not large enough to enable them to qualify, what new proposals is the minister considering in order that these people may be in a position to qualify to purchase homes?

Mr. Speaker: Again this is far too general a question.

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of National Revenue. I wonder whether the minister would consider removing the 11 per cent sales tax from building materials in order to facilitate house construction.

Some hon. Members: Oh.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

FAILURE TO BROADCAST NEWS OF DAIRY POLICY DEBATE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State, who answers for the C.B.C., and pertains to the motion brought in yesterday by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette). Knowing the great interest that Canadian farmers have in this matter, would the hon. lady inform the house why the discussion was not mentioned last night on the C.B.C., so that Canadian farmers and all those in the various political parties interested might be reassured?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is making representations to the minister instead of asking her a question.

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, in that case, I wish to discuss the matter at ten o'clock.

[*English*]

EXPO '67

REPORTED INSISTENCE ON U.S. FUNDS AS PAYMENT FOR ACCOMMODATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. S. Smallwood (Battle River-Camrose): Mr. Speaker, my question arises from a newspaper article in my hand. I wish to address it to the Minister of Trade and Commerce who is responsible for Expo, but in his absence I shall address it to the minister answering for him. Is the government aware that certain motels and hotels in greater Montreal area are refusing other than United States funds in payment of accommodation? Also, does the government not think this is an insult to Canada and Canadians?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I am not sure who is the acting minister of trade and commerce, but as I am the acting minister of almost everything else—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: In the absence of the Prime Minister I shall take the question as notice and see if there is any truth in the extraordinary statement the hon. gentleman has made.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

HALIFAX—REQUEST OF DOCKYARD COUNCIL RESPECTING PAY RATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Halifax): I wish to ask the acting minister for everything else my routine question, about an important matter. I wonder whether in the Prime Minister's absence the minister could indicate the govern-

ment's position with respect to the matters raised in the urgent telegram forwarded today from federal local 173 of the Canadian Labour Congress in Halifax regarding artillery crafts, general trades and labour in H.M.C. Dockyard, Halifax.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue and President of the Treasury Board): The telegram has not yet been brought to my attention. I can assure my hon. friend that it will be dealt with as soon as it is.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

NOVA SCOTIA—REPORTED PROTESTS RESPECTING TRADES TRAINING

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, on April 13 the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. Muir) asked me whether I had received a representation from a group of workers of Sydney, Nova Scotia. I did receive such representations complaining of or charging political discrimination at the Canada manpower centre in Sydney and making allegations with respect to training allowances. I have ordered an investigation into those charges. As soon as I have that report I shall inform the house of what has taken place.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

NOTICE IN "VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS" ON ALLOCATION OF TIME FOR DEFENCE ACT DISCUSSION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister who I presume is now the acting house leader. My question pertains to a notice of motion presented yesterday by the house leader and published in *Votes and Proceedings*. The house leader said that on Thursday next he would move a motion pertaining to closure. The latter part of the notice of motion as printed in *Votes and Proceedings* says:

> —that the motion will provide, that two days shall be allocated for the completion of discussion on the committee of the whole stage on Bill C-243, an act to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof (as amended), and that one day shall be allotted for the completion of the third reading stage on the bill.

Sir, the house may be taken by surprise unless those two days refer to two days in May, June, August, October or November, as

I suggested to the house leader. There is nothing specific in the notice of motion to guide the house. The matter is indefinite and I ask the acting house leader if he can explain this type of invalid notice of motion.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I feel that to explain a notice of motion that is on the order paper would be anticipating a debate and contrary to the rules. I shall, however, ask the house leader if he will communicate with the spokesmen for parties on the other side of the house to clarify any lack of clarity there may be in the matter.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: Will the acting house leader, who as usual is making light of a serious matter, not consider my question? Does the government not wish once again to be extricated from an error? This motion will be invalid if placed on the order paper tomorrow in this wording. We shall accordingly have to protest, to defend the rules of parliament.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. member should protest at the appropriate time. I can assure him that I will not accept with levity any protest from so experienced a parliamentarian.

Mr. Churchill: May I direct a supplementary question on the same subject to the Minister of National Defence. Would the minister not pay serious attention to this matter, if he really intends to apply closure to the bill that has consumed so much of his time recently?

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR SUBSIDY ON SURPLUS FLUID MILK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): I should like to address a question to the acting minister of everything else, which I presume includes agriculture, and ask him what the government's response was or will be to the request that surplus fluid milk be reinstated in the dairy subsidization program.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I inadvertantly misinformed the house; I am not the Acting Minister of Agriculture. My colleague the minister for Indian affairs is, and he is much more experienced than I am.

Hon. Arthur Laing (Acting Minister of Agriculture): I am so experienced that I will undertake to draw this question to the attention of the minister immediately on his return from his duties in London.

Mr. Olson: May I ask the Acting Minister of Agriculture how long that will be?

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF LAURENTIAN SINGERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax): May I direct a question to the Secretary of State, who is not afraid to answer anything. Will the hon. lady who is in charge of our centennial celebrations ask the centennial commission to consider inviting other non-Canadian groups as fine as the Laurentian Singers, now in the public gallery—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McCleave: —to join in this Canadian celebration?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I thank the hon. gentleman for the compliment, and I should like to join him in welcoming these visitors.

INQUIRY AS TO APPLICATION OF BILINGUAL PREMIUM POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): I have a question which I trust is in order. After consulting with my very good Conservative friend from York-Humber (Mr. Cowan)—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Choquette: —I thought I would direct the following question to a minister of great competence, the Minister of National Revenue. Is the government prepared to apply the 7 per cent premium policy to bilingual employees of the House of Commons?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue and President of the Treasury Board): This is a question which I believe is more appropriately addressed to you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

AMALGAMATION OF NAVY, ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The house resumed from Tuesday, April 18, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-243 to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof—Mr. Hellyer—Mr. Batten in the chair.

The Chairman: When the committee rose last evening, clause 2 was under consideration.

Mr. Dinsdale: It had been my hope that it would not have been necessary to participate again in this debate. I say this because as last week concluded it appeared the minister intended to spend a quiet week end considering some of the recommendations which had been made by members of the opposition, so that when the present week began it would be possible to arrange a reasonable compromise along lines which are usually followed by parliamentary institutions in a desire to resolve difficulties created by controversial measures of the kind now before us.

Unfortunately the attitude of the government has hardened instead of softened and the opposition is now faced with the inevitability of closure. This it seems to me is the antithesis of the process of parliamentary discussion, having regard to the nature of the bill now before the house. We have not moved beyond clause 2 in our consideration for the very good reason that that clause is revolutionary in its implications and in the effect it will have on our troops, on the defence of this nation and on the discharge of our obligations under international commitments. Some speakers have indicated that clause 2, which is the heart of the matter, is so revolutionary that it can only be compared with the great leaps forward which are taken by totalitarian régimes from time to time.

It was the irresponsible attitude on the part of the minister, supported, obviously by other members of the government—because no one on that side has disagreed with his viewpoint on this subject—which caused senior officers to retire prematurely rather than become identified with such a policy with respect to national defence and external affairs obligations undertaken by this nation.

I say it is customary among parliamentary institutions to reach some kind of consensus or compromise when there are such fundamental differences of opinion, and I enter the

debate once more at this time in the realization that the government has obviously decided to continue its bulldozer approach to the legislation before us. Democracies move forward slowly. The very reason we suffer the relative tedium of the democratic process of discussion is because we all realize that no government or group of individuals is infallible.

• (3:20 p.m.)

It was Winston Churchill who said that democracy is the worst form of government ever devised by the mind of man, except for all other kinds. It seems to me that our friends on the government side who have decided on the application of closure have agreed with the first part of that thesis, that democracy is the worst form of government ever devised by the mind of man, and they are going to eliminate the processes of a democratic House of Commons that have been going on with reference to this present important issue, notwithstanding the fact that there have been reasonable alternatives put forward to the minister whereby he might achieve some sort of consensus. A consensus in a democratic country is always a relative thing.

I have been in this house for some 16 years and I have found that most of the legislation which has been passed during the period I have been here has been revised three or four times. The minister, however, takes the point of view in respect of this bill that it is absolutely perfect, that all other countries in the western world with follow the pattern that has been laid down by Canada and that this legislation will bring about a great increase in efficiency in our armed forces. In other words, it is the essence of perfection in so far as legislative procedures are concerned.

I submit that this is characteristic of the totalitarian mind. I have read the evidence of the former chief of the defence staff, and that given by the other men who were responsible for the military affairs of this nation less than one year ago. Without exception they have withdrawn their support from this legislation because they believe it is something that is going too far too fast, and that it will endanger Canada's position in the field of national defence. As I have indicated already it is only the minister and the government that have taken the totalitarian point of view that this is the essence of perfection. Throughout the discussion I have marvelled at the ability of the government party to maintain unbroken discipline in the course of the debate. We are dealing with a most serious subject. Obviously there are members on the government who must have serious reservations. The hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) for example, is such a member; but he rationalizes the legislation and says that actually it is no different from integration.

All members of this house agree with integration as it was provided for under the legislation of 1964; yet we are accused of being Colonel Blimpish, of tilting at windmills, and of resisting the process of technological change. These are fine propaganda phrases. I shall in the course of my remarks deal with that particular item. Our friend, the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) who should be resisting this legislation, rationalizes and says that it is nothing more than integration.

It seems to me that hon. members on the government side have not really read even the explanatory notes in the bill, because I find in these notes the following:

> The policy of the government that the three services of the Canadian Forces be unified was stated in the white paper—

And so on. Then in the last sentence of this explanatory note it goes on to say:

> Since that time the planning required for the integration process has continued and it is now considered appropriate to proceed to the final goal of a unified defence force for Canada.

That is the aspect of this legislation that was resisted, even at the sacrifice of their careers, by the responsible military leaders of this nation. Then we go to the explanation of clause 2:

> The purpose of the amendment to section 15 is to provide that the Canadian Forces will consist of one service called the Canadian Armed Forces, rather than three services as at present.

This is not integration; it is unification or, as it is described on the order paper, amalgamation of the navy, the army and the air force. I submit that this is a revolutionary leap forward and is not the usual manner in which democracies adapt to changing circumstances. It is more in line with the slogan which seems to have replaced the traditional policy of our Liberal friends. They now follow the slogan of power, patronage and perpetuity.

The minister himself has indicated—and it is repeated in the explanatory notes—that he has legislative authority to proceed with the necessary reorganization and now what he wants is a blank cheque to completely change the basis of the organization of the armed forces of Canada. Democratic parliaments do

not give blank cheques to governments. Democratic parliaments—particularly those which follow the British pattern—always reserve the right to demonstrate where the government is in error. In this particular instance the minister has substituted slogans for facts. This has been commented upon editorially as being an unseemly rush. He has drawn rosy pictures of the inevitable result of this well evaluated legislation. He has described it in the most exaggerated terms. This seems to be an unusual position for someone who operates under our democratic system of government to take.

I know the suggestion has been and is being put forward that the government has been forced to bring in closure because the opposition refuses to let this decision be made by the due processes of discussion in the house. We know that this is a house of minorities; we know there is a regional imbalance of representation in this parliament. We know that the government does not respect the national perspective or the national consensus on any matter. This is the reason I feel it has been able to get away with divisive legislation during its brief three or four year history in this country.

This decision to invoke closure, however, is not new. It was referred to by the chairman of the Liberal caucus committee, the hon. member for Durham, away back on March 28 when he indicated in a letter to his constituents that this likely would have to be the ultimate manoeuvre of the government if it was to get its controversial bill through the house. This is not a conclusion they have reached because of the intransigence of the opposition. They were thinking in these terms long before this debate in this final stage was under way in the house. This, of course, is true to the Liberal attitude on most matters.

During the second world war the Minister of Agriculture served with a night fighter squadron much the same as I did. I am surprised he has not taken part in this debate, because night fighters above all groups were aware of the success of combined operations, and the benefits in esprit de corps of the rivalry and competition based on traditions and records that had been established. There was this sense of keen competition even between the three Canadian night fighter squadrons. As I say, I am surprised based on his experience he has not taken part or made any comment about this measure.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Some two weeks ago we invited the Minister of Agriculture to my constituency to preside at the opening of the Manitoba Winter Fair. Unfortunately he could not find room in his departmental aircraft for the member for Brandon-Souris and I was not able to accompany him to that constituency on that occasion. At that time he did make certain statements which I thought were a little out of place for a man who had been invited to preside in a ceremonial way at the opening of that fair, which is reputed to be the best of its kind in Canada, next to the Royal Winter Fair in Toronto.

I have in my hand an article from the Brandon *Sun* of April 4, just after the minister's visit, in which he is reported to have said he had all sorts of useful agriculture legislation to bring before the house but the opposition would not let him do so. One might say that kind of comment is a violation of western hospitality, and if the minister were a westerner I am sure he would not have trespassed in this manner. One does not deal with partisan political matters when attending a function as a result of an invitation by the people concerned.

According to this article the minister, in reference to loans for agricultural fairs, said this:

> Noting that making such loans available was "one of the planks in our last campaign", Mr. Greene noted that "delay" by the opposition has prevented the government from bringing the measure to the house so far.

Who is in control of the business of this house, the government or the opposition? Obviously the government cannot get other business done if it insists on pursuing controversial items of this kind. The Minister of National Defence said that all he wanted was a blank cheque. I quote him quite precisely on this regard. He has also said he has the legislative authority to proceed with integration and reorganization. He gave this assurance in the explanatory notes and during his opening statement at the commencement of the committee stage on April 3. The minister has also said that unification will not go forward to completion for five or ten years. Why are we blockading all the other wonderful pieces of legislation the government continues to talk about? The government suggests that the opposition in this house is creating this blockade. This is unadulterated propaganda.

It must be obvious to anyone who has travelled in western Canada that we have a

good sense of humour. In this regard let me refer to a headline which appeared in the Brandon *Sun* on April 3. The headline is "Greene in city to open fair today". The subheading is "Bull judging first big item". I think this speaks for itself, having regard to the comments made later by the minister for agriculture. I am not sure whether he got first prize or not because the story does not go on to deal with that aspect of the matter.

Mr. Baldwin: Would the minister qualify as an expert in this field?

Mr. Dinsdale: I should not like to express an opinion because in a democracy we do not deal with absolutes. In a democracy we move forward slowly in order to avoid making great mistakes, such as those made by totalitarian states within recent tragic memory. Keeping this in mind I ask again why we are pressing forward with this measure regardless of consequences.

I have read clause 2 and the explanatory notes. I have searched the records of the committee, I have been in the house during most of the debate on this bill, and I have come to the conclusion that the amalgamation of the navy, army and air force, as a matter of practical organization, cannot be successful. No matter what we call these forces, we still have one operating on the land, one in the air and one on the sea. Three separate environments are involved. No matter how you bang your head against the wall you cannot amalgamate, unify or bring these three environments together, into one.

I was very interested in the remarks of the hon. member for St. Ann, one of the few government spokesmen thus far. He assured the members of this committee that combat units will retain their identity. In my lexicon that means there is not going to be unification or amalgamation This whole matter is very confusing. The hon. member for St. Ann also said the men would not be jacks-of-all-trades. Surely that is gobbledegook or double talk of the most confusing kind.

If these forces or units are going to retain their operational identities, why should we go through this charade of amalgamation or unification? Why should we continue to push forward unnecessary legislation? A democracy should try to get by with a minimum of legislation, yet this government insists on a maximum amount camouflaged as positive action. All we can do is change the names of these forces, and a rose by any other name will smell as sweet.

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre dealt in detail with this whole matter of name change. Like that hon. member, the only logical explanation I can discover for supposed unification or amalgamation is that this is an attempt to change the name, because unification or amalgamation is an operational or organizational impossibility. If the minister wants to change the names why does he not do so in a forthright and direct manner rather than by this subterfuge?

Clause 2 of this bill states in part:

> The Canadian forces are the armed forces of Her Majesty raised by Canada and consist of one service called the Canadian Armed Forces.

If this one force is to be Her Majesty's armed forces why should we not call it the Royal Canadian Armed Forces? There seems to be something in this whole business that is not according to Hoyle. There have been some other contradictions in the minister's statements, some of which have been pointed out. He suggests that we must have civilian control of the armed forces and that he had to take severe disciplinary action against insubordination in the military ranks. His treatment of those who have spoken out against unification and amalgamation is quite different from the treatment of those who spoke out in favour of it. Those in favour of amalgamation and unification are the latter day experts who have come to positions of prominence because they have supported the minister.

• (3:40 p.m.)

This is totalitarianism; this is not democracy in action. This is authoritarianism. The principle is: You agree with me, or off comes your head. This prevents the possibility of debate. It prevents the possibility of any difference of opinion, if you are going to listen only to those to whom you want to listen. There are none so blind as those who will not see, or so deaf as those who will not hear. As the *Globe and Mail* editorial of Wednesday, March 22 put it, "Does Mr. Hellyer hear only what he chooses to hear?"

We have military leaders at the moment verging perilously close to participating in political discussion while this debate is continuing, yet they are praised by the minister for their great sense of responsibility and public duty. Here is confusion and contradiction beyond all comprehension. The other day the minister criticized the right hon. Leader of the Opposition because that gentleman when he was prime minister had the temerity to exert civilian control over the military with

respect to the selection of the CF-104. Yet the minister himself has stoutly defended the selection of the C-5, even though it was just as stoutly resisted by the air force authorities. I am not going to get into a debate on that subject; perhaps we will deal with it later in this discussion. I do not want to take up time in dealing with some of the technical details with respect to the merits of the CF-5 as opposed to the other types of aircraft which might have been selected. However, perhaps I may mention that its load capacity is limited as compared with the F-4 or the A-7. Its air refuelling capacity is less; its endurance is half that of other types of aircraft. Notwithstanding all its deficiencies and the recommendations of the authorities, the minister chose the C-5. But he criticizes the right hon. Leader of the Opposition for similar action when he had the responsibility as prime minister of this nation.

There is another question that interests me. I refer to the control of the news media by the minister and his staff. I mention this in passing. I recall the night of the famous interview on television of Lord Mountbatten. In the middle of the interview and out of the blue—it turned out that this particular television clip had been taken some months previously—strategically and suddenly at a critical moment in the debate Lord Mountbatten seemed to be supporting the idea of unification and amalgamation. There is something rotten in the state of Denmark, as they say.

There is another reason, of course, why the minister is pursuing this headlong course. It is because of his inexperience operationally, which has been mentioned before. We have been described as Colonel Blimps resisting change; but if you unify our forces in this complex, technological age, if you bring them all together in one great monolithic unit, how can you maintain the specialization and flexibility that are required to meet the complexities of our technological age? A monolithic unit, rather than providing for flexibility introduces rigidity. The minister says: If you have a single supreme commander, you must have a single force. That is nonsense. It is not even necessary to debate the point, because in every other area of modern society we are moving toward specialization, we are moving toward specialized knowledge in complex fields so that we might not introduce institutional rigidity into our national structure. Anybody who has operated under conditions of modern warfare will understand that this is so. This is why Lord Mountbatten emphasizes combined operations and bringing the various units together, with their backgrounds of tradition and esprit de corps, with their specialized knowledge. This business of rigidity and inflexibility is the product of the sawdust Caesars, the men of the first part of the twentieth century who brought their nations to the brink of disaster by their rigidity and even their stupidity in their approach to military matters.

Not very long ago I was re-reading "The First and the Last" by the German general, Adolf Galland, who commanded the luftwaffe during the last war. He attributes the collapse of the luftwaffe, which was supposed to be supreme in its field, to the fact that the civilian authority took over, interfered with and ignored the advice of the military experts. I mention one example in this respect. I would recommend the reading of this book to the minister, who is obviously a military strategist. Corporal Hitler overruled the luftwaffe experts when they had developed the jet aeroplane ahead of other nations. The jet aeroplane could have played a major role in determining the outcome of the war. Corporal Hitler overruled his experts and decreed that the aeroplane should be modified and used as a blitz bomber rather than being involved in the fighter force. This resulted in a delay of some six months in the production of the aircraft. Decisions of this nature had the gravest consequence.

I am not going to deal further with the speech of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. His was one of the major contributions to this debate and I think what he said has been adequately dealt with. The Secretary of State for External Affairs did not in any way reassure the members of this house that we were going to be able to meet our commitments to NATO, NORAD and the United Nations. In fact, it is impossible for us to say we will be able to meet those commitments because we do not yet know what they are going to be. Also, we have the expert advice from retired generals, admirals, air marshals, and so on, that the reverse will be the case.

I want to conclude my remarks by dealing with a matter that I do not think has been raised in this debate. The minister has talked about the interservice rivalry which will be removed by amalgamation. I would like to suggest—

The Chairman: Order, please. I must advise the hon. member that the time allotted to him has expired. Does the hon. member wish to continue?

Mr. Dinsdale: With your permission, Mr. Chairman, and that of the committee I should like to finish this point.

The Chairman: Does the hon. member have the permission of the committee to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mr. Dinsdale: I thank the committee and you, sir, for this consideration. The removal of interservice rivalry has been put forward as one of the main reasons for the necessity for unification. But what are we doing? We are developing a mobile command which will constitute a large part of our Canadian armed forces; 29,000 men will be in the command when it reaches its peak. Its headquarters are located at St. Hubert, which again is contrary to good military policy because we are locating the headquarters or the core of our armed forces on the fringe of a metropolitan complex which would be the first to be destroyed in the event of a missile attack. Hitherto the emphasis has always been on decentralization and dispersal of our strategic military headquarters. It would be much better to have it out in the west—I suppose the west is expendable; at least it is from the government's standpoint—where there will be no danger of obliteration by ICBM's which most probably will be aimed at Toronto and Montreal. St. Hubert, which is the heart of our mobile command, sits right in the centre of the target. This makes no sense whatsoever.

The mobile command consists of three infantry brigades in Canada and later will include four squadrons of CF-5 jet attack planes, as well as Buffalo transport planes and heavy and light helicopters.

It has administrative control of the infantry brigade in Europe. It is also expected that mobile command will take over maritime command's fleet, the replenishment vessel, the *Provider*, as a troopship, and two similar ships for which contracts were recently awarded. The maritime command being mainly naval is of course disturbed about this. The R.C.A.F. component of maritime command, the four squadrons of patrol planes, is obviously unhappy about being swallowed by the navy. Also the R.C.A.F. fear that mobile command will try to get its hands on air transport command. This seems to be inevitable in view of the course that is being taken at present. It leaves the air force with only the air division in Europe, and the air defence command, and both these roles are withering away.

[The Chairman.]

The minister said there are no complaints in the armed forces. He said the troops are rejoicing at what is taking place. This is not what my mail says, this is not what my wartime buddies say. They are trying to get my ear at every opportunity to try to encourage us to stop this headlong rush toward confusion on which the government is embarked at the present time.

These informants tell me that the old power struggle between the three services is being rapidly replaced by an even fiercer struggle between the field commands. Inevitably we will be faced with the situation where mobile command has become a power unto itself. This will create divisions and jealousies. Unification will destroy the old names and the old esprit de corps. The second state will be much worse than the first.

It is these considerations that have persuaded me to address myself again to the minister as an old friend. A short time ago the minister was making laudatory headlines with regard to the necessary reorganization of integration. However, today he is beating his head against the wall and is rapidly losing his reputation. Let us, in the spirit of democratic institutions everywhere, try to come to some reasonable compromise. Let us either accept some of the amendments which were put forward in the committee's discussions, or else perhaps let us delay the proclamation, if that will resolve the present impasse which faces the house. Another possibility, which I think might be the wise course to take, would be to withdraw the bill. The bill is not necessary. We have all the legislative power that we need. Let us move forward step by step to make sure we do not make the fundamental errors that other totalitarian states have made in this twentieth century.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, to change slightly the tone of this debate which has lasted for several days, and even several weeks, I should like to say that it stirs no interest in the public. I feel that the Conservative members would put an end to this useless and futile debate were it not for their fear of losing face as a result of the attitude they adopted long ago.

They have accused us of wanting to help the government by voting in favour of the unification of the Canadian armed forces.

Mr. Chairman, in the public at large, we meet people who favour unification, and others who are against it. For that matter, the situation is the same here in parliament.

During a similar debate, that on the adoption of a distinctively Canadian flag, a lot of interest was stirred up right across Canada, and we received hundreds and thousands of letters from all over the country, asking us to take such or such an attitude, but we find no similar interest in the case of the unification bill. People do not write in about this.

Yesterday at noon, I addressed the Ottawa West Rotary Club, English speaking people, businessmen, professionals, industrialists. They are definitely disgusted with the time lost here in parliament by the extension of this debate, through repetitions without, however, any clear and precise solution to the problem.

We are studying Bill No. C-243. All its clauses were studied by the committee on national defence where every member had the right to attend, where he could discuss, and express his viewpoint. Everyone interested in the matter went there. Back in the house, we will have to go back once more to the committee. The discussion here is as long as it was in committee. Later, in committee, it will be as long as it was here. The bill will come back for third reading and we will no doubt discuss it again, repeating once more what we have heard for a month and a half. In the meantime, the Canadian people are paying for that loss of time.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I proposed the adjournment of the business of the house to discuss a definite subject namely the problems of the dairy industry. All the Conservative and Liberal members should have supported the motion to change the debate and discuss a matter concerning an important sector of the Canadian economy, namely agriculture. Instead of that, we carried on the debate on Bill No. C-243. There are pros and cons. Some are afraid of closure, others are afraid to lose votes in their ridings.

I was saying that the Canadian people were not very much interested in this matter. In fact, I received one telegram and one letter. The telegram was from London, and the letter from Winnipeg—probably from the riding of my excellent friend, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill)—and I quote:

• (4:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

Dear Mr. Caouette,

I cannot understand why unification of armed forces must proceed. It almost sounds like "peace at any price" of those who appease war-makers. If it is clearly so good why do great numbers of taxpayers, students, armed service personnel (of long practical experience) oppose the plan and its consequences of Canada having no effective fighting force to defend Canada first?

How can one possibly believe the idea money will be saved except by combining, say, postal and health services? Without competition between fighting regiments (or their sports) how can their morale possibly be as good? Until these and other dangers stated and unstated are settled carefully would it not be safer for Canada to vote no? Keep up the constructive work you do as a fighter for freedom with responsibility and private enterprise.

I will not mention the name, but the letter comes from Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Mr. Churchill: Will you vote against the bill now, having received that?

Mr. Caouette: Pardon?

Mr. Churchill: Will you vote against the bill, having received that letter?

Mr. Caouette: Well, I have a telegram which—

Mr. Churchill: It is very sound advice.

Mr. Caouette: Yes, it is very sound advice. I have a telegram here which is a little clearer. It is dated April 18, which was last night. I should like to read it:

Mr. Réal Caouette
Social Credit Rally Leader,
Parliament Buildings, Ottawa.

Dear Sir: I am not a Social Crediter—

He may be a Conservative.

Mr. Churchill: A wise man.

Mr. Caouette: Yes.

—but I think that you have the interest of the Canadian people at heart, so would you please use your influence in trying to get this unification bill through.

Mr. Churchill: He is a Liberal.

Mr. Caouette: I continue:

I am a veteran of 18 years of service—

Just as many years as my hon. friend.

—and I would say that 85 to 90 per cent like I are in favour of this unification bill so would you please help to keep us together. We have full confidence in our Minister of Defence, Mr. Hellyer.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): It sounds as though Bill Lee sent that telegram.

Mr. Caouette: The telegram reads:

We have confidence in our Minister of Defence, Mr. Hellyer.

It is signed, "A corporal from London, Ontario". I will not say the name, but he has been in the armed forces for 18 years. My friend was asking me if I would vote against the bill now. These are the only two communications I have received, one from London, Ontario, and the other one from Winnipeg, Manitoba.

[*Translation*]

In my province, Mr. Chairman, we did not receive a single letter or telegram suggesting that we should vote one way or the other. In Quebec, we have the Royal 22nd which is, I think, a rather important and illustrious regiment in the Canadian army, and although we are told today about experts in the Canadian army who are fighting Bill No. C-243, there are others who are not fighting it.

General Allard is not opposed to it. Some may say that General Allard is in favour of unification because he is the commander in chief of the Canadian armed forces. We can impute motives to him, Mr. Chairman, but we can also impute motives to those who hold different views.

We live in a democratic country and we certainly have the right to be against this measure. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) has the right to oppose Bill No. C-243, but we have just as much right to be in favour of this bill. We have reasons for approving this bill, just as the hon. member has reasons for being against it.

Personally, I see one Canadian army, not three. I see one Canadian army as a Canadian family, with a father, a mother and 10 children. The 10 children, sir, will not all become lawyers, or businessmen; they will not all get into the same trade; no. Each of the 10 children will go his own way, but will nevertheless remain within the same family; that is a unified family.

What prevents the people in the air force, the army or the navy from being part of a single force while remaining in the land army, the air force or the navy? Nothing whatsoever, Mr. Chairman.

I suggest all this is a tempest in a teapot; somebody is trying to turn the matter of the Canadian army into a clearly and purely political matter. Now, the Canadian army must stay above political matters or considerations. The Canadian army is neither Conservative nor Liberal nor Social Credit; the Canadian army is the army of the Canadian people. It is the army of all Canada. This army belongs to the Canadian people and not to the government. The present government may change in a year or two; it will be followed by another which will possibly be changed four years later, whereas the Canadian army will last regardless of political considerations or changes of government.

The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre is perfectly aware of what I say and he knows I am right in speaking as I do.

When his government was in power, pressures were then exerted to unify the Canadian armed forces. If this government were still in power now, it would probably have to introduce a bill which might not be Bill No. C-243 but possibly Bill No. C-995 but which would propose exactly what the government or the Canadian armed forces are now asking.

Look at what is going on across Canada. The hon. member knows that the present debate is of no interest anywhere in Canada, neither in his own constituency nor in my own, neither in Montreal nor in Toronto.

Yesterday I met prominent citizens of Toronto, people who had military service in Canada and who support the unification of the Canadian forces into one army.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I did not understand what the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) said.

Mr. Mongrain: You haven't missed a thing.

Mr. Caouette: So, I haven't missed a thing.

[*English*]

Mr. Dinsdale: I asked the hon. gentleman if he met the people from Toronto who were not in favour of unification?

Mr. Caouette: I will be very frank with the hon. member and say that up until now I have never met anyone from Toronto who was against this Bill No. C-243.

Mr. Dinsdale: Have you met the members of TRIO? They seem to be against it and they are based in Toronto.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I do not deny the fact just referred to by the hon. member. I do not dispute it. It may be true. But with those I have met from Toronto yesterday, it was not a question of finding out whether they were Conservatives or Liberals or Social

Crediters. Not at all. But we did discuss this debate and everybody found it horrible.

And the Conservatives are responsible for it because we have been ready to vote on this bill for two weeks now. If the bill is defeated, all right then, it will be defeated; if not, then it will pass.

It seems to me that under our democratic system we should at least have the privilege of taking a stand by voting in the house. The Conservatives are free to vote against Bill No. C-243. But as it is, they are preventing the house from voting on this matter, by going on with this marathon of speeches.

I sincerely think that I am now giving to Canada as a whole a true image of what is going on in parliament. This debate is disgusting to the people, costs hundreds of thousands of dollars to taxpayers and settles absolutely nothing. If the unification of the forces does not answer the purpose in ten years, it will still be time to change something.

We are neither angels nor saints. Legislation passed today can be amended in a year if it is not effective then.

The Canadian army is not now what it was in 1914-18. The means to fight are not the same as those which were used then. Everything has changed since 1914, even since the 1939-45 war. Weapons are not the same, means are not the same, systems of communication are not the same. Everything has changed, everything has evolved. Only the Conservatives are not following the times. They remain firmly seated in their place. They keep their conservatism: Let us keep outworn doctrines, obsolete methods, let us stand still; Let us show some stability. And what is the meaning of stability? To move neither forward not backward, but to remain always at the same place? But this is exactly what the Conservatives are doing at the present time.

The hon. member is making fun of Canadians, he is showing a complete lack of concern for the Canadian taxpayer in trying to prolong the debate. Tomorrow he will shout "closure" when a motion is brought in to put an end to the debate.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to accept that closure, to muzzle those irresponsible members of the house. We are certainly going to vote in favour of it.

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Caouette: Certainly.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Churchill: Would the hon. member accept a question? A question now and again helps out a debater who is running short of ideas.

Mr. Hellyer: You could have used some yourself last night.

Mr. Churchill: In view of the really grave problem that the hon. member raised yesterday concerning the dairy industry, and the opportunity that was afforded the government to debate the matter in the house yesterday, was it not the fault of the government that we continued on the unification bill? Second, does the hon. member not realize that the Liberals, whom he so slavishly supports on every occasion, do not really want his assistance; otherwise they would have permitted the debate on the dairy industry yesterday?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, as for the first part of the question asked by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, I will say he is right. Yesterday, I believe, the Liberals dodged their responsibilities and I charge those of the province of Quebec—I can see some there—who were too scared yesterday, and it is very much in order to say this, to get up and stand for the farmers, for the milk producers of Canada. This I will repeat throughout the whole province of Quebec, and in any case the whole province knows about it.

I make an exception for those from Montreal who never saw a cow being milked in their lives and do not understand the dairy industry situation, but the others from the province of Quebec are responsible if the government's dairy policy is not more generous.

The second part of the question is to the effect that we have an understanding with the Liberals, to support them or to have them support us on another occasion; there is no question of that and there will never be any question of that. And the hon. member is very well aware that we have voted more often with his group against the government than for the government since 1962. It is a fact. We are not bound to the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre or to the Liberal members. The Liberal members from Quebec know that we are not bound to them. We are free. We can say whatever we like and we can vote as we see fit. But we want to vote in the best interests of the Canadian people.

As far as the change proposed in Bill No. C-243 is concerned, I think it cannot be effected overnight. It will take ten or 15 years perhaps before unification can be accomplished. But I am pretty sure that at that time, the cost of national defence for the country as a whole will be less than it is at present. We shall then be able to take out of the billions saved through unification certain amounts that we could appropriate to agriculture, to our domestic expansion, to the development of our natural resources.

Then, as I say, we will have helped every class of our Canadian society, every Canadian, regardless of political consideration. I am convinced of that.

That is why we, of the Ralliement Créditiste, have decided to vote in favour of Bill No. C-243. There are no other reasons. It is not for the reason suggested by the hon. member, to the effect that the Liberals opposed the debate yesterday, though it is true that they did oppose it.

Had the ministers, had the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) suggested yesterday that we should debate the matter of the Canadian dairy industry, Mr. Chairman, we would probably be still at it today, had the house given unanimous consent. But no, there is no wish to—

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. I believe that the hon. member has no right to speak as he is doing at present, because we are quite familiar with standing orders on this side of the house and we knew that the motion introduced yesterday would be lost, as it actually was.

I would ask my good friends of the Ralliement Créditiste to learn the rules of the house properly and not to introduce to no avail motions for an urgent debate when the said rules do not allow it.

[*English*]

The Chairman: Order. This might be a good time for the Chair to remind hon. members that the question before the committee is clause 2 of Bill No. C-243.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) rose last night and took the time to say what he had to say. Again this afternoon he is allowed to repeat exactly the same stupidities he uttered last night in this house.

I want to say this: if the Liberals had accepted the debate yesterday, we would have had it. They know that the motion has not been ruled out of order. It was said yesterday specifically that it was not the proper time for such a debate but that it might be the proper time today.

When the time comes for a vote of non-confidence Mr. Chairman, the member for Lotbinière may take a position for or against the farmers of his constituency of Lotbinière.

As far as the standing orders are concerned, I believe the members of the Ralliement Créditiste understand them as well as the hon. member for Lotbinière who is 100 per cent wrong and far afield when he rises in the house to make a speech or on a point of order.

Mr. Choquette: Sure. That is because I like the fields.

Mr. Caouette: Precisely, but perhaps you do not like the same sort of things.

Mr. Chairman, I do not hold a grudge against the member for Lotbinière, not at all. He is a fine fellow, a gentleman. His only weakness is being too Liberal. When he is not overly Liberal, he is otherwise intelligent.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Chairman, I conclude my remarks here with a specific and clear reminder that we want to be objective in this debate. The Conservatives know that we are wasting the time of the house and that there are other important items of legislation to pass. They have been told that we could stand section 2 temporarily, in order to pass other sections, and that we could come back to section 2 later, but no, they do not want to do so; they are stubborn.

All I ask is that the debate make some progress, that we get on with our discussions and that we stop ridiculing the Canadian people and making ourselves ridiculous in the eyes of the Canadian people. This question of unification must be settled. Very soon the government will be charged with dictatorship because of a motion calling for the end of the debate in committee. I do not consider that as the application of a gag but rather as the establishment of some kind of order to make us stop wasting our time here.

We must be objective and see the bill as it is. If we must try something new, let us go ahead. Something must be tried. If it does not work, it is possible to make a change, but let us try it. And if the experiment proves to be useless, unsuccessful, I will be the first to turn against it and to look for a new way of creating a Canadian army which will be

effective, which will not waste money, of which we will be proud not only in Canada but throughout the world.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a contribution to this debate, because I think it is a most important and most interesting one, and because I cannot understand the stubbornness of the official opposition in fighting this legislation, particularly the stubbornness of the flying squad, if I may call it that, composed mainly of the hon. members for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Nugent), the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) and the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. MacInnis).

One of the arguments of the official opposition against Bill No. C-243, from the start of this debate, has been that all retired top officers oppose the unification of the armed forces.

At the beginning of my remarks I should like to put on the record some of the statements issued by officers who are surely as distinguished as those who are opposed to unification and integration, by high-ranking retired officers who give their unqualified support to unification.

The first is that of Air Vice Marshal Sully, as reproduced by the Canadian Press on November 9, 1966, and I quote:

[*English*]

When so many ex senior officers are bursting into print with emotional opposition to Mr. Hellyer's plans for unification of our defence services, it is time that some of us who support this forward movement spoke up.

As an experienced senior officer and as a businessman,—

And I emphasize "businessman".

—I find it difficult to understand how any rationally-minded man could oppose this excellent move to unification of our defence services.

Mr. Dinsdale: He must be a Liberal. A Liberal must have written that.

Mr. Prud'homme: Politics are not allowed in the Canadian armed forces.

Continuing:

I speak with intimate knowledge when I say that if the public was aware of the tremendous overlapping of effort, and the consequent inefficiency, and of the appalling inter-service jealousies and rivalries for status, they would rise as one and demand immediate unification and at a much faster clip than is now planned.

Mr. Churchill: Would the hon. member identify the author of that?

Mr. Prud'homme: In case the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre wonders, I did my share in the Canadian armed forces. I was in Shilo, Manitoba, for two years, and I was in a position to see that what the minister advocates is correct. I shall now continue quoting:

Another problem that worries me and indeed frightens me, is that this plan was put forward over two years ago. Everyone was informed of it and the intention of this plan was obvious to any thoughtful man or officer. What were these senior officers doing in the last two years? They have had every opportunity to express themselves. Have they just finally found their way through on this business? This frightens me. Is this an indication of the lethargy in thinking in our services? Fortunately, I have spoken to many young and dedicated officers and they are all enthusiastic about the plan. Of course, some others will have to "pull up their socks" and perhaps they shudder a bit.

[*Translation*]

And he continues as follows:

[*English*]

To our politicians, please get thinking about Canada. Forget about your party status. This is a real opportunity and you will be happy and proud you had a chance to help.

Mr. Churchill: Who signed that article?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: I would ask you now to hear what Commodore A. B. Fraser-Harris has to say:

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: Would the hon. member identify the author?

Mr. Prud'homme: This is by the Canadian Press of November 9, 1966.

Mr. Churchill: But who is the author of the letter?

Mr. Prud'homme: Air Vice Marshal Sully.

[*Translation*]

Let us listen now to Commodore A. B. Fraser-Harris, who said the following in a telegram he sent to the Canadian Press, probably to Mr. David MacIntosh, of whom I should like to speak later:

[*English*]

Heard from abroad the traditionalist uproar against service unification. At a time when enlightened people throughout the world are learning at last that the pigment of human skin is not a mark of quality, local concern over the colour of a uniform or the title of a man appears singularly unimpressive.

And please listen to this:

Let us always be willing to learn from history and be strengthened by tradition but let us never forget that history is made by the actions of men

and that men create tradition and pride of title not vice versa.

Unification of the three services is undoubtedly sound and timely. Let interservice jealousy, personal rivalry and the extravagances of triplication give way to a single, effective and streamlined service in which Canadians can build future history and new tradition in the service of Canada, whether by land, sea, air or space.

Mr. Dinsdale: Would the hon. member permit a question? It seems to me that the hon. member is talking about integration and not unification. If he talks of unification how can he bring the sea, land, air and space together.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: I very seldom rise to speak in the house and hon. members opposite have told me so. With your permission, I shall come back to this whole problem. As far as I am concerned, it is part of the same operation.

Those statements, Mr. Chairman, are those of retired senior officers. They know very well what they are talking about and they definitely support unification. Their number increases constantly.

As for members of the opposition, at a certain time, and even today, I count seven of them—which shows the extraordinary opposition they have raised against this matter which, according to them, will destroy our traditions—I count one, two, three, four, five and even nine of them in the house. Monday night last, April 3, there were only five. That is no doubt an indication of their conviction.

Wing Commander Yellowlees certainly put his finger on it when he said, and I quote the *Calgary-Herald* of December 10, 1966:

[*English*]

For months now Canadians have been watching military traditionalists arguing against unification. The dispute unfortunately, has been shamefully distorted by emotion, blatant politics and jowl-shaking demagoguery.

This is written by a man called Yellowlees —not Lee.

Mr. Churchill: Lee's name comes into everything.

Mr. Prud'homme: That is the name I have heard many times since this debate started.

• (4:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

However, I cannot understand those relentless attacks against a man by the name of Lee.

[Mr. Prud'homme.]

[*English*]

I have heard it said of Mr. David McIntosh of the Canadian Press that he is biased, superficial, and does not report objectively to the Canadian population. He may be biased yet many editorials are written on his reports, columns are based on them and cartoons are drawn. I do not wish it to be thought that when I speak I reflect the words of Mr. Lee, just as I do not think when the hon. member for Athabasca speaks he reflects the hidden words of Mr. McIntosh. I do not care to behave in that way. I shall now continue:

Modern—and future—military operations call for hard, business-like methods. The scientist, the engineer and the logistics expert will be all-important.

That might have concerned the hon. member for Brandon—

An hon. Member: Brandon-Souris.

Mr. Prud'homme: Brandon has a nice sound. I went there every week end for two summers.

Mr. Churchill: It is close to Shilo.

Mr. Prud'homme: I continue quoting:

The future demands the utmost in efficiency. Let us listen to Mr. Hellyer.

[*Translation*]

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see briefly who is against this policy. They are of many categories. First, there is the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) who still endeavours to define unification but who did not bother to read the record of the committee proceedings in which, on many instances, the minister defined unification as follows:

[*English*]

When I refer to a unified force, I refer to a single integrated service encompassing the naval, land, air and support units necessary to carry out its assigned roles and missions, and operating under unified management.

[*Translation*]

That is clear enough, I think. And then there is the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Nugent). I intended to take up every point of his numerous statements. I am not in the habit, on the other hand, of launching verbal attacks against anybody in an unparliamentary manner. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) must have noted that I have followed his remarks very closely. I have listened to his many interventions which are always made

courteously. I obviously disagree with the hon. member, but I must admit that he expresses his views in an acceptable and reasonable manner, at least in this house.

His participation in this debate is not to be compared with that of the member for Edmonton-Strathcona who is constantly using insulting language and always suspecting conspiracies everywhere, behind the curtains, in the office of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer) and in the Liberal caucus. I would rather not mention the hon. member's remarks, but I say to this house that whether or not we are in favour of the unification and integration of our armed forces, we ought never utter such words. That was unfortunate, and if I were allowed to do so, I would apologize for him before the house for the remarks he made here.

Next, there is the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. MacInnis). All hon. members know him.

[*English*]

He is a jumping member, always very devoted to his constituency, I would agree; but when it comes to these large and important questions I think he is completely out of order. I am sorry he is not here; I am sure we could have a good debate between us. Perhaps we shall have it at another time.

[*Translation*]

But for some reason, which is beyond my understanding, the member for Cape Breton South replaced the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Fane) during some of the committee meetings.

The major contribution of the hon. member of Cape Breton South during the discussion was a personal and malicious attack against the minister. I took out several other epithets, because I want to concentrate on what I said earlier about the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona. Mr. Chairman, I pass over three lines of the text which I had prepared and over all the epithets which I could have used to qualify, not the member for Cape Breton South personally, but his statements. So, he said these things about the hon. minister, and above all, he offered the fallacious idea that unification would lead to conscription.

Moreover, our hon. friend, the member for Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ricard) said the same things last night. He also saw the dark cloud of conscription looming on the horizon. He knows that his words may cause the people to follow him, the nation or the state call it what you will; I do not like semantics as much as that. He will try to arouse the feelings of the French speaking population which seems to be afraid of conscription. I think the hon. members for Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot and for Cape Breton South get on well together. They will probably be conscripted, but certainly not in the army.

Now, I shall talk about the contribution made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) who, instead of dealing with Bill No. C-243, made a violent diatribe against the new Minister of Justice (Mr. Trudeau) who, it seems, had written some articles in a magazine called *Cité Libre*. Therefore, I made a few inquiries. I remember when I was a student, regularly reading *Cité Libre* as all the University students did in the province of Quebec.

I particularly remembered that the new Minister of Justice was even then an impartial observer, and that he had not merely talked about Liberal members and the Liberal party.

In an article I will be allowed to quote—I will do exactly as he did—written by Pierre Elliott Trudeau in *Cité Libre* on April 16, 1960, here is what the author said of the then prime minister, Mr. Diefenbaker now Leader of the Opposition:

DIEFENBAKER UP IN A BALLOON

—Mr. Diefenbaker could have chosen—without being blamed for it—to govern quietly during the years required to learn the trade of statesman. If he had proceeded thus, by slow and thoughtful maturation, the Conservative leader might have eventually given his party a truly historic dimension. Whereas now, that party is in way of becoming the usual mixture of loud-mouths and adventurers, a collection of lawyers at so much per mile and contractors at so much per square foot, in short, the traditional party of Canadian politicians.

In fact, Mr. Diefenbaker has chosen to strain his talent. Elected by the greatest majority since confederation, this leader could hardly bear to think that some traces of the Liberal legend could subsist. He seemed determined to overshadow the very shadows filling our current political history.

First, there was Mr. Pearson, Nobel prize, highly respected in every chancery throughout the world and leader of the opposition.

Mr. Grafftey: That is because Mr. Trudeau was a socialist at that time.

Mr. Prud'homme:

Mr. Diefenbaker had to rush to overshadow him by rising as a giant on the international scene.

You remember Mr. Chairman, his dream, his vision of a great commonwealth—

To go on:

Unfortunately, his balloon sprung a leak over Asia, notably in Pakistan where misery, riots and anti-parliamentary governments showed him a thing or two on the hazards of a common policy—

But there was also Mr. Howe, this satyr of trade and finance who had left his indelible imprint on the direction of our economy.

Mr. Diefenbaker decided that any trace of that man had to disappear, and he hurriedly announced a drastic 15 per cent reorientation of our international trade. In terms of political economy, it was very odd; but Great Britain made as though it played the game by proposing a free-trade system between our two countries.

• (4:40 p.m.)

There was also Mr. St. Laurent, one of the main architects of NATO and, who, in another field, was responsible for the repatriation of part of the Canadian constitution by amendment No. 2 of 1949. To outdo as fast as possible the achievements of the former liberal leader on strategic matters, Mr. Diefenbaker hurriedly led us into certain commitments towards NORAD with such an ill-considered zeal that our country finds itself in a state of military dependence which brings it back 100 years. And now, in the constitutional field, Mr. Diefenbaker announces that he will repatriate—

I spare you the rest, Mr. Chairman, but I wind up Mr. Trudeau's article, and I have many others anyway. Therefore I quote:

In all those instances, and in many others, those were generous measures but—one must regret it—they remained for the most part, just good intentions. They were balloons filled with hot air and pushed by the wind which invariably crashed with their operator before going too far.

Mr. Diefenbaker's good intentions have failed so often that we are justified to find in them the very nature of his style—

And he has not changed, as you will note.

—now, as Buffon said, the style is the man himself. Thinking that inspiration does for reflection, he lacks the patience or the modesty to hurry slowly, he does not find it necessary to gather around him men able to establish the Canadian policy on deeprooted reason.

I will spare the house this quotation and go on.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Asselin, Richmond-Wolfe): Will the hon. member allow the hon. member for Rosthern to ask him a question?

Mr. Prud'homme: When I have concluded my remarks, Mr. Chairman. I come now to retired officers.

Mr. Grafftey: He was giving his support to the New Democratic Party at that time.

[Mr. Prud'homme.]

Mr. Prud'homme: Yes, and that goes to prove the open-mindedness of the Liberal party; he saw the light and joined the Liberal party. What can I do about it?

You know, Mr. Chairman, some people spend their lives dreaming. As for him, he is a practical man. He knew he could build something concrete, he realized that only within the Liberal party he could make his fair contribution to the greatness of this country, Canada, and that is why he joined the Liberal party. That also is the reason why the hon. member for Hochelaga became a member of the Liberal party, and that goes for the Quebec leader also. What is wrong with that?

The Progressive Conservatives cannot do that because they would rather look to the past than to the future.

I quote the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, when he said at the beginning of his remarks on April 5, 1967—

Mr. Grafftey: They are only good opportunists.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi wants to, he can tell it himself to the Minister of Justice who will surely reply.

I ask the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi to note the essential difference between the Liberal and Conservative parties. I therefore quote the member for Winnipeg South Centre who said on Wednesday April 5, 1967:

I begin, by expressing my regret that in our centennial year we should be involved in a debate such as this. During centennial year, we are emphasizing the history and traditions of our country in every hamlet—

I will read no further, Mr. Chairman. But when the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre rose to speak and set forth his theory on Canada, my speech was ready and I wanted to rise and say:

As we enter the second century of our existence, we must come up with bills such as the one proposed to us by the defence minister, which are oriented toward the future, without necessarily disavowing the past.

But the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre was consistent with himself and with the policy of his party, which is to look to the past and ignore the world in which we live. He is consistent with the policy of his party. I do not blame him for it, I am not insulting him. Let us not disturb him, for he is listening carefully.

That is the basic difference between a Conservative and a Liberal. Perhaps, the Conservative party needs a unification and integration bill, for the integration of the forces which are scattered for unification.

There are retired officers. I think Group Captain Patrick—and I should like to insist, because I would not want the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre or some other hon. members opposite to say that I am trying to speak against our British institutions, for I respect them—

[*English*]

—I will say that in English. I respect our traditions and our past. I am proud to be a member of this House of Commons where we have the British parliamentary system. I respect that; but I am not so blind that I cannot look to the future—

[*Translation*]

—said exactly what I should have liked to say, but I prefer to quote his own words, which are at the bottom of page 1284:

[*English*]

One of the fears expressed about integration which does have a certain amount of popular appeal has to do with tradition—and tradition is symbolized by one word, "uniform".

We do not have a Canadian uniform, just as we did not have a Canadian flag. Many of the same kind of people who raised such a fuss about getting a new flag now do so over the uniform and for the same reasons.

[*Translation*]

I went to the trouble of seeking out the names of those who spoke in the flag debate. I went to the trouble of listening to the 290 speeches made in this house at that time. I was a brand new member of parliament. The same arguments were repeated then. The hon. members taking part in the present debate are the very same ones who spoke then. The hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Nugent) spoke eight times; the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) spoke three times; the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) spoke five times; the hon, member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) spoke ten times; and the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) spoke 22 times. These same people, today, when we are studying a bill to Canadianize our institutions, are again rising to accuse us of wishing to repudiate our past.

I do not deny our past and our Canadian institutions. But I believe Canada is the country in the world which has known the longest and most peaceful evolution toward complete sovereignty.

And I say that this bill is part of this normal evolution of Canadian institutions. When I look to the future, does that mean that I jeer at the past? Does that mean, for instance, that I am not proud of the part played by my brother who served in the armed services and fought in Europe during seven years? Does that mean that those who died, whether they were French speaking or English speaking—

[*English*]

Personally I am becoming a little tired of speaking in both English and French. I should like to make this clear, however, that I am proud to be participating in this debate as a French Canadian. To correct myself, I will say I am proud to be participating in this debate as a Canadian of French culture. So I am going to speak in your language because I like you. At least you stand for your principles. I disagree with your principles, but at least you stand for them. However, as a Canadian of French culture I believe you know where I put the emphasis. I think this is a good bill; it is a bill for the young Canadians to be proud of.

[*Translation*]

I do not see why the hon. member would not be proud to take part in it. Air colonel Kenneth Patrick continues by saying:

[*English*]

We do not have a Canadian uniform.

The Canadian Navy uniform is a copy of the British Navy uniform.

[*Translation*]

And I have another quotation.

[*English*]

I think it was Admiral Brock or Admiral Rayner who explained that the Canadian Navy uniform is different because it has a zipper. Big deal.

I will continue with the quotation:

The Canadian Army uniform is the British Army uniform.

There is nothing distinctively Canadian about any of our uniforms and this has already caused some real problem in our peace keeping tasks. There is a quotation here which is very long and I do not intend to read it, but I suggest that hon. members might read it. During the last war and during the years since, Canadian servicemen have had a

problem to identify themselves as Canadians. One of the ways of doing this is with a distinctive Canadian uniform. Is it being anti-British to ask for something that is pro-Canadian? I should like somebody some day to explain that to me.

There is evidence at the moment that in England there is a new demand for one armed service. I turn to the *Morning Herald* of Sydney, Australia.

You should read this article. It is very interesting.

> The debate has been given impetus by the submission of annual plans by individual departments.
>
> Critics are saying that Mr. Healey's latest reforms, mainly the abolition of separate ministers for each of the three services, do not go anything like far enough.
>
> It is known that proposals for much more sweeping reforms have been put to Mr. Healey—

Not Hellyer—Healey.

> —particularly for a unified policy on weapons. Mr. Healey has rejected these proposals. He is a "strong" minister who feels he can overcome inter-service rivalries and he refuses to contemplate an ultimate unified armed service. He argues that tradition is too deeply embedded.

It seems that only Canadians could think that our minister could not do something good in this way. It seems to be the belief of some that everything the minister does, because he sits on this side of the house, is wrong. I have read the article in the Sydney *Morning Herald* where it refers to Mr. Paul Hellyer as the able and thrusting Canadian defence minister.

[*Translation*]

I conclude—I still have five minutes; I kept track of my time—with Mr. Patrick's last paragraph.

[*English*]

> There is talk about the new uniform, the colour and what type it should be. I do not think anybody really cares so long as it is sensible and functional.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, a fortnight ago the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre—he has a lot to say—asked that the Red Ensign be flown at Vimy. I respect the Red Ensign, but it no longer is the Canadian flag. The single leaf flag is Canada's flag.

Mr. Chairman, much is said, often blindly, within the bounds of tradition, with no possibility of escape toward new attractive concepts.

[Mr. Prud'homme.]

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Prud'homme: I have just four minutes.

Mr. Churchill: All right.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: The hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) have asked for a pause in order to think things over and make sure we are heading in the right direction. But did they stop to think whether it was wise to clamour for the resignation of the chief of staff, General Allard, or to tell him in the house to "shut up"? Did they take the time to check the accuracy of the reports published in the press? Surely not. No more, indeed, than they apologize for the off-hand manner in which they handled this unfortunate affair.

On the other hand, we find on the part of headquarters nothing but sensible and effective planning, checked and double-checked, with the assurance that it is time to go ahead, that we are going in the right direction and that the time to act has come.

Mr. Chairman, I pass over two quotations, because I would like to read the last one. I shall not say—I do not think I will be forced to do it—who said this.

• (4:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

If you should like to know who made the statement let me read you the last paragraph of my speech. Before doing so I should say that I am not referring to any hon. member of this house. This is the quotation:

> Any idiot can go on doing what has been done before, but it takes real courage, intelligence and character to assess the needs of the future, to devise a sound program and carry it into effect. This is particularly true of the armed services, which become merely an expensive luxury unless the process of improvement, modernization, forward thinking, and planning goes on continuously.

An hon. Member: Who said that?

Mr. Prud'homme: This was said in an address to the Royal Society of Military Engineers on July 20, 1962, by someone I hope my hon. friends will respect. It was said by none other than the husband of the Queen of Canada, the Duke of Edinburgh.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Would the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. Prud'homme: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I still have three minutes so that—

[*English*]

The Chairman: Order, please. The hon. gentleman's allotted time has expired. Does he have unanimous consent to answer questions?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, my question is as follows: I admit that the hon. member for Saint-Denis' eloquence is proverbial, if I can thus express myself. He entertained us and was interesting. Why did the hon. member not show the same eloquence in favour of Canadian milk producers yesterday when I brought forward a motion to adjourn the business of the house to discuss the matter?

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Chairman, I know that I am probably out of order, but I will answer briefly. If the hon. member knew the work performed at the Quebec caucus, if he were aware of the representations made by the Quebec members at the national caucus, in short, if he knew the work done in a special committee of the Liberal caucus of Canada concerning farming policy—he is just coming from Montreal, he said so—he would not speak as he is doing now. Soon, however, he will recognize what has been accomplished, by the hon. member for Lotbinière, Richmond-Wolfe and Lévis, Messrs. Choquette, Asselin, Guay, in short, by all those who represent rural constituencies.

Mr. Choquette: Another $30 million for agriculture.

Mr. Prud'homme: Then, the hon. member for Villeneuve will see that farmers will be delighted to meet unbiased members of the Liberal party who do not wish to be demagogic with respect to the dairy policy of the Liberal government.

Mr. Caouette: Ineffectual work.

[*English*]

The Chairman: Order, please. The committee has heard the question and the answer, both of which are out of order.

Mr. Bigg: Mr. Chairman, the same old story is coming from the Liberal side of this house; there is no need to discuss this bill further.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bigg: It is always encouraging to receive applause at the beginning of one's speech. I am quite sure that when I have finished there will be little applause from that side of the house. I had not intended to begin on an emotional note, but the last speaker would be disappointed if I did not pay some attention to his remarks. Let me say a word or two in this regard. That hon. member was trying to present the same old argument. In doing so he was attempting to drive a wedge between loyal English speaking Canadians and loyal French speaking Canadians, and there are many in both categories.

It is not fair to say that because a man spoke on the flag debate or now speaks on the defence debate, he is necessarily a wasp. Let me remind the hon. gentleman that on June 13, 1940, I was not baring my little bosom to the spear in the outskirts of London. I was within 30 miles of Paris, and I was with a very specialized arm of the services, the Royal Canadian Horse Artillery.

Some hon. Members: Near the rear.

Mr. Bigg: I do not believe unification as it has been explained so far is at all necessary to meet the needs for men of tremendous experience, training and specialization. I am not one of those, nor shall I ever be, who would refuse to serve my country because of the colour of the uniform—and I know something about serving in a colourful uniform, as many hon. members are aware. I like to put first things first.

When I spoke on this debate the other day I was referring to the survival of Canada for Canadians. We must attack this whole suggested method of survival at its root. Are we willing as a nation to defend Canada to the last man? My answer is an unequivocal yes. I believe everyone who has accepted Canadian citizenship, whether of French, Ukrainian, German or any other origin, would accept anything that would increase the efficiency of our armed forces.

We are debating this bill because we want to satisfy ourselves that in the long term planning for the defence of Canada it will be sound in every last detail. I am not against any revolution which is evolutionary and will streamline our active forces.

As my last reference to personalities during this debate I should like to say that I find it a little tiresome to be lectured about my dedication or motivation by an individual whose great claim to military experience is two years at Camp Shilo and three years in Laflèche Caverne. I speak from experience because I was on the outskirts of Paris in 1940. I think that everyone should give credit to those who were there for having decent motives.

Let me paraphrase what Gibbon wrote in "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire". He said that Rome fell when the young men would rather wear silk pants and play with dice in the streets than defend the walls of Rome. I appeal to everyone within the sound of my voice or who takes the trouble to read *Hansard*—and I know that I will not be quoted by the press—to realize that we are dealing with a very basic principle of survival. Surely we should all listen to anyone who wants to make some contribution to this debate.

The role of the defence department is unique and defence should not in any way be based on politics. This department should serve Canada. That is its only job and only reason for existence. If you will pardon my rather stilted French, it is the *raison d'être*. I assure the minister and the defence department that I am not afraid of revolutionary changes which increase the efficiency of our armed forces.

• (5:00 p.m.)

As I said before, I do not think these things depend on the colour of the uniform. We have listened to many emotional appeals with regard to these wonderful uniforms, but I think any real soldier would serve Canada regardless of the colour of the uniform. If there is a policy, whether it is in the mind of the minister, the Department of National Defence as a whole, a political party or leaders in this country, no matter how eminent they may be, of looking forward with confidence to the peaceful existence of mankind on this planet, and that policy with regard to our defence is predicated on this wonderful dream, I say those who have devised the policy are self-condemned and self-disqualified in respect of this very important job.

I believe the revolutionary ideas of the minister are pale, compared with some of my own. I am not the minister of national defence. Rather than the emphasis being put on unification and doing away with regimental mottos and regimental dress, I would like to see a standardization of defence for the North American continent. I would like to see our defence units interchangeable with those of the Americans, because nobody but a blind man, nobody but a deaf man would suggest that we can survive in the next 25 years on this planet unless we stand shoulder to shoulder with our American allies. I say "American allies" because we are allies of theirs in two great theatres; I do not think you could call us allies of theirs in the Pacific theatre at the present time. I believe very sincere efforts are being made by Canada to be a mediator in this conflict. I would like to see Canada able to mediate and be instrumental in bringing peace to Viet Nam, peace with honour, in the name of humanity. But I do not think a red herring should be dragged into this defence debate and that because we are trying to do something worth while in Viet Nam, Cyprus or the Gaza strip we should close our eyes to the need for taking a very, very hard look at establishing a fully effective armed force for Canada.

I believe it is not necessary to unify our forces in the way put forward in this bill. I would like to see this money spent in standardization, because I believe that standardization between us and the Americans on land, sea, in the air and even in space, would in the end result save us money; and who is there so base that they would not try to save us money—with apologies to Shakespeare.

The standardizing of training is extremely important. I cannot conceive of our taking part in another world war without our American cousins there to supply men at the ratio of 10 to 1, and probably 20 to 1 in dollars. It would be a sensible move on our part if, when we needed ammunition, we could get it from our allies; if when we needed spare parts for our tanks, the assembly lines in the United States were able to supply them; if when we needed shells, we could get them from our allies. We should be able to call upon our allies to help us when help is needed. In a total war, which we can visualize, the whole potential of Canada's manufacturing industry could be knocked out with one blow. With about three atom bombs you could knock out Canada's effectiveness in manufacturing.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we should go for standardization rather than unification. In my opinion it will not help Canada one bit to establish a small, very ineffective, unified force as envisaged by this bill. The colour of the uniform of this unified force will not help in the defence of Canada. I doubt very much whether changing the uniform to that of one solid colour, whatever colour it may be, will encourage us to stand together man for man and carry our burden man for man. We would all go for a standardization of uniform if it meant there would be no such thing in the future as a hyphenated Canadian and we were all just Canadians. Would the previous speaker have me believe that standardizing the uniform will mean we will get more volunteers from all the ethnic groups in

Canada? Does the hon. member think that for a minute?

I can see something in standardizing training. Certainly we should train all our officers so that they have a broad knowledge of military affairs. We live in a complicated world. In future wars we will probably want to transport our troops by air. It would therefore be very desirable if all our officers, and men if we could do this, had a working knowledge of airplanes, tactics and aerodynamics. However, as an ex-service officer I know this cannot be done. I know that you cannot make an expert artillery officer, an expert submarine commander and an expert jet pilot out of each and every one of us. We all know this, so why pretend? If we realize that we cannot do this, why not spell it out and say so? If we do not expect men to be jacks-of-all-trades and masters of none, let us spell it out and say that we still need specialists.

The minister does not say this; he uses ambiguous language in this bill. As we discuss the clauses of the bill we will take every word and deal with its significance. It is said that in an emergency servicemen can be transferred. Gentlemen, war is an emergency. The only reason for having armed forces at all is the threat of war. We are not spending $1.7 billion a year to maintain a gentlemen's club. The object should be to train men for war. That is the only reason for our having a Department of National Defence.

I would be delighted to make some contribution to a world peace keeping force. As hon. members know perfectly well, the recent suggestion by Canada has already been turned down. I have no doubt that as the United Nations gains in world prestige and as the communist nations in particular mature and recognize the need for world peace, nations will be willing to go along with the consensus of the world. I hope this will be the case, but we have not yet seen any indication that it will be. Russia has consistently refused to pay her way in the United Nations. China is not yet seated in the United Nations. We are not debating that topic at the moment; we must look at the world situation as it exists. Every move made by our Department of National Defence must be toward the security of this nation. The Department of National Defence should be taking a long term view in this respect. We must put wishful thinking in the background, which is its proper place.

The last speaker mentioned one or two things with which I cannot disagree. We need men of courage. We need men of character. We need men who are not afraid to lead. We need men who cannot be panicked in any situation. We need men who will put the defence of Canada first. We must have men whose characters stand up between wars, who are prepared to take a cold, hard look at the situation in the world and say that we must remain prepared and must remain strong.

• (5:10 p.m.)

I would like to see Canada so strong at home, so united, so well trained in our armed forces, and so well able to protect this sprawling northern half of the North American continent that she could afford to give some of her armed strength to the underprivileged nations of the world, in the name of the United Nations. I am proud of the contributions we have made so far, but if we take 29,000 men and spread them out to put out six spot fires in the world, what are we going to do if the ugly shadow of a war were to hang over Canada?

I do not know whether I am making my point clearly. I am not only criticizing; I am offering an alternative. My alternative to unification, as it is laid down in the bill, is standardization. It also means national service. This is supposed to be a dirty word; it is supposed to be one we are afraid to use in this country. Why should it be? What is wrong with serving Canada? I am not asking anyone to go off on Anglo-Saxon wars. I am asking that Canada be defended. Why should it be otherwise?

Some of my ancestors were in this country when Jacques Cartier landed. Let nobody give me the senior citizen act, in other words, "We were here first and you took our country away". We did no such thing. The Anglo-Saxon part of my family came out here looking for exactly the same thing as did the glorious French settlers. They were looking for a better life. They were looking for freedom. These people have made me proud to be a Canadian.

We Canadians of the two founding races stood together on two occasions when we were invaded by the now friendly nation to the south, something it has not seen fit to do again in 150 years. It was not because our soldiers were dressed in a common uniform. They had no uniforms: They fought in their overalls; they fought in their skirts; the women helped, the children loaded the guns. The only unification we had then was the unification of our dedication to Canada. We will not

achieve unification in Canada by branding everyone who does not speak the same language or is not of the same race. Name calling, whether it be between person and person or race and race, will never make Canada what I want it to be.

I hope the small contribution I made during the war will not be misinterpreted, because at that time I was fighting for the French Canadians as well as the English Canadians and the Indian Canadians. I fought for the little creek out west as well as for the little creek in Quebec, and the acreage surrounding it. So let us stop calling each other names. Let us take a good hard look at our defence. Let us not indulge in negative emotionalism, which is just as bad as positive emotionalism.

We should all be aware of the contribution made by the people of French origin in this country, the members of the Royal 22nd Regiment, which is second to none. I may be wrong and I stand to be corrected, but it is my understanding that an exception will be made in the case of the Royal 22nd Regiment so far as unification is concerned, in that it will be allowed to keep its proud traditions. If such is the case, why then should we ask all other units to give up their traditions? There is good reason for allowing the Royal 22nd to keep its name, and the reason is that in two world wars it has made that name immortal. There is no virtue whatsoever in burying traditions which are worth keeping, but I would be the first to bury those traditions which tend to divide us.

The hon. member for Saint-Denis did not take the trouble to remind the house that I spoke four times in the flag debate for a total of 160 minutes. I am not ashamed to advise hon. members to get out their *Hansards* and read my speeches. If anyone can find one word in those speeches which tended to inflame our differences, rather than to beg for mutual respect, which I expect and which I give to every Canadian citizen, I will resign my seat in the house. During those speeches I was interrupted and was told to my face that I would be "rubbed out". I did not lose my temper because I realized that those were emotional interjections which were not to be taken seriously by anyone who wants us to be a great nation—which we can be and which we are.

It is unseemly for us to put anything above the welfare of Canada. We need a department of defence which represents parliament and therefore the people of Canada. We need a minister who is not only daring but who bends an attentive ear for all those people who can help him achieve this great end. Having served under men like Lieutenant General Guy Simonds I cannot believe that he would do anything but give the minister, directly or indirectly, the kind of advice which comes from the bottom of his heart.

I cannot believe that men, some of whom have served in the Royal Canadian Navy for more than 30 years, would do anything but give the minister the kind of advice which they believe will make Canada's navy even better than it has been throughout our magnificent history. The same applies to our air force. By the turn of this century we may have to move into a category of defence where space looms large. I hope that the other branches of our services, which relatively speaking are falling in importance, our land, naval and air services, will be given proper emphasis and the proper number of dollars in their kitties. Are we to be panicked into unifying our forces, without thought, merely because in the past there were those in the armed services who thought more of building a little empire of their own than they did of serving Canada, or those who would rather climb over the next in rank in order to get the brass. No doubt there would be such people in Canada but they are few and far between, or else Canada would not have the finest naval, air force and army personnel to be found anywhere in the world.

We are not happy to give up our traditions. We are proud of the gallant men whose ranks are thinning, men who made greater sacrifices and gave greater service to the country than I ever did. I had to see the Battle of Britain from the ground. I was in England for four and a half years and ate the rations which were brought across by our merchant navy, which has not as yet received the recognition which I think it deserves. Who would not rather have been an infantry officer in England stationed in the sunny south downs than chief petty officer in the stoke-hole? But these little things are not important. There is not a serving member in the Canadian armed forces who cares more about medals or uniforms than to serve the country and keep it free.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I am sincerely worried about whether or not Canada will ever take her part again in fighting, if necessary, an aggressive war for freedom. I do not know when a war is aggressive and when it is purely defensive. The little training I received taught me that in

many cases the best defence is offence. You have to be trained therefore to last, as well as to retain your temper and to keep quiet. There is a time for fighting and there is a time for talking peace. The role of the defence department is not that of talking peace. They have one job, and one job only, and that is to make sure that in time of danger Canada and Canadians can give a good account of themselves.

Are the days of 1914 when Winston Churchill was First Lord of the Admiralty forgotten? In the first days of August the cabinet met and decided it was inauspicious —that is the kind of word we use in peacetime—for the British parliament to mobilize the British fleet. However, during the 48 hours before war was declared Churchill mobilized the British fleet on his own initiative. This was not very democratic but is was common sense. This type of common sense has not been bettered in 53 years. This is the kind of leadership we need, but we cannot legislate that kind of leadership.

I could not agree more with the hon. member who just spoke when he said that you need character at the top. Character at the top will sift down right to the last serving man, to the last taxpayer in Canada. When you get this kind of dedication, this type of character, then the battle is half won. I have nothing to say about the character of the defence minister except perhaps to suggest he should take a good look at this bill to make sure the idea behind it is based on this one, clear fact, that this change is the best change he could make at this time for the future of our country. He has to be able to do that, perhaps against the will of his own leader. His own leader has the job of being a world statesman; he has to go to the peace tables around the world to try to make deals. The defence minister in Canada cannot make a deal with anybody, except his own conscience, before God, because the life of every man, woman and child in Canada is on the table.

Personally, I do not believe anything short of some definite move toward national service is any good at all. I do not expect there will be general agreement with this idea. We are in between two wars and we see no enemy. Certainly, I know that the survival of Britain depended on the fact that four out of five in England had seen some service. It was the home guard of England which held her together in the darkest days of the blitz. Thousands and thousands of men, some of them as old as 70, knew what to do. They knew where to go and how to take orders. The whole nation, at least mentally, was geared for war. It was the brass that let the people down then. The generals and the admirals did not speak out strongly but allowed the government to go to sleep. It was a miracle of character, a miracle of training, that held the British nation together. I unhesitatingly, therefore, believe it would be good for every young man in Canada to have a reasonable period of back straightening.

I have thought a lot about this matter. It would be a wonderful thing if every young man in Canada between the ages of 18 and 25 had an opportunity to put in, say, 18 months of national service. He could get out in the fresh air, meet friends from every corner of Canada and develop a little bit of physical fitness. He could get a little bit of discipline and be introduced to a pair of shears. You could clean him up and give him some soap and water. Who knows, he may get used to it. By the way, I am not pointing the finger and saying that I believe all young Canadians are long-haired slobs. They are not; but we should give every man, and today perhaps the women as well, not only an opportunity to do his or her duty but should give them the opportunity to undertake a national obligation by putting themselves at the service of their country for a short time. They should be given an opportunity, while they are young and active, not only to know themselves but to know other young people in Canada, who I know are basically just as good as we ever were, and perhaps in many cases a good deal better.

The Chairman: Order. I wish to advise the hon. member that the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Finish your remarks.

Mr. Bigg: Thank you. I have spoken to thousands of people in Canada and I know that this sounds like a politically hot issue. However, if we can get together to give our young people in Canada an opportunity to do this, I think it would be a nine day wonder. Before the turn of the century, people would look back and say that in centennial year we did some planning, that we gave up talking about the meaning of words like "unification", "standardization" and "morale", and all these other things and took some positive, sensible steps to see that when our test comes our young men will not be sitting in the streets playing with dice but will be manning Canada's walls.

National Defence Act Amendment

Mr. Herridge: I wish to make a few comments with respect to what I consider to be a certain amount of discrimination against the women who serve in our armed forces. My comments are based on conversations I have had with women serving in the navy, army and air force, as well as a number of other persons who are interested in this question either because of their interest in the armed forces or their interest in the question of non-discrimination because of colour, creed or sex. What I have to say, Mr. Chairman, is related directly to the principle and purpose of this bill because it is related to the efficient development of integration and to the maintenance of morale in the armed forces.

I know the minister has spoken on this question several times during the debate. I know the associate minister is also interested in doing all he can to maintain the morale of the armed forces. In that connection and in support of the argument I wish to make very briefly later, Mr. Chairman, I should like to quote from a statement made by the Prime Minister in this house on February 3 when he annonced the appointment of the royal commission on the status of women:

• (5:30 p.m.)

The government has decided to establish a royal commission on the status of women.

The Chairman will be Mrs. John Bird of Ottawa. Other members of the commission will be announced when their appointments have been completed.

The royal commission will be asked to inquire into and report on the status of women in Canada and to recommend that steps might be taken by the federal government to ensure their equality with men in all aspects of Canadian society. Its findings will, of course, have to take into account the division of legislative powers between the federal and provincial governments under the constitution.

The commissioners will be free to look into such matters as they feel are relevant and in particular the following areas:

—Laws and practices under federal jurisdiction concerning the political rights of women;

—The present and potential role of women in the Canadian labour force, including the special problems of married women in employment and measures that might be taken under federal jurisdiction to help in meeting them;—

That includes the Department of National Defence.

—Measures that might be taken under federal jurisdiction to permit the better use of the skills and education of women, including the special re-training requirements of married women who wish to re-enter professional or skilled employment;—

[Mr. Bigg.]

That too applies to the Department of National Defence.

—Federal labour laws and regulations in their application to women;

—Laws, practices and policies concerning the employment and promotion of women in the federal civil service, by federal crown corporations and by federal agencies;—

That provision relates directly to the Department of National Defence.

—Federal taxation pertaining to women;

—Marriage and divorce;

—The position of women under the criminal law;

—Immigration and citizenship laws, policies and practices with respect to women.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the policy announced by the Prime Minister to which the Minister of Manpower and Immigration has given his endorsement on many occasions in this house, as well as in speeches across the country. He is particularly concerned with the question of discrimination on any ground whatever in this country, and I support both the Prime Minister and the Minister of Manpower and Immigration in their approach to this very important matter. I am bringing these matters to the attention of the committee, Mr. Chairman, because they have been brought to my attention.

The committee may be interested to know that a number of women serving in the armed forces have informed me that they consider there is a measure of discrimination in the fact that women are not permitted to be trained for combat service in peace keeping operations. I was rather surprised to find that that was the case. I did make inquiries of certain sections of our armed forces, but I found no direct representations have been made to the navy, army or air force women's sections in this regard.

However, it has been suggested that the government should consider the policy adopted by the state of Israel and other countries whereby women have proven to be an effective arm of the combat forces of the country in question. I might say that in this respect there is a precedent in Canadian history. Anyone who knows the history of this country is aware that in the early days men and women fought together to defend this country from the invader and the enemy.

I am pleased to see that the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare is showing some interest in this question. I mention it here because it has been brought to my attention, and I always try to represent the views of persons in my

constituency and in other parts of Canada. As a result I agreed to bring the matter to the attention of this house. I would suggest to the associate minister, who I am pleased to notice is listening to me very carefully indeed, that he bring this question to the attention of the minister so that some consideration might be given to the inclusion of women in combat forces particularly used for peace keeping purposes.

I want to bring to the attention of the associate minister another matter in connection with the reserve officers training plan. I am informed that this does not apply to the army at all, and to the air force only when commissions are given from the ranks when the requirement exists. I understand that there is no discrimination as far as the navy is concerned with respect to their servicemen having the opportunity to take advantage of the reserve officers training plan.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is another illustration of a form of discrimination which requires the attention of the minister and the associate minister, particularly in view of government policy as announced in this house and by various ministers throughout the country, and also in view of the speeches made on this question by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration and the present Minister of Justice, both of whom are very interested in this problem. I trust that the associate minister will make note of this question for later consideration. There have been some complaints in this respect and I did promise to raise this matter in the house.

I should also like to deal with the medical students subsidy to those serving in the armed forces. I am informed that this subsidy is not applicable to women serving in the army, as they are considered a reserve. I am also informed that the air force has not received any applications for medical students subsidy and therefore does not consider it necessary at this time. I might point out that it has not received any applications because nothing has been done to promote any applications. In many cases people are unaware that the subsidy is available. I am also informed that the medical students subsidy does not apply to the nursing service. I am told that it is not the policy of the nursing service to subsidize young nurses in schools of nursing. This is the practice in the United States, where I understand very substantial subsidies are given for training, as is the case in other countries.

I trust that the associate minister will correct me if I am inaccurate in this respect, but I understand that the Canadian defence authorities feel that many young girls would marry before completing the course. I am not sure that that is a valid argument because I know that there are a number of young women who would like to train for nursing in the armed services. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, once again I suggest there is discrimination in the application of the medical students subsidy, and I think this also merits the attention of the associate minister.

If I appear to be hesitating, Mr. Chairman, it is because I am somewhat at a loss for words and I am a little embarrassed to some extent. When I was on the defence committee following the second world war I made certain inquiries and discovered that the defence department had thousands of pairs of unused items described officially as "leg coverings, female, black". I inquired what these were, and I must say that this is a rather delicate question for a shy, old backwoods man like myself to deal with. However, when duty calls I am prepared to accept the call. I will try to be as lucid as possible on this rather unusual topic, but in order to complete my argument I must rely to some extent on the imagination of the members present. I have gone into this matter, Mr. Chairman, and I am pleased to say that this practice of distributing, by order, what were known as "leg coverings, female, black", has been discontinued. I inquired of the services most carefully, and I am glad to say that that has been discontinued, that at the present time another policy has come into force and that a grant of $15 is given to each woman on joining the armed services toward the cost of her unmentionables. In addition, the service is so generous—one ought to relate this to what the men get—that there is a grant of $1 per month to each woman in the armed services for the maintenance of these unmentionables. That is an improvement on the former policy. I note that, because I thought it was most improper for the general staff to choose the colour of a lady's unmentionables.

• (5:40 p.m.)

I understand that women in our armed services up to the rank of warrant officer first class are entitled to a clothing allowance of $8 a month. I find that there is much discrimination in the amounts allowed by the armed services, when one compares the allowances given to women as against those given to men. The small allowances given to women

for the maintenance of their garments in question does show that the minister and associate minister ought to look into this matter carefully to make certain that this gross discrimination does not continue.

As I said before, this is a delicate and difficult subject. I promised the ladies in question that I would bring it to the attention of the house and I have done so, even though it has been difficult for me. I am sure you appreciate that, Mr. Chairman, knowing my usual modesty.

I also wish to deal with the question of disease and the population explosion, and here again I am somewhat embarrassed. I am informed that the men of the armed services are provided with certain devices to prevent disease and the population explosion. That information came officially from the department. On further inquiry of the women's services of the navy, army and air force, I find that nothing like this is done for the women of the armed services of Canada. While I would not suggest that a policy of providing these devices for our armed services women is necessary—I would not suggest that for a moment—I do think, Mr. Chairman, that as a matter of principle the minister, associate minister, and their colleagues in the department ought to inquire of the policies pursued in the defence forces of other countries. I understand that we have not gone as far as we ought to have in this respect, and here I refer particularly to policies in Great Britain, the United States and other European countries.

This is only a theoretical matter at this point, Mr. Chairman, but I wish to make certain that there is no discrimination in this respect. I will not suggest that pursuing this policy is necessary from a practical point of view, but in theory it ought to be pursued. The government might implement some policy in this respect.

In conclusion I urge the minister and the associate minister to inquire into the complaints I have advanced on behalf of the women in the armed services of Canada, so that they may share in the equality of women in all aspects of Canadian society, in accordance with announced government policy.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I rise to take part in this debate after having listened with great concern to much talk on the unification of our armed services. I am still amazed that the minister wishes this house to permit unification of the services when he has not suggested the name that the new armed service of Canada will have. Perhaps General Allard had a good name when he advocated it be called Finks, using the four letters to denote Infantrymen with naval knowledge. Surely the minister and his capable public relations man, Mr. Lee, can invent a better name.

This debate has shown how parliament may be hamstrung. Before Christmas, when the matter was before the house, I talked, trying to convince the minister that the principle of unification ought to be sent to the committee for study. The matter did not go to committee. It is now an accepted fact that nearly all senior officers of the three services are against unification.

While Air Marshal Miller was the minister's assistant he was prepared to support integration, but was against unification, which he alleged would cost the Canadian taxpayers more money than the old, three service system had cost them. The committee studies bore out Air Vice Marshal Miller's contention. The unified services will be more expensive, not less expensive than the three separate services.

It is interesting to note that the Ottawa *Journal* recently has said that this debate ought to be limited and that the guillotine will be applied for the first time on Thursday. Great haste is being made to cut short the debate or to limit the freedom of speech. One would expect that something terribly important hinges on the passage of the bill, that it must be implemented almost immediately, or that conditions are such that the passage of this bill is extremely important for the armed forces of Canada. On page 14927 of *Hansard* for April 14, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, addressing the Minister of National Defence, asked this question:

> Is it not a fact that in the committee General Allard told us that he would like to see the proclamation of the bill postponed for at least four months, and that until the bill is proclaimed no action can be taken with regard to the steps toward unification. That is the advice of the senior officer in the defence forces.

● (5:50 p.m.)

As the question shows, there is a demand that the bill be not proclaimed for at least four months after passage. He went on to say categorically that until the bill was proclaimed no action could be taken toward unification. I ask the associate minister this: Why in these circumstances should we have to read in today's paper that the guillotine blade will fall on Thursday? As to suggestions that further evidence may be brought out, is any further evidence necessary after all the

senior officers have given evidence and declared, practically to the last man, that they have grave doubts as to the need for unification or where unification will take Canada? This is made clear in an editorial which appears in today's *Gazette*—an article by Mr. Arthur Blakely. The author says the minister agrees the chiefs of staff are predominantly opposed to unification of the armed forces. And the minister is quoted as saying "Chiefs of staff all over the world are opposed to unification of the armed forces."

The evidence before the committee has made this abundantly clear. Senior military advisers who have spent years and years in the forces and who know the military art, are opposed to unification and wonder where it is taking them. In the light of their views and the hope expressed by General Allard that after the bill is passed it will not be proclaimed for four months, during which time no action could be taken toward unification, what need is there for haste? The minister himself said on Monday that integration will only be achieved as a result of a series of steps and may not be complete for seven or eight years. We live in a democracy where we cherish freedom of speech. Why then, should we have to read in the papers that the guillotine will fall unless we pass this legislation immediately? What is the urgency?

It was once commonly thought that the minister of defence wanted to pass this unification measure, believing he could do so without any great difficulty, in order to improve his own position as a contestant for leadership of the Liberal party. It was his idea that if he could effect savings in the Department of National Defence, the public would believe him capable of realizing savings in every department of government.

Most of those serving in our armed forces firmly believe that this was the idea in the minister's mind when he began this process of amalgamating the three services into one unified force—a force for which he has not yet found a name other than the one given it by the chief of staff, General Allard—Finks, that is, fighting infantrymen with naval knowledge. I am sure this name does not well suit the men in the forces today.

One could talk a good deal about esprit de corps—how it arises, and how it is maintained. It is interesting to note the minister's statement that putting our forces into the same type of uniform would not affect their morale or fighting spirit in any way. Yet what is happening throughout the world? In the present conflict in Viet Nam we are witnessing the creation, shall I say, of the Green Berets. What is significant about that? It is significant because it is a move to add something, an article of headgear, to the uniform which part of the force is wearing—to provide something which is just a little extra in order to enhance esprit de corps. This is important. Songs have been written about it. Books have been written about the special training these men must take.

The significant point is that these men are proud of having taken these courses and passed these examinations. They are proud to wear this particular piece of uniform. So here is a nation that has fought in many wars throughout its history, coming up with something new to maintain or build up esprit de corps among their servicemen. On the other hand, we in Canada are proclaiming that the generals and the vice marshals are all wrong and that uniform does little for esprit de corps. The minister says our forces can be dressed in green sacks, if necessary, as long as whatever they wear has some sex appeal about it. The associate minister agrees with this. Well, it is not enough. It is not enough to call them Finks and say they must be fighting infantrymen with naval knowledge. This is borne out by the fact that even today United States is creating special distinctions in uniforms to build up the esprit de corps of its fighting forces.

The whole question of the unification of the armed services was considered by the Russians shortly after the second world war. They carried out the initial steps and for all I know they may have gone as far as integration. But they did not go the whole way. They shrank from taking that particular step because they found it was not workable and would not provide for the best possible defence of their country.

Mr. Knowles: Six o'clock.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): This is really what we are concerned about, and this is why taxpayers contribute toward a fighting force. They want it to defend Canada first of all, and then to play a role in keeping peace throughout the world.

May I call it six o'clock?

Mr. Churchill: So that there may be no further delay imposed by hon. members such as the hon. member for Saint-Denis and the hon. member for Villeneuve, I propose we let clause 2 stand and go on with clause 3 the

next time this bill is before the committee, which may be next October.

Mr. Knowles: The Minister of National Defence suggested this last night and others of us have suggested it two or three times. If there is now unanimous agreement, let's do it.

Mr. McIlraith: There is no objection if the hon. member wishes to stand clause 2 and call clause 3.

The Chairman: Does the committee agree to allow clause 2 to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chairman: The committee will now proceed to the consideration of clause 3.

Mr. Churchill: Rise and report progress.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I called it six o'clock.

Mr. McIlraith: In order that there may be no embarrassment as to procedure, let me say that I did not intend in any way to cut off the speech of the hon. member who was speaking at six o'clock. If he wishes to continue his remarks on clause 2 I will put the suggestion forward again at the conclusion of his remarks. I will transmit the suggestion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre to my colleague the Minister of National Defence. It can be done in whichever way the hon. gentleman who was speaking wishes.

• (6:00 p.m.)

The Chairman: Order. Is it the suggestion of the Minister of Public Works that the hon. member for Acadia be permitted to conclude his remarks and that then clause 2 will stand?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, my embarrassment is this: The hon. member for Acadia had the floor. He sat down on the assumption that it was six o'clock, but did not appear to have concluded his remarks. The suggestion then was made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre that we stand clause 2 and proceed to clause 3. I agreed to that suggestion without realizing that by so doing I was cutting off the remarks of the hon. member for Acadia. I rose to explain my embarrassment in that regard. I had no intention to cut off the remarks of hon. member for Acadia.

I am agreeable either to have it understood that we still are on clause 2 until the hon. member completes his remarks or that clause 2 stand now. I am agreeable whichever way hon. members of the opposition wish to have it.

The Chairman: Order. As chairman, I should like the members of the committee to come to some very definite determination so that there will be no misunderstanding when the committee meets tomorrow or some other day.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Chairman, I should like to proceed with the bill. I think that tomorrow I would take probably five or ten minutes to conclude my remarks on clause 2 and then we could go on to clause 3.

Mr. McIlraith: Then I take it that we are still on clause 2, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: The committee will still be on clause 2 when it meets again.

Progress reported.

It being five minutes after six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, April 20, 1967

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MOTION FOR TIME ALLOCATION RESPECTING DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, in accordance with the provisions of standing order 15A, I made the proposal that the question of allocation of time for the committee of the whole stage and all remaining stages of procedure on Bill No. C-243, being item No. 107 on the order paper, be referred to the business committee.

The members of the business committee had discussions for three days on this matter, in accordance with the provisions of that standing order, and on Tuesday, April 18 I reported to the house that the committee had been unable to reach unanimous agreement on the question referred to it. On Tuesday, April 18 I also gave notice that on the next Thursday I would move for an order providing for the allocation of time. All this appears in *Votes and Proceedings* of that day. I now propose to make that motion.

As hon. members know, standing order 15A provides for a business committee which has the task of setting up a timetable for debate on a bill. The two-fold assumption behind that order is that all parties will want debate and discussion so that the thinking of the house and the country will develop and mature, and also that all parties will want the house to do its duty by rendering a decision regardless of what individual members may think that decision should be. It is inevitable that there will be differences of opinion. To devise an allocation of time balancing these differences is precisely the task assigned to the business committee. That task it sought to perform, but it was unable to reach the necessary unanimous agreement.

Therefore it now becomes the right and indeed the responsibility of the government under standing order 15A to take the step of providing the opportunity for the house to make a decision on the additional time the house should take in further discussion of the remaining stages of this bill.

23033—956½

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order. What stage are we at now in the proceedings of the house? I understand that Your Honour called motions. I do not see anything on the order paper to indicate that the minister has an opportunity to speak at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is quite right. I have been expecting the minister to make a motion.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What has the minister been talking about?

Mr. McIlraith: It has become clear—

Mr. Starr: Order.

Mr. Monteith: Make your motion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the minister that he make a motion. I understand there may be a debate on the motion—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: —and perhaps the minister can leave his comments until then.

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill):

• (2:40 p.m.)

That an order be made allocating the time on the committee of the whole stage and all remaining stages of procedure on Bill C-243, an act to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof (as amended), being government order No. 107 on the order paper, and that the motion will provide that two days shall be allocated for the completion of discussion on the committee of the whole stage on Bill C-243, an act to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof (as amended), and that one day shall be allotted for the completion of the third reading stage on the bill.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I rise on another point of order. I understand fully that last Tuesday the minister gave notice of this particular motion, and that it appeared in *Votes and Proceedings* to which I drew attention yesterday. However, it does not appear on today's order paper. I wonder, sir, whether you would give a ruling on this question. Is it permissible simply to give notice of motion

and then, without following the normal custom of the house, to move the motion verbally the next day or some subsequent day without anything appearing on the order paper for the information of members? I am not sure there is any rule governing this procedure, but the custom of the house over the years has prevented members of the house from being taken by surprise.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: It has been the practice to disclose the government's intentions in the order paper, and the same has applied to private members. Private members who give notice of motion with regard to the introduction of a bill place that notice in *Votes and Proceedings*, then the order paper brings it to the attention of the house on some subsequent day. Is some special dispensation being granted to the Minister of Public Works or to any member of the government, because in the past we have been accustomed to another procedure than that followed by the minister today? I would ask Your Honour's ruling on this important point; because if Your Honour reaches a decision that this may happen, then in future any of us will be free to give notice of motion, have it appear in *Votes and Proceedings* and then, at our choice, raise it orally when motions are called.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to the point of order just raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre I should like to read standing order 15A (5), as follows:

> If the chairman of the business committee reports that the committee has been unable to reach a unanimous agreement—

Which was the case in this instance.

> —or if the committee fails to report within the time specified by section (3) of this standing order, a minister of the crown, notwithstanding the provisions of standing order 41, may give notice of motion that at the next sitting of the house, provided that day is not a Wednesday, he will move that an order be made allocating the time for the item of business or stage thereof.

As I indicated when I first rose, notice of motion was given on Tuesday. The motion was to be made on Thursday because the standing order provides it cannot be moved on a Wednesday. Paragraph 6 of the standing order reads:

> A motion of which a minister has given notice under section (5) of this standing order shall be made during routine proceedings.

Then the order goes on with other matters not relevant to the point at issue. In the light of the standing order it will be seen that I have followed exactly the procedure set out in it. This being so, I respectfully suggest that the procedure envisaged by standing order 41, which is specifically exempted from applicability to this motion, has no bearing and I am in order.

Mr. Speaker: In so far as the point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre is concerned, I have been giving some thought to this problem which I felt might be raised. Standing order 41 reads:

> Forty eight hours notice shall be given of a motion for leave to present a bill, resolution or address, for the appointment of any committee, or for placing a question on the order paper; but this rule shall not apply to bills after their introduction—

I will not read the whole of the standing order. We should remember that the provisional standing order suspends the provisions of standing order 41. Section 5 of standing order 15A not only dispenses with the requirement for 48 hours' notice with respect to a motion for time allocation; it also renders inoperative the ordinary machinery for putting a notice on the order paper. Hon. members will note that a similar procedure with respect to notice will be found in standing order 33.

Section 6 of standing order 15A reads in part as follows:

> A motion of which a minister has given notice under section (5) of this standing order shall be made during routine proceedings.

I suggest to hon. members and I believe there is doubt about the interpretation of these words "routine proceedings". They must be interpreted in the light of the recommendation made by the special committee on procedure in 1955, which was concurred in by the house and recorded at page 944 of the *Journals* for July 12, 1955, as follows:

> That motions for concurrence in reports of any standing or special committee, for the suspension of any standing order, or such other motions made upon routine proceedings, as may be required for the observances of the proprieties of the house, the maintenance of its authority, the appointment or conduct of its officers, the management of its business, the arrangement of its proceedings, the correctness of its records, the fixing of its sitting days or the times of its meeting or adjournment shall be listed, when notice is required, called and disposed of under "motions".

In view, therefore, of the provision of the standing order and the interpretation which I think is the only one possible, I cannot accept the contention of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

Mr. Churchill: Of what use is the order paper, then?

Mr. Speaker: I must say I am not too clear on the other point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, and if my impression is wrong perhaps he will correct me. I believe he suggested the motion is irregular inasmuch as there is no specific reference to those days on which the matter is to be considered—

Mr. Churchill: No; with deference, Mr. Speaker, I think my second question was overlooked because of the diversionary tactics of the Minister of Public Works. What I should like a ruling on is this. I quite agree that proper notice has been given, and I am not arguing that point at all. The rule has been followed. What I am asking a ruling on is this. After notice has been given and has appeared in *Votes and Proceedings,* has it not been the custom of the house, a custom which should be observed, that the motion for presentation to the house should appear on the order paper so that everybody is informed rather than have this oral reference back to an item in *Votes and Proceedings*?

Mr. Speaker: I was under the impression I had covered this particular point. I believe it is more than a custom that is involved here; this notice is given by virtue of standing order 41. However, this provisional standing order was specifically exempted from the provisions of standing order 41.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Mr. McIlraith: As I have indicated, the business committee has been entrusted by the house with trying to find a balance that would provide a timetable that would cover the two elements which must enter into the operations of the House of Commons if it is to perform the duty for which it is here. One of these elements is the opportunity for full and adequate discussion of proposals submitted by the government; the other is the taking of decisions upon proposals submitted by the government. The business committee having been unable to reach a unanimous agreement, it is now the responsibility of the government —as I have said, I think there is an obligation upon the government—to put before the house the amount of time the government thinks would be appropriate to provide adequately for the completion of the discussion of the measure, and to permit a decision to be taken on the measure consistent with the responsibilities of parliament.

I am not going to develop the argument further, because it must be apparent to hon. members on all sides that this measure has been very thoroughly discussed. Yesterday was the thirteenth day of debate on the committee of the whole stage of the bill; that is, the clause by clause discussion of the bill. Those 13 days of debate did not bring even clause 2 of the bill to a decision of the house, and it began to be readily apparent that the purpose of the official opposition was to inordinately delay this measure or to prevent a decision being taken.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The minister is imputing motives to the official opposition. He said it was evident that our purpose was simply to delay. Our purpose was to bring to the attention of this house, to the attention of the minister who has attended none of the debate during the last 13 days, and to the attention of the general public the weaknesses of this bill. Point after point was brought forward during the course of the debate, and new points entered into the argument during the last two days which have not been answered. The minister must withdraw his accusation.

Mr. Speaker: I hope the minister is not imputing motives. I think all members realize that nobody is trying to impute motives, and I am sure this is not what the minister is doing now.

Mr. McIlraith: If the sensitivities of the hon. member induce him to feel that I was imputing motives to him I would very happily withdraw the part of my remarks that caused him such offence.

Mr. Churchill: It was the general feeling over here, not only my feeling.

Mr. McIlraith: My remarks were not of such import as to cause him any offence. However, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that the record of the discussion on this bill during the last 13 days is in cold print to be studied by all, not only by those who have been present to hear the debate. It is clear that a very long time indeed was being taken in the discussion of one clause of this bill. It seemed to the government in the exercise of its responsibility that such an inordinately long time was being taken to discuss this clause that it had a duty to give parliament the opportunity of deciding whether or not the House of Commons should take a decision on this bill. Under the British system—

Mr. Churchill: Would the minister answer a question at this point?

Mr. McIlraith: Well, Mr. Speaker I should like to put at least part of my remarks before the house without interruption. At the conclusion of my remarks I will be happy to answer any questions the hon. member may have; indeed, sometimes I enjoy his questions. In any event the truth of the matter is that under the Canadian parliamentary system, based as it is on the British system, the government is given the responsibility of governing. That implies the right to have a decision taken by parliament, or in this instance by the House of Commons, on the proposals laid by it before the house. That right, of course, in controlled by the full right of discussion by the elected representatives of the people sent here to consider these proposals and to take decisions on them. Any other arrangement would be intolerable, for the separation of authority and responsibility is the first definition of tyranny. I respectfully suggest that an overextension of either right would lead to the development of anarchy. To find the correct balance between debate and decision must ever be the task of responsible conduct in the House of Commons.

We in this parliament have chosen the procedure under temporary standing order 15A, but we must, in choosing that responsibility, exercise it in a way that will be consistent with our concept of parliament and not permit an abuse to arise that is the first step toward tyranny.

Holding those views, believing that the stage has now come when this house must pass on the proposal for the allocation of time which we have submitted, I have made my motion providing for two further days of discussion in the committee of the whole house on the individual clauses of the bill and one day for the third reading stage of the bill. With those words, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit my motion for the consideration of this house and ask the house to pass on it in accordance with the views of individual members.

Mr. Churchill: May I now ask my question, Mr. Speaker. I would now ask the government house leader whether, in discussing the length of time spent on clause 2, he will disclose, first, there was the suggestion that clause 2 is the most important clause of the bill; second, on behalf of this party I proposed to him on Monday that we were prepared to pass all clauses of the bill except clauses 2 and 6 which we asked to have deferred until the fall. Nevertheless, the rest of the bill would have been passed on Monday—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: —without further debate. In addition we were prepared to pass the bill on adult training, the report of the rules committee and interim supply by Friday of this week. That offer was rejected by the government.

Mr. McIlraith: I shall be very happy to answer that rather lengthy question as fully as I can. In assessing the important clauses of the bill, undoubtedly clause 2 is very important, going to the root of the bill. Whether it is the most important of the 65 clauses I cannot say, but certainly it is a very important clause going to the very root of the bill.

I do not want to go into details of what was said by each person in the business committee because I have always taken the position that the confidentiality of house leaders' meetings or business committee meetings should not be broken, but I would be happy to confirm that a proposal was made by the hon. member, not that we pass the bill as he suggested in his question, but that we let clauses 2 and 6 stand and that we then call the other clauses of the bill and carry them in the committee of the whole stage, and that the whole bill then stand, with the result that there would be no legislative effect, no legislative result to what was done.

• (3:00 p.m.)

The whole bill would then stand over for four or five months—I think that was the term he used—or, anyway, until the fall of this year, without having been passed. In addition, if the proposal not to proceed further with the bill at this stage of the session was acceptable, they would agree to winding up the other business for this session of parliament, that is the manpower training bill, interim supply and the report of the rules committee. They would do this within three or four days, or in any event within a very short period of time.

That proposal was rejected after careful consideration—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McIlraith: It did get careful consideration, and it was rejected for the following reasons. First, the bill would have been stopped completely. I should add that as part of the proposal the hon. member had agreed

on behalf of his party that in the new session, that is in the fall, the stages up to the committee stage of the bill would be dealt with without debate or vote.

These proposals were rejected for the following reasons. They would, in effect, amount to a complete stopping of the bill at this time. This would leave the Department of National Defence and the armed forces in a position of uncertainty.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McIlraith: After careful consideration and examination it was felt this would lead to a material deterioration of morale in the department and armed forces.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McIlraith: It would mean also there would be no authority in the department to continue any steps forward in connection with this subject until the bill was passed. It would, in effect, be similar to the six months' hoist, because it would end the bill as far as this session was concerned though giving us the right, of course, to bring it forward in the new session of parliament and make progress next fall. This seemed to me and to others to be a wholly unrealistic approach to this question, although, as I have said, it did get very thorough consideration, notwithstanding interjections by some of the backbenchers opposite.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Are hon. members rising to ask further questions? We should determine in the first instance whether the minister has completed his remarks or whether he wishes to reply to further questions at this time.

Mr. Webb: A point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Before I recognize the hon. member for Hastings-Frontenac, do I gather that the minister is relinquishing the floor to the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. McIlraith: No, I have indicated that I would accept a question from the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich.

Mr. Speaker: Before the question is asked I believe the hon. member for Hastings-Frontenac has a point of order to raise.

Mr. Webb: The minister was kind enough to say he would answer all questions.

Mr. McIlraith: I did not say that.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member rising to ask a question? The hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich has been recognized first for that purpose.

Mr. Chatterton: May I ask the leader of the house to tell us the reasons which prompted the government to set two days for the committee stage? If the purpose was to bring an end to the debate why was a period of two days chosen rather than five or six days, for instance?

Mr. McIlraith: I can answer that question very simply. Notice was given on Thursday, one week ago today, that this procedure would be used. After that notice had been given the discussion continued, and in those intervening days it became quite clear from the lack of progress that there would be no disposition to dispose of the various clauses within any given length of time. Moreover, I had borne in mind that the committee had already spent 13 days in clause by clause consideration of the bill. I had also borne in mind intimations that no allocation of time however long would be agreeable to the opposition. It had been made very clear that it did not matter what length of time was proposed, whether weeks or months; they would not agree.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Webb: Since the government is today introducing closure in connection with a bill which concerns Canada's future defence, I would ask the minister whether it is significant that today is also the anniversary of Hitler's birthday.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McIlraith: But for a reference which was made at the beginning of the hon. member's question I would not answer it. This is not a closure procedure. A closure procedure is an arbitrary procedure taken to shut off debate. This procedure is based on the premise that there is a responsibility upon the house to permit a decision to be taken. It is a method of trying to make those groups which, without responsibility, would seek to impose their will on parliament, to negotiate and try to come to an agreement or arrangement consistent with their responsibilities in parliament. And it provides, in the event of failure to bring this about, that after due notice the house itself shall pass on the matter. That is not closure. That is the antithesis of closure procedure.

Mr. Nasserden: I have a question for the leader of the house. Is he insinuating that the intervention of Liberal speakers in the debate represented an encroachment upon the decision-making process?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not think we are making any progress at this point.

Mr. Forrestall: I should like to ask the distinguished house leader whether, in the light of the evidence given before the committee by Brigadier Lawson and confirmed in this house that in any case from four to six months would elapse before the government could move to the promulgation of this bill, because of the regulations which have to be drawn up, he would comment on the position of the discussion on clauses 2 and 6 of this bill if we ask to have them stood over until the fall.

Mr. McIlraith: The hon. member seems to be under a misapprehension with regard to the process followed in what he calls the promulgation of the bill. I presume he has in mind certain regulations which have to be made and certain steps which have to be taken once the bill is passed and has become an act. Then the proclaiming of the bill becomes a procedure which does not need the concurrence of parliament; either the House of Commons or the Senate. It is an act by the executive on a different procedure, and in the interval between the passage of the act and its promulgation there is the authority in the Interpretation Act providing for those responsible, once it has been passed and approved by the parliament of this country, to pass the regulations under it. This is the essential difference. The hon. member seems to have missed the whole essence of it.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the house leader to explain why, since as late as Tuesday of this week, when the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre moved that we go on to other business and the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer) said "We are going to continue with the unification debate in order to give you every opportunity'" now in defiance of the express promise of the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence that every opportunity would be given for a thorough examination of this bill, they are bringing in this closure.

Mr. McIlraith: I would be very happy to explain. I joined completely with the Minister of National Defence, and I am happy to note we were in such total accord, in going contrary to the official opposition's effort to prevent this bill from being discussed in the house on Tuesday, when we had given notice to resort to the procedure under standing order 15A. He, like myself, did not wish to deny the House of Commons the opportunity to discuss this bill that day and make progress with it. As to the second point, the misuse by the hon. member of the word closure, I have already dealt with that.

[Mr. McIlraith.]

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the play on words by the Minister of Public Works is clear and apparent. This isn't closure, he says, when in point of fact it is nothing else; and by simply saying that it isn't what it is, he in no way meets the argument that the guillotine is to be used in place of the axe.

I listened with interest to his dissertation on parliamentary debate and the manner in which it should be carried on, and I could not but be reminded of the words of Lewis Carroll when he said—and this describes the attitude of the minister.

> "I weep for you," the Walrus said:
> "I deeply sympathize."
> With sobs and tears he sorted out
> Those of the largest size,
> Holding his pocket-handkerchief
> Before his streaming eyes.

Oh, what an idea, to think parliament would ever consider that these paragons of parliamentary practice who sit opposite would do anything wrong and shock those sensibilities of which the minister spoke. I quote to him the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, one of the great democrats of this nation, one of the parliamentary giants of all time. Apparently the minister has not read what Laurier said. A moment ago he was complaining about the number of days that had been taken up in this debate. If my estimate is correct, in the days that have gone by 30 members other than members of Her Majesty's loyal opposition have spoken.

Mr. Starr: On the second clause.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Of course on the second clause, as the hon. gentleman says. By way of an answer, let me read what Laurier said to those people sitting opposite who in 1967 are revealing that they have forgotten 1956.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: They said the same thing then. I could quote one and all, the Minister

of Public Works (Mr. McIlraith), the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill), the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), but I restrict myself to the latter. These were the words of ridicule that he heaped on us in 1956:

> The opposition, of course, claim, and they claim very often, to be gagged. If that is true, Mr. Speaker, they are the noisiest group of gagged men in history.

Those words came back to destroy the government of which the right hon. gentleman was then secretary of state for external affairs. The Minister of Public Works says the debate has gone on for so many days. Let me read what Laurier said in regard to debate. I refer to the 1912-13 *Hansard* at page 7431:

> It has been charged against us that we have delayed the business of the house, that we have prevented it from going on. Sir, I deny the charge altogether; there is not a word of foundation for it.

Further on he said this:

> It is true, sir, that we opposed a certain measure. It is true that we opposed the bill for naval aid. We did that with all the might at our command; we did it with all the means at our command under the rules of the house. Am I to be told that in the exercise of this power of strenuous opposition we did anything which is not in accordance with the best traditions of parliamentary government?

Then he went on to deal with the length of time, and in reply to an interruption he pointed out this fact, as recorded at page 9454 of *Hansard* for the same session, and I quote the interruption first:

> My right hon. friend would surely be disposed to admit that in nineteen or twenty days we ought to be able to make sufficient progress to enable every amendment to be considered.
>
> Sir Wilfrid Laurier: I do not admit anything of the kind. I can show precedents of bills of less importance that have taken the house more than thirty days in committee of the whole—

The minister referred to British parliamentary practice. As recorded at page 9534 of the same *Hansard* Sir Wilfrid Laurier said it is quite common in the United Kingdom to have lengthy discussion in committee on important bills, for one, two or three weeks. Then he went on and dealt in general with the situation in this regard.

Why has there been this debate, Mr. Speaker? Because we have not been able to get the answers to those questions we have asked.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am now going to refer to words that will become immortal as an example of non-egotism on the part of the Minister of National Defence. Before I do that I say this, what we have been treated to in this country in the last few weeks is a plethora of press releases issued by the visible presence of the representative of the minister—organized nonsense.

• (3:20 p.m.)

I cannot pass up the opportunity to refer to one thing that took place in the United States, because it is of interest today. In 1942 the father of the United States airborne forces and the first officer to command one of the divisions was William M. Lee. He had the rank of major general, which of course we must not bring up at all for consideration at this time. It was the custom then as a man jumped from the transport plane to shout "Geronimo". Geronimo was an Apache rebel who caused the Americans a lot of trouble. Major General Lee was transferred to another unit and his place was taken by General Maxwell Taylor. He issued orders that instead of shouting "Geronimo" each paratrooper of the division should shout "Bill Lee" as he jumped out. History is a magnificent study. It is probably only a coincidence that there was so much disorganization, confusion and a complete mix-up when that name was substituted for the former. Let me bring this up to date. The Minister of National Defence and this government are so disorganized and unprepared they might well shout the same cry.

What has happened at this time is that generals, admirals, and air marshals have been swept aside. Their views mean nothing. As the minister said in the course of his remarks "We have to use our own God-given intelligence" to make decisions. I ask the Prime Minister when he speaks—

Mr. Pearson: I am not going to bother.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is he not going to speak?

Mr. Starr: He is not going to bother.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He is not going to bother. That is the best indication of the utter disregard the Prime Minister has for parliament; he is not going to bother to speak. Is that because he has adopted that unusually unattractive position he took in Vancouver when he was asked about the subject of abortion? He was asked where he stood in this regard and his answer was "I stand firmly". The next question was "where"? His answer was "On the fence". He is not going to bother. No wonder we are faced with closure. The Prime Minister does not want to answer. He does

not want to take the position he should take as the leader of this nation and tell the House of Commons what this government intends to do in respect of unification.

What are the government's plans? In the last 24 hours we have been told—and it is interesting to note that the newspapers are now reporting these things—that plans are being made against the eventuality that a peace keeping force will be sent to Viet Nam. Surely this is part of the propaganda program. In the last few days there has been debate on this question, and suddenly now there is a deliberate leak by a defence department source while parliament is in the throes of a debate on this subject. I have said, and the minister has denied this, that it is generally accepted that this government intends to produce a kind of faceless organization, once it gets these men into green jumpers, to be used as a special force for peace keeping. I think that is one of the pivotal reasons for this measure. This suggestion has already been turned down by the United Nations, yet the government proceeds with this idea. A government spokesman has said that plans have been drawn up to send a thousand man force to Viet Nam. I asked the Prime Minister to give us this information, not that minister who refuses to answer questions and substitutes abuse for arguments.

Has there been any discussion about this with the United Nations? Has there been any indication of such a request forthcoming, or is this just another of these publicity blurbs that regularly fill the wastepaper baskets of the press? What indication has there been of any acceptance by Hanoi of a cease fire and withdrawal, without which there can be no peace keeping? These are questions we want answered, yet they remain unanswered. What is the government's attitude in respect of renewal or rejection of NORAD? Surely if this house ever had a right to information, it has a right in this regard.

What is the government going to do with these green uniformed representatives in the armed forces of Canada? What is the government's policy in respect of NORAD? What is the attitude of the government regarding our commitments to NATO? I read the diaphanous explanation given by the minister. I can only say to him that in my experience no man is his equal, if that is his general manner of answering. He conceals so little thought in so many words.

What is the government's policy in respect of NATO? Is there any foundation for the suggestion that the number of men will be reduced? We have a right to this information. This debate would have concluded long ago had we received answers to these questions.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, yes. I am not speaking about the 22 Liberal members, if that is the number, who have spoken. They would have spoken in any event. I am speaking about Her Majesty's opposition. We have no right to let this government sell Canada a pig in a poke, and that is what is being done.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What amazes me is that the Prime Minister says he has nothing to say. Shades of Laurier. Shades of King. Shades of St. Laurent. The only time Mr. St. Laurent did not take part in a debate to reply to suggestions or questions was in 1956, and we all know what happened to the St. Laurent government in 1957 after that government trampled on parliament. This government ridicules us now. This is the same old bunch.

Mr. Starr: You have been integrated up to your necks.

Mr. Diefenbaker: All I can say is that this is an arid integration in so far as answers are concerned.

Mr. Prud'homme: What about integration within your own party?

Mr. Diefenbaker: I heard a voice. As a cuckoo in June, heard, but not recorded.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member wishes to rise on a question of privilege.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, the "voice" heard was mine, and I should like to repeat the suggestion I made in my speech yesterday, that there should perhaps be a bill for the unification and integration of the Progressive Conservative party. That was all I said.

• (3:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is not a question of privilege.

Mr. Diefenbaker: After reading what Walter Gordon said yesterday, if I may use his name, I would say that you do not want to talk about integration when you face extinction.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member has already risen on a question of privilege which was out of order. I hope his question this time is more justified than the last.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, following the remarks of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition, I could perhaps send him the notes he forgot on the articles written by the hon. Minister of Justice which appeared in the magazine *Cité Libre*.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[*English*]

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Speaker, I wish to apologize to the right hon. gentleman for saying that he has mellowed.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Is the minister rising on a question of privilege?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I can only say to the hon. gentleman who has just interrupted that while he does not speak much in the house, when he gets outside he has strong opinions.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: After this happy interlude I now quote from a newspaper that worships at the altar of Liberalism. I refer to the Winnipeg *Free Press*. Some of its subsidiary newspapers are also doing a good job in that connection. I am going to deal with them on a later occasion. There are two of them in eastern Canada, if I may put it that way, that used to be independent Conservative newspapers but now belong to F.P. Publications and reflect so often the general views of the *Free Press*. On this occasion I want to quote from the *Free Press*:

> The federal government could be making a mistake—

That is the first time in the history of this government that the *Free Press* has ever admitted even the possibility or likelihood of a mistake having been made by the government.

> —if, in its determination to impose unification on Canada's armed services, it should resort to some form of closure on parliament.

The government can argue that the unification bill has been through the legislative mill, including the defence committee, and that there is nothing of value to be gained by prolonging the discussion. In fact, not all witnesses who should have been heard were called before the committee. And in spite of all the talking that has been done, some major questions remain unanswered—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is why I suggested that the Prime Minister cancel his temporary vow of silence in this debate. The article continues:

> —in spite of all the talking that has been done, some major questions remain unanswered--notably those concerning the effect that unification may have on Canada's military commitments under NATO and under NORAD.

That is what I am asking for. That is what we have been asking for for days. What is the minister going to do with these people? You put them in a uniform, you march them up the hill, you change the present uniform to one that is green, and march them down the hill again. What are you going to do? What are your plans? The article goes on to say:

> The suspicion has grown that the reason these questions have not been answered is that the government does not know the answers.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It is a surprising thing that all the ministers have such a hiatus in their thinking and speaking when it comes to dealing with these questions. Then the article says:

> If closure is resorted to, this suspicion will be strengthened.
>
> Unification is government policy, but it is a policy that has met vigorous opposition from many members of parliament who must feel that they represent a substantial body of opinion. The government can press on—

I realize that. All they have to do is look at the battalions they have to our left in this chamber. The leader of the Creditistes says, "I march with you. Away with the uniforms of the past and all the traditions of the forces." Social Credit has not yet spoken with definiteness but I am sure the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson), with his infinite capacity for turning somersaults in the house, will be able to explain, with that clarity that always characterizes his utterances, why it is that while he does not agree with the principle of closure in this case he is going to vote with the government. There is also a possibility that he will vote against them, because now that he knows closure will be voted for

by the Creditistes it is safe for him and those associated with him to vote against it.

The article in the Winnipeg *Free Press* goes on to say:

> The government can press on; that appears to be its intention. But if it does so at the expense of cutting further debate, it cannot help but leave the same kind of impression that the St. Laurent government left when it used closure in 1956—that here is a government which has failed to convince the majority of the population.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, they can gag us by brute force with the assistance of third parties, but they cannot gag our belief and that of millions of Canadians that what is being destroyed here is tradition, which the minister sweeps aside. He said, "What does it matter what your uniform is?" I am going to refer to his words in a moment when he gave his views on the processes that brought about this situation.

I now come to the explanation of the minister. From the beginning he has pursued a tortuous course. I have always had a rather warm feeling for him. While we sit opposite one another and express ourselves strongly in debate, there is still something within us that admires ability and capacity, and above all willingness, to do one's best for one's country. If I may make a diversion at this moment, Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring a simple example to the attention of the house. This happened in 1961. My wife and I were in London. We were invited to a dinner given in our honour by the prime minister of the United Kingdom. Sir Winston Churchill came that night. My wife sat between the prime minister and Sir Winston. I was on the other side of the table, away down. I had been introduced to all who were present there but I did not realize who the lady was next to me. Her name was Mrs. Chamberlain. I did not associate her in any way with the prime minister of the United Kingdom of the late 1930's and the early months of 1940. Sir Winston was in unusually good humour that night. I turned to her at one point and said: "Is it not wonderful the way he enjoys life at his age? He is happy tonight." She said: "Yes, if it weren't for him we wouldn't be here."

• (3:40 p.m.)

Mr. Habel: That is a bedtime story.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I know it registered nothing in the mind of the hon. gentleman. That is my idea of public life. Mrs. Chamberlain's late husband was driven out but she maintained that tradition which is the essence of the British parliamentary system. The interference opposite indicates that the hon. members do not know parliament.

I have followed the minister's course with a great deal of interest but the manner in which he has given explanations to the house indicates that when he is faced with arguments he takes up another position. His first statement was that all the experts and all the servicemen were on his side.

Mr. Hellyer: I never said that.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That was proven to be completely without foundation. His second position was—

Mr. Hellyer: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman gave the impression he was quoting from something I said. Would he give the source and the time and place so I can find it?

Mr. Diefenbaker: It has been said over and over again. Those who did not agree were retired, so naturally he must have felt he had the unanimous support of those who were permitted to remain.

Mr. Hellyer: You paraphrased it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: If the minister can name me one high officer who dared say he did not agree with unification and is not yet out of the services, I will give him the opportunity.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): This is Hitler's birthday.

Mr. Diefenbaker: There is an expression which I cannot repeat here but, to paraphrase, it means that when you advance an argument you should stand by it.

That was the minister's first position. There was the case of an admiral of the fleet who was condemned and denigrated by the minister. Six months later the minister said: "I really did not mean it". I wish he had developed the same epidermis with regard to the comment made by the member for Edmonton-Strathcona. But no, the minister was going to sue. He had no case because only what was said in the house was repeated outside it. I wonder when legal action will be taken? Never since General Currie in the Port Hope trial has there been anything like the reaction of Hellyer versus Nugent. I know him as Terry. When is the minister going to start the action? He must start it within a certain

number of days. He will lose the right unless he acts soon.

Then the minister said: "Well, what they said really did not matter because after all they did not know". Let us read his words. They could not have been unprepared. They have every appearance of having been sent from above. They could have come from nowhere else. He said:

> Having listened to all of the points of view which have been expressed, I think it is incumbent on members and ministers to make up their minds on this matter. We have to use our own God-given intelligence to take a decision instead of simply relying on evidence of people in favour or the evidence of people not in favour.

As long as these generals, admirals and air marshals said they believed in a measure of integration their evidence was sound. But when they said they did not believe in unification they ceased to have that God-given intelligence which apparently is the monopoly of the minister and those associated with him. Farther on he went on to say:

> —believe me, Mr. Chairman, this is all I have done and it is what the associate minister has done.

Then he said:

> All I ask, Mr. Chairman, is that we use our own God-given intelligence and examine all of the changes in technology which have taken place during the last 20 years.

This is one of the strangest doctrines I have ever heard. Everybody is wrong but the minister and the associate minister who possess something that is denied to other members of parliament and which apparently has been arrogated to the minister and those associated with him, namely, God-given intelligence.

I ask the minister, where was this God-given intelligence in 1961 and 1962 when the minister said that the whole idea of having any nuclear arms is wrong? He said, "we will have nothing to do with it; it is pouring money down the drain." In January of 1963 the God-given intelligence received intelligence from another country.

Mr. Pilon: From NATO.

An hon. Member: God giveth, God taketh away.

Mr. Diefenbaker: This issue cannot be determined by this government. No doubt the other parties will say that the rights of parliament have not been trampled upon. I say to my friends in the New Democratic party: Your predecessors, the C.C.F. party, were wrong in every policy on national defence from 1938 onward. I have the record here.

I would like to know where Canada's contributions would have been if it had followed the policies of the New Democratic party. Unless it becomes necessary to elucidate I will leave the subject there, but the record stands. I repeat that in 1938, in September, 1939, and in 1941, the party which claimed so often to have a monopoly of humanitarian intelligence was wrong. I hope the passage of years has brought them a new capacity to judge on questions of defence.

Mr. Winch: Where is the Conservative party's God-given intelligence?

Mr. Diefenbaker: If the hon. member wants quotations, I can furnish them without any difficulty at all. I would ask him to read the record and I will be glad to discuss the matter with him now. Let him read the record of the declaration of his party's policy in 1937. Let him read the record of his party's policy in 1939 when there was complete agreement in the socialist party that not one man should be sent overseas and that Canada's aid should be solely economic. They say that parliament's rights have not been trampled on. But, sir, we in this party have taken our stand on this subject. They can trample on our views but if the correspondence that is coming in means anything, it is clear that this government has embarked on a policy that is not acceptable.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Someone criticized me for having said that General Allard has political ambitions. I think it was the Ottawa *Journal*, which used to be independent Conservative too. I was simply referring to a fact that the press had reported. I know also that in 1951, if I am correct in the year, General Allard was offered a portfolio but felt he ought to stay with the armed forces for a while longer. On the one hand we have the chief of staff and on the other we have a number of gentlemen whose names I am going to read. This list reads like a Who's Who in Canada's glorious record of service. They are: General Charles Foulkes; Lieutenant General Robert Moncel; Vice Admiral H. S. Rayner; Air Vice Marshal M. M. Hendrick; Admiral Brock; Admiral Pullen; Admiral Stirling; Lieutenant General Fleury; Air Marshal Curtis; Air Marshal Clare Annis; Lieutenant General Guy Simonds; Air Chief Marshal F. R. Miller, and the man who stood, Read Admiral W. M. Landymore.

There is the list of some of those who spoke out. Do not these men possess that God-given

intelligence of which the minister has spoken? Are these men endeavouring to bring this nation to a position of degradation by their stand? What has happened here has been that this government, and more particularly the minister, has been playing politics with the defence of this nation.

Mr. Hellyer: Absolutely untrue.

Mr. Diefenbaker: As I said before, and I repeat, defence is being used as a platform for personal ambition.

Mr. Hellyer: Absolutely untrue.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It is easy to say this is untrue but the facts tell the story. No amount of denial can get away from it.

Mr. Hellyer: You tell the story but you don't know the facts.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Now, Mr. Chairman, we have the admission. Those who tell the story don't know the facts. If you can equal that for a statement of positive self-satisfaction and egotism, it is your move. What manner of person is this? The minister has a divine right. Who are these people who do not know the facts?

Mr. Hellyer: No, I said you do not know.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Look at me, the minister says; I have them but I am not going to tell parliament. This has been his attitude and when finally he found himself in an impossible position he attempted the strategic course of bringing about closure. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. McIlraith) says it is not closure; we have changed the name. It will have the same result, but let us be careful about the use of that word. It may be a synonym but it is not closure. Sir, never could a minister equal the vacuity of that last statement the minister made in his interruption. They do not know the facts.

Mr. Hellyer: That is not what I said; I said you do not know. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it more specific, I do not want a general statement—

Mr. Diefenbaker: But I am saying what they have said. I am not one who glorifies my position, as the hon. gentleman does, by setting myself apart. Oh, what a statement that was. Everybody else has lost his intelligence but he has his own God-given intelligence. Today he says "they do not know the facts". Then, he amends the statement and says "I do not know the facts". All I know is what I read in the evidence. Every solitary bit of the evidence that was given, I have read. If ever there was a case made completely against what is being produced here for the political deification of the hon. gentleman, this is that case.

What is being done is this: Here is what we are going to do, he says, and he submits his case without argument. You have got to take it because if you do not, then with the assistance of my colleagues I am going to bring about a vile repetition of 1956. I am going to push this measure through. I am going to push it down the throats of Canadians regardless of their feelings because I have the God-given intelligence that is denied to the generals, admirals and air vice marshals as well as to the men and women who serve in the armed forces and who write me daily saying that they hope the opposition presses on. They do not want their names mentioned or they will be destroyed. This is what is happening in this nation. They have every reason to be afraid because after all they only occupy the ranks of private, lance corporal, corporal or sergeant or equivalent ranks in the other services. What has taken place in this nation as a result of the manipulations of the government in this connection is that men and women in the armed forces are full of fear and foreboding. They do not dare speak out. They have been overwhelmed with the 48,000 copies of the speech of the minister duly annotated, decorated and engrossed. Each one of them knows what will happen if he dares to speak out.

On June 7, 1965, the minister put out another press statement reading in part as follows:

> The command structure of the Canadian armed forces has been redesigned on a functional basis, in keeping with the principles and objectives outlined in the white paper on defence of March, 1964.

He has done nothing of the kind. The white paper never envisaged the tinkering and interference that have taken place or the results that are today flowing from that action. The press statement ended in this way:

> The new command structure, which reflects the major commitments assigned to the forces by the government is the product of careful study by the defence staff. Major field commanders of all services have been consulted in detail on the plan which is four months ahead of schedule.

This statement, sir, is not true. If this government tramples on the right of parliament to information about why this change is being made, what our international commitments

are and how they are going to be met under this neutralized scheme, and bulldozes this measure through, then Canadians everywhere will have the same feeling they had in 1956. They will feel that the rights of parliament have been trampled on. As far as the people in the armed forces are concerned, while they are now silenced by fear, the day will ultimately come when they will be able to speak out, by which time their morale will have sunk to unheard of levels, I am afraid.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, I could hardly resist the persuasive invitation of the right hon. gentleman opposite to take part in this discussion, so I should like to say a few words on the motion before the house. I am not speaking to the defence bill. There are three more days to discuss that measure and if I have a statement to make on it I will make it during that debate and not during this one which does not deal with the defence bill itself.

The right hon. gentleman did say that we on this side were attempting to bulldoze this bill through parliament. He is suggesting we are bulldozing it when, Mr. Speaker, we are in a minority position in this house and when the motion before us will not pass unless it gets the support of the majority of the members of this house. This is a queer kind of minority bulldozing.

A proposal was made a short time ago that was apparently designed to avoid this discussion. The effect of it was that we give the two clauses of this bill which are controversial, the two clauses that matter, the six months' hoist. That proposal was put before us. You know, Mr. Speaker, there is at least one tempting aspect to this proposal, and that is that if the six months' hoist were given, this matter would not come before this house again until next October. After listening to the right hon. gentleman this afternoon it is tempting to think that perhaps by that time we would be spared another speech by him on this question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is what you have desired for years.

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, that is not my desire. I hope that my right hon. friend will be sitting in that seat for a long, long time.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: And I am not being entirely unselfish in that wish, Mr. Speaker. The right hon. gentleman, with his customary scattergun approach, dealt with a great many things which had nothing whatever to do with this motion. In doing so, Mr. Speaker, I noticed something that he has done before, and I say this in no critical way. He redoubled his energy every time he lost his aim.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, may I help out the Prime Minister. That was first said in 1862 by Disraeli.

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker; that was first said—and I should put it in quotes—in 1853 by William Ewart Gladstone. I should like to plagiarize some other observations but perhaps I had better begin to make my own speech.

The right hon. gentleman did talk about closure, and that is pertinent to the motion. He was against closure. He said he did not like it and that he could see no distinction between closure and time allocation. I suggest it should be obvious to anybody that closure can be imposed on the House of Commons without the consent of the House of Commons having been sought whereas time allocations cannot. Parliament has its opportunity and its duty to decide whether there will be time allocations, and parliament will decide this evening at a quarter to ten whether there should be an allocation of time to discuss this particular bill.

In support of his bitter attack on closure this afternoon the right hon. gentleman quoted some newspapers such as the Winnipeg *Free Press*. The Winnipeg *Free Press*, in commenting about closure in connection with the flag discussion, had this to say—and this is now one of the right hon. gentleman's favourite newspapers:

> Mr. Diefenbaker must therefore answer this question: If closure is the terrible thing which Conservatives pretend, why did he force it upon Mr. Pearson?

As I say, Mr. Speaker, this is what the Winnipeg *Free Press* had to say in connection with the flag debate.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What is the date of that article?

Mr. Pearson: It is the issue of December 14, 1964. It goes on to say:

> If the rule itself is wrong—

That is the closure rule.

—Mr. Diefenbaker must explain why he gave repeal of that rule such low priority that, even with a large majority—

The largest majority in our history, Mr. Speaker.

—and, as it turned out, with the assent of the Liberals—

Because we asked him to do this.

—he failed in six years to remove it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: But we never imposed it at any time.

Mr. Pearson: It was mentioned during the campaign, and in the first speech from the throne of my right hon. friend's government there was included the sentence: "We will abolish closure". That was in 1957.

Mr. Hellyer: A broken promise.

Mr. Pearson: It was never used and it was never abolished, and it is part of our procedure now.

Closure, of course, can be a very arbitrary action. The right hon. gentleman referred this afternoon to Sir Winston Churchill in terms of admiration and respect which we all feel for a great democrat and lover of parliament. But Sir Winston Churchill did not hesitate in government to use closure when he felt it was necessary to do so.

Mr. Diefenbaker: With the consent of the Speaker.

Mr. Pearson: But in order to avoid closure, Mr. Speaker, we have by agreement—and this is part of the rules and procedures of this house—worked out a system of time allocation for legislative and other proposals that come before this house. We hope that agreement on allocation of time can be reached voluntarily. However, if it cannot be reached voluntarily it can then be made the subject of a motion put to the house by the government of the day for its acceptance or its rejection. Is there any fairer way than that to bring debate to an end when the time has come for a decision to be made after due debate? That is what we are asking to do today, Mr. Speaker.

I want to discuss this procedure because I think this is the first time in our parliamentary history that any government has asked parliament to allocate time for a piece of legislation. We are here to consider this procedure, and I think we must consider it in light of the present parliamentary situation and the debate that has taken place on this bill. We must consider whether there has been time for adequate consideration and discussion in the light of the present situation of parliament, in the light of the important developments in our country which require parliamentary intervention and action, and in the light of the necessity for getting on with the business of parliament and the business of the House of Commons that requires us to take action in regard to these important matters.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I shall examine this resolution in the terms and context of our parliamentary program and the functioning of parliament under the present rules and in existing political circumstances. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is the context in which we should be discussing this matter and not in the context chosen for the most part by my right hon. friend, which would be more appropriate for the debate on the defence bill, a debate that has been going on for days and days and days. I shall ask the house, Mr. Speaker, to look at the basic situation we face today in the light of parliamentary and legislative action. When that is done I suggest that it will not be difficult to justify in the minds of the majority of this house and in the minds of the majority of people in this country that the time has come to bring this debate, important as it has been, to a conclusion so that we may get on with other important pieces of legislation.

Our country is developing. It is changing at a pace and in a way that is unprecedented in our history. New problems are constantly emerging because of these changes. Because of increased organization, because of the need of people to shift from areas of less than full employment to areas of labour shortage and because with our complex industrial economy it is essential to make adjustments constantly to ensure the continuance of the high rate of growth in this country, increasing prosperity and the high standard of living, we must adopt our living to new conditions.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Half a million unemployed.

Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are half a million unemployed and that is a deplorable situation, but only half as deplorable as when there were a million unemployed under my right hon. friend. Half a million is bad but one million is worse. We want the kind of legislative changes put into effect

which will reduce the half a million unemployed to the irreducible minimum in this country.

All these complex changes in our society require changes in our law and in our legislative processes to keep pace with them. If the laws are not adjusted in accordance with the requirements of our new life they can impede the development of Canada and reduce our capacity to provide the standards and levels which we would otherwise be capable of maintaining. That means, Mr. Speaker, that more legislation is required on more subjects in this country than ever before in our history. I hope to be able to indicate the evidence of this shortly. If our parliamentary institutions are unable to cope effectively with these legislative requirements, people will lose faith in parliament and its processes and they will lose faith in democracy also.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: Apart from the rapidly changing material circumstances of our society we are experiencing, as other countries are, a rapid change in values and popular attitudes. This has been reflected in this session of parliament in discussion of the laws relating to divorce, capital punishment, penal reform and other social problems. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is of fundamental importance that the legal fabric of our society lag not too far behind these changes in values and attitudes.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: Surely it is important and essential that parliamentary procedure adapt itself to these new requirements.

If our laws are to be changed, they have to be changed by parliament. That is one of the main reasons for parliament's existence. Let us have discussion, of course, but discussion leading to decision after a reasonable time has been given for that discussion. Discussion, yes—but discussion leading to legislation, to approval or rejection of the proposals put before parliament. If parliament is not capable of dealing quickly and effectively with the needs of the country, it fails in its essential purpose. This does not mean, Mr. Speaker, and I would not like it to be interpreted as meaning, that this parliament has not accomplished a great deal.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Ha.

Mr. Pearson: This parliament has passed and is passing more legislation than has ever been passed before in our history.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Ha.

Mr. Pearson: That is true.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: In a similar period of time.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I thought we were obstructing.

Mr. Pearson: But that is not the proper standard of measurement we must apply to our parliamentary procedures. The standard is not measured against the record of the past but against the needs of the present and the future. The standard is not what has been done in previous sessions or, indeed, earlier in this session. The standard must be the needs of Canada and the Canadian people in the weeks, months and years ahead. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is in this context that we must view the present situation in which parliament finds itself, and it is in this context, I suggest, that we must consider the decision of the government that there should be an opportunity for the House of Commons to allocate time as provided by our rules and to draw to a close this debate on defence unification and defence matters—by agreement, if possible. That agreement has not been possible. It was not possible because the official opposition made no proposal of any kind, as I understand it, for such allocation.

An hon. Member: That is not so.

Mr. Pearson: They made no proposal about any time that might be sufficient to dispose of this bill. Their view was that this bill is wrong—

An hon. Member: What about Tuesday?

Mr. Pearson: —that the government of the day does not accept their position that this bill is wrong, that it should not be proceeded with, and that they would continue to use the rules to discuss the bill in the hope of breaking our will so that we would abandon this bill at this time and go on with something else. Their position was, in other words, that we surrender to the opposition.

Mr. Churchill: Postpone the bill.

Mr. Pearson: Postpone the bill?

Mr. Churchill: That is the advice of the senior officers.

Mr. Pearson: My hon. friend says: "Postpone the bill." Postpone consideration of unification which was first put before members of the House of Commons in March 1964.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Nonsense.

Mr. Churchill: When did the bill come before us?

Mr. Pearson: We do not understand that. We think we would be derelict in our duty toward all the other things we ought to be doing in this house if we added to the time that has already been given in this house for the consideration of this bill. It has been said this afternoon and it has been said previously that the allocation of time and the way this motion is being put before the house are an undue limitation on the rights of parliament for free discussion of an important and controversial issue, as undoubtedly this one is, and very strong views are genuinely held by those against and those in favour of this bill. The charge, I think, is legitimate in the sense that it must be met.

How long has discussion gone on concerning this important measure? The figures have been put on the record before and I do not apologize for putting them on the record now. This bill, or this question, has been before the house in this session in one form or another for 27 days and the standing committee on national defence met on the bill on 26 days. This amounts, Mr. Speaker, to 53 days of discussion on this question in this session. I do not include in my total the three days spent largely on this subject on supply in February, 1966, nor will I include the 14 days on which this subject was discussed with varying degrees of intensity when the standing committee on national defence was considering the estimates for 1966-67 in May and June, 1966.

• (4:20 p.m.)

In case anyone should wish to examine my analysis of these statistics it is as follows: in the House of Commons, second reading, five days; in committee of the whole, 13 days; in interim supply, nine days, making a total of 27 days; in the standing committee on national defence on Bill C-243, 26 days. That seems to me to be an adequate time for consideration to be given even to a bill as important as this one.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Would the Prime Minister permit a question? He has indicated the time taken to consider this measure. Would he explain why the Minister of National Defence found it regrettable that more witnesses were not called before the committee?

Mr. Pearson: I am indicating the amount of time which was made available to hon. members of the house and the committee for discussion of this bill and producing witnesses to take part in that discussion.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Would the Prime Minister answer the question?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Prime Minister has the floor.

Mr. Pearson: I wish to pass now to another aspect of this question, one to which I alluded at the beginning of my remarks. I should like to make as clear as I can the stark reality of our parliamentary situation in regard to the time we have already spent on legislation and on other proposals this year and the time which will be needed to do the things which should be done, some of which are already on the order paper and others of which have been announced.

Before each session of parliament, as the right hon. gentleman knows, having been head of the government, all departments are asked to indicate what legislative measures are required together with an opinion as to their importance and priority. When this was done for the opening of this present session so long ago in January, 1966, a larger number of proposals than usual were put forward as being important and urgent because it had not been possible to deal with them in earlier sessions.

At the beginning of this session the cabinet reduced the list to those items of which parliamentary approval might reasonably be expected and which in our view warranted the highest priority. These appeared in the Speech from the Throne on January 10, 1966. The list did not by any means include all the legislation which was considered to be urgent or important or both. For instance, that particular list did not include amendments to the Canada Water Conservation Assistance Act, amendments to the National Parks Act, revision of the Expropriation Act, revision of the Vocational Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons Act, amendments to the Navigable Waters Protection Act, amendments to the Immigration Act and over 15 other pieces of legislation which were considered at that time to be desirable. These were all bills which in our view were needed to meet the national requirements and improve national life. Yet, as

I have mentioned, we felt it was impossible even to list them with any hope of parliamentary action—and we were shown to be right.

An hon. Member: Why fool around with this measure then?

Mr. Pearson: Of the legislation which was listed in the speech from the throne, parliament has by no means dealt with all of it even after sitting for 244 days, as of yesterday. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) has a question on the order paper in which he asks:

> What are the intentions of the government at this session of parliament with respect to the following measures forecast in the Speech from the Throne but not yet introduced:

The question goes on to set out those proposals. The intentions of the government are to get these measures dealt with. But what are the intentions, or the possibilities, of the House of Commons? By including these measures in the speech from the throne the government indicated its intention that they should be acted upon. But there is a second part to the hon. gentleman's question. Why, he asks, has action not been taken to date with respect to each of those measures promised in the speech from the throne. If the hon. member would consider what has happened in connection with the defence unification bill and other proposals, including interim supply, he might be able to answer his own question.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: Apart from the important pieces of legislation which the hon. member for Carleton has mentioned there are others of importance which he has not mentioned and which equally clearly cannot be passed at this session of parliament, though we would like to see them introduced and dealt with as soon as possible. Perhaps I should mention some of these. I do not think there is any possibility of getting them through this session though it is possible we can do so during the rest of the year: amendments to the Area Development Incentives Act; recapitalization of the C.N.R., visiting armed forces act; amendments to the Canada Corporations Act; Canada manpower and immigration council bill; national museums of Canada bill; bill respecting the Cape Breton coal industry; amendments to the National Housing Act; broadcasting legislation.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): A point of order, Mr. Speaker. It arises from the statement by the Prime Minister that possibly the Cape Breton coal legislation could be dealt with this session.

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): The point of order arises from the fact that the minister of mines has already announced that it will not be dealt with during the present session.

Mr. Speaker: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Pearson: Had the hon. member been listening closely he would have realized that this was a list of proposals which cannot be dealt with during the present session but which we hope to deal with during the rest of this year. With the items I have mentioned and one or two others of less importance which I have omitted, including a proposal for the appointment of six more parliamentary secretaries—

Mr. Diefenbaker: May I put a question to the right hon. gentleman? A little earlier in his remarks he said that capital punishment might be discussed. In view of the uncertainty which hangs over those who are today awaiting death, is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation at the present session in this connection?

Mr. Pearson: I mentioned this as one of the problems which the government has been considering. It is not a matter which can be dealt with this session but I would hope it could be dealt with this year in a responsible way.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: With the items I have mentioned—I have left out a few of the less important ones—and with those listed by the hon. member for Carleton we have 21 items of legislation which were considered to be important enough to warrant our trying to get them through in this session of parliament but which we shall not now be able to deal with, though I still say we hope to deal with them later in the year.

Nor is this the total measure of our inability as a parliament to meet the needs of the country, though it is certainly evidence of our failure to measure up to the standards which Canadians might reasonably expect in terms of parliamentary action. Let us consider the session we are trying to bring to an end, and I am sure all hon. members will be glad when that can be done.

Mr. Churchill: I suggested how it could be done six weeks ago.

Mr. Pearson: It could be done this week with respect to three items provided we gave up the defence bill, and we are not going to do that.

Mr. Churchill: Just postpone it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Just postpone the disintegration of the armed forces.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Pearson: There are some things of such urgent importance that because of the requirements of the situation they must be done before we prorogue. They must be done this session. There is interim supply. Supply has been voted for April only and we must have finances for May to enable the business of the country to go on. Then there is the occupational training of adults bill. This must be dealt with as the old program expired on March 31. Interim action under the provision for interim supply cannot cover the full field.

There are the rules of the House of Commons. The interim rules, inadequate as I believe them to be for our present requirements, must be extended for the new session if we are to measure up even as badly as we have done in this session to the current needs. I would hope that the rules committee when it meets in the next session will be able to bring in some very far-reaching changes that will commend themselves to all hon. members.

Then there are amendments to the Wheat Board Act. These should be passed or essential provisions of the act will expire at the end of July. There are also amendments to the Canadian Citizenship Act. Surely we are going to pass this legislation so that by our one hundredth birthday we shall have established equality between naturalized and native born Canadian citizens.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: There are amendments to the Income Tax Act, to repeal the 5 per cent tax on business profits. There is revision of the Interpretation Act. This bill has been introduced in three parliaments, in 1962, in 1965 and in the present parliament. It has never been passed and because it has not been passed the whole process of statute law revision is being held up. The list I have given does not include action on the report on Mr. Justice Landreville or, indeed, the question of capital punishment.

How long will it take parliament to deal with these urgent items if there is no allocation of time in respect of the current debate? I would go further than that. In the light of these legislative requirements and the problems they pose to the House of Commons, surely it would be possible for the business committee to get together and allocate time to all these things I have mentioned—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: —because if we cannot do something like that, if we cannot plan—and it takes agreement by all parties to bring about this kind of planning—what will be the situation when we face our new session, our centennial session of parliament? When is it going to start? Well, we don't know. How much will it be able to do? Well, we don't know. That will depend on how we can plan the work by allocation of time to this and the various other measures we should put through before the centennial session.

Mr. Churchill: Closure.

Mr. Pearson: It is not closure because I hope it can be done by agreement as it is done in the United Kingdom each week by agreement between the whips, and done so successfully that there never has to be a government order planning time except on rare occasions. When such a government order is made in the United Kingdom—and I point out that we like to follow British parliamentary practice or at least we hear this said so often—when the government makes an order for allocation of time it becomes an order of the house once it is introduced by the government.

By contrast we are presenting the House of Commons with a procedure under which, by agreement, we can allocate time to all these important matters, and the priority and importance of these legislative proposals can be agreed on by representatives of all parties, not merely by the government. Surely that would be a step forward in the conduct of parliamentary business.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: But if that cannot be done and if a new session begins say on May 8—I have no grounds for believing that that can happen, but let us for the sake of argument say we can end this session on May 5 and begin the new one on May 8—there are certain things that should be done, some that have to be done, before we can even consider

a summer adjournment when hon. members may like to take part in at least some of the centennial celebrations.

With the maximum number of days they require for debate under our present rules, these things that in the government's view have to be done are the debate on the address, for which eight sitting days are provided; supply, 30 sitting days; supply motions, eight sitting days; the budget, six sitting days, or a total of 52 sitting days for those particular items.

Her Majesty the Queen, Mr. Speaker, will arrive for her centennial visit on June 29. From May 8 to June 28 there will be 38 sitting days to deal with proposals which could require, if we do not agree, 52 sitting days. In other words, we cannot possibly, unless parliament changes its approach to these problems, accomplish even the basic essential requirements to maintain the business of the country before the arrival of the Queen. That visit will require a parliamentary adjournment of a week or so around July 1, with the session resuming in the second week of July to cover the essential business. By the end of the second week in July, by which time I would hope that essential business would be completed, we shall not have passed one single item of legislation in the centennial session that I have been talking about. We can stay on all summer or we can come back in September or October.

The legislation that will be facing us at that time—I hope I am wrong but I do not think I am because it is not likely that the legislation will be facing us before then—will be legislation that is important to the country and which ought to be passed this year. It includes the Broadcasting Act, the Immigration Act, the Unemployment Insurance Act, the Canadian Development Corporation Act, the Cape Breton coal and development legislation, amendments to the National Housing Act, major social legislation including changes in the legislation regarding divorce, penal legislation, juvenile delinquency legislation and other social reforms, and a new corporations act to provide for better information by corporations and better protection for investors.

It also includes amendments to the Food and Drugs Act, amendments to the Proprietary or Patent Medicine Act, amendments to the Criminal Code, amendments to the Parole Act, the budget bills, legislation which is ready or will be ready soon on manpower mobility, amendments to the Indian Act, amendments to the Farm Improvement Loans Act and the Fishery Improvement Loans Act, revision of the Customs Act to take into account the results of the Kennedy round of tariff discussions, which I hope will be good, amendments to the Customs Tariff Act, a new Canada water act, amendments to the Financial Administration Act, amendments to the Canada Elections Act on election expenses—perhaps we can agree on cutting down the time for general elections—legislation to control pollution in interprovincial waters, amendments to the Post Office Act, amendments to the National Energy Board Act, legislation on educational television unless it has been previously dealt with by estimates—

Mr. Knowles: It won't be.

Mr. Pearson: —and a resolution covering the words of the national anthem.

These, Mr. Speaker, are not all the items of legislation that should be dealt with if the laws of Canada are to be made consonant with the needs of Canada, but this would be a good program for the rest of 1967.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: If we are going to be able to do this as a House of Commons, and I am speaking as a member of the House of Commons and one who has a very special responsibility in these matters, we do have to work out procedures not only in respect of the critical situation which we have now, something which has been building up, but procedures which will anticipate these difficulties and allocate time to bring in proposals before the discussion on those bills and proposals. If we can do that then we will be able as a House of Commons to plan a legislative program for the years ahead which will show that we are aware of the needs and the requirements of this new country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to discuss the defence bill but to confine my remarks to the motion for time allocation which is now before us. It is unfortunate that it was necessary to move this motion to allocate the amount of time which will be made available for the debate on unification of the armed forces as set out in Bill C-243. I feel certain that had there been greater foresight and had less adamant positions been taken at the earlier stages it probably would not have been necessary to bring in the motion now before us. However, I am glad that the government

did not act under standing order 33 which provides for closure and was invoked in 1956 during the pipe line debate. By acting under provisional standing order 15A of which notice was given a week ago today, the government has at least provided an opportunity for consultation and has given fairly adequate notice. If this motion passes tonight those who wish to discuss the bill further will still have three more days in which to do so.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that there comes a time when in respect of any piece of legislation, no matter how important, a decision must be made. The matter of the unification of the armed services, which is extremely important, was discussed at some length during interim supply, for four or five days on second reading, during 55 sittings of the defence committee and now 13 days on clause 2 in committee of the whole.

There is value in having a fairly prolonged debate on something which is controversial because a prolonged debate provides an opportunity for the public to become aware of the issues at stake. It also gives an opportunity for parliament to obtain a reaction from the public, particularly those sections concerned about the principles at stake in the legislation in question. However, this matter has been before the house at various stages since last October and the question of integration and the white paper since 1964. It would certainly seem to me that the public is now fully aware of all the ramifications of this legislation. Certainly parliament has had an opportunity during the sittings of the defence committee to hear expert opinion. We have now heard from both sides of the house and from all available parties with reference to their reaction to the proposed legislation. It seems to me that all points of view having been expressed, parliament now has a responsibility and a duty to make a decision on this matter.

Whether a member agrees with the unification legislation or whether he disagrees, surely the time has come in a democratic forum to allow the majority of members to register their opinion either for or against it. Not only have we a responsibility to do this but it seems to me we must give some regard to the fact that unnecessarily prolonged debate on one measure of necessity precludes discussion on other matters which may be of equally vital importance.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask a question?

[Mr. Douglas.]

Mr. Douglas: I would prefer if the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre would defer his question until I have finished so I can keep some coherence of thought in the case I am trying to present.

Mr. Alkenbrack: That is pretty difficult.

Mr. Douglas: Yes, it is when I get silly remarks from people who do not even get up when they want to object. I am trying to make a cohesive statement, and I am sure that during the last 13 days a coherent line of thought would have been strange in this house.

I am not only concerned about bringing the debate on the unification of the armed services to a decision. I am concerned about the fact that the present impasse in which parliament finds itself focuses attention on the serious deficiency of our parliamentary procedures. There is little value now in trying to apportion blame as to who is responsible for the fact that now we must adopt the extraordinary procedure provided by provisional standing order 15A in order to bring this debate to a close. There is not much point in saying that the minister of defence is arrogant, that the government is bull-headed, or that the official opposition is obstructive and repetitive. What we have to do in all seriousness is accept the fact that all of us who are members of this house must assume some of the responsibility for the manner in which we have conducted the affairs of parliament. We must recognize that parliament has now become a full-time job and that the matters which concern parliament are much more complex and far reaching than they have ever been in the past. There is hardly an aspect of the daily lives of men and women that is not reflected in some matter we discuss in this parliament.

Parliament in this country, as in nearly all democratic countries, has reached out to touch areas of human endeavour that were not subjects of governmental concern 25 or 30 years ago. Because of that it seems to me that the old method of conducting the affairs of parliament will no longer suffice to meet the demands of the present situation. In this regard we have only to look at what has happened this session, which we hope is now nearing its end. The 1966-67 session will be the longest in our history. The previous record was set by the session of 1964-65 when the famous flag debate took place. That session lasted 248 sitting days. By next Tuesday, April 25, we will have equalled this record for

sitting days, but since parliament sits longer hours we will actually have sat more hours. If this session of parliament extends beyond next Tuesday, which it undoubtedly will, it will have the record as being the longest parliamentary session in our history.

How much longer can we continue to operate under a series of archaic procedures when, after 14 months, we still find ourselves with a great many important items which have not been dealt with and will have to be passed over until the next session? There are many important questions which should be dealt with during this session and which, in the opinion of members of this party, must be dealt with at the next session and during this calendar year, 1967.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Assuming that a new session of parliament begins in the next week or two, it will take from then until July 1 just to deal with the speech from the throne, the budget and the estimates. What have we left? The Prime Minister has already indicated a whole host of things that he would like to see dealt with in the next session.

Mr. Lewis: This year.

Mr. Douglas: Yes, he wants to see them dealt with this year. I must say that while the Prime Minister wants them dealt with this year, I think it is a great pity that many of them were not introduced this session. While the government has not full responsibility for how long debates take, nobody prevents the government putting legislation on the order paper. Many of the things the Prime Minister has been dangling in front of us today like Christmas packages could have been on the order paper and they were not. Some of them are of long standing, but there are some items which in the opinion of this party must be considered and adequately dealt with in the present year.

One of these is the housing situation, which has now reached the proportions of a national crisis. There is the report of the broadcasting committee to be dealt with. Broadcasting in this country and the operations of the C.B.C. are almost in a state of suspended animation until we receive some direction and a clearcut policy is laid down. Then there are the social measures that members in all parts of the house have been discussing and to which the Prime Minister has indicated he is favourably disposed. These include such matters as divorce legislation, amendments to the Criminal Code regarding the dissemination of birth control information, and legislation regarding the legalizing of abortions where the health of the mother is in danger.

We need to deal with the manpower policy, which is not in a happy state at the present time. With 400,000 unemployed this country will need a manpower policy that is much more aggressive and far reaching than anything we have had to date. There is also the Canada-United States auto pact, which the government has now indicated it would be willing to have discussed by a committee of the house. If it is to be the pattern for future rationalization of the industries of Canada and the United States, this pact has to be examined to see how it has affected our economy, what benefits we have received from it and what disadvantages we have suffered. Then there is the legislation regarding the Canada Development Corporation which must be dealt with. This measure was first introduced in resolution form as far back as 1963 and has been put off year after year by the government. There is no legislation before us in this respect.

In my opinion the defence committee of the house and the house itself must in 1967 discuss NORAD. This treaty is subject to renegotiation in 1968. We do not want to be discussing it the way we discussed Bomarc missiles, that is, after the government has signed an agreement. The defence committee first and then the house ought to undertake the fullest possible investigation and examination of this problem, particularly with reference to the anti-ballistic missile program which could involve this country in tremendous expenditure.

We must also deal with unemployment insurance legislation. We are still waiting for some action on the Gill report. The benefit rates and ceilings are still those established eight years ago and they are completely inadequate today. We have not yet been able to deal with the report of the public accounts committee. This is a serious matter. Some of the comments of the Auditor General are disturbing. This house ought to have the opportunity to discuss fully the report of the Auditor General and that of the public accounts committee.

The Prime Minister in a speech yesterday referred to communications satellites. This whole matter is of vital importance to Canada if we are not to be dependent upon another country for our communications systems in the future. I am hoping the Prime Minister will agree to send this matter fairly soon after the

new session starts to a committee of the house so we may know what type of research work is being carried out and whether we are taking adequate steps, and taking them quickly enough, to safeguard Canada's interests in the field of communications.

The Prime Minister has mentioned the matter of amendments to the Canada Elections Act to deal with the report of the committee on election expenses. There is the question of capital punishment, the matter of the Cape Breton coal mines, anti-pollution of water and air, and a whole host of other things. We will not be able to deal with these matters in 1967 unless we are prepared to examine the procedures of the House of Commons. In the opinion of the members of this party parliament must plan its business if we are to adequately discharge our responsibilities and grapple courageously and effectively with the vital problems that are confronting the people we represent.

The Prime Minister has given us a long list of items that he would like to have had discussed in this session and which he hopes will be discussed in the next session. He says that parliament has not been able to organize its business in a way which would have permitted these matters to be dealt with. I say to the Prime Minister that he must accept a very major share of the responsibility for this situation. One of the responsibilities of government is to give leadership in arranging the affairs of parliament. What attempt has the government made to plan the work of parliament? We set up a business committee with great hopes that it would effect the planning and conduct of our work in this house. I think that with the exception of the redistribution legislation, and now the unification of the armed services legislation, this committee has never been called into session.

The government has simply drifted from one little crisis to another and has made no real attempt to plan the work of the session or to get the co-operation of the parties in planning that work. It is true, as the Prime Minister says, that it takes all parties to do this. Of course it does. But it requires leadership, and that leadership must come from the government and the Prime Minister. It has not been forthcoming; the house has not been getting that kind of leadership. I am convinced that we have now such a backlog of legislative items that we will not be able in this calendar year to cope with them unless we begin almost immediately to use the business committee of the house to plan the work of the session one or two weeks in advance, to obtain where possible agreement as to the amount of time that will be allocated for each debate, and if we cannot reach agreement the majority of the members of the house will have to decide what that allocation shall be.

• (5:00 p.m.)

All of us are for free speech. All of us want to have the right to express our opinion. If that right is monopolized by a few and on a selective number of items, this automatically excludes other hon. members from discussing other items which they consider to be of equal importance. Unless we allocate time in the 1967 session of parliament we will wind up next Christmas or early next winter in exactly the same position we are in now, with a backlog of legislative items and programs untouched.

I am not suggesting for a moment that parliament can become a sort of board of directors. I recognize that parliament is also a forum for dialogue and for a confrontation of ideas. But even in a forum there must be some fair allocation of time so that various ideas have an opportunity to be expressed and various items can be debated. Therefore I am suggesting to the house on behalf of this party that if we have any hope at all that the items to which the Prime Minister has referred, those which I have enumerated, and many others for which the Canadian people are asking, are going to be dealt with during this session, then we must be prepared to exercise some self-discipline and to reorganize our procedures so that we can do the job we were sent here to do.

I want to make it clear that if there is going to be an allocation of time for debates, it has to be done in advance. It is not good enough when the government, dawdling along, allows itself to get into an impasse, calls the business committee together and tries to secure some unanimity, and then comes before the house asking that a debate be curtailed after strong emotions have been aroused and a certain degree of acrimony displayed. The only way we can really have planned debates is to plan them a week or two in advance so that we know what items are going to come up, so that we can agree among the parties that a certain debate will take two or three days or a week depending on the importance of the subject, and so that when we begin the debate we know how much time there is and therefore how many speakers each party will be entitled to have

and thus will be able to plan our work accordingly. Those members who cannot take part in that debate can be preparing for another debate. In this way we could hope to deal effectively with the very large program which the Prime Minister has outlined.

But if we do not do that, if the government continues to drift as it has been doing, if it will not give any leadership—certainly the opposition parties cannot take the initiative in this matter—then I warn the government that it had better not try at the end of this year, when all kinds of items have not been passed and in some cases not even been introduced, to lay the responsibility at the door of the opposition. I can say to the government that if it is prepared to give some leadership and to use the business committee as a planning committee to organize the work of the house and the work of the committees, it will have our full and complete co-operation.

I do not need to tell the members of this house, who are just as close to the public as I am, that we are living in a very critical age when men, women and particularly young people are reassessing our institutions and customs. Things that were accepted as sacrosanct for generations are now being taken out and examined. We are now in the presence of a generation which is stripping off the irrelevant and outworn and which recognizes that if society is to move forward it can only be done by retaining the things that have relevance for life.

This is going on in every field of thought and endeavour. Parliament is not immune. People today are examining democratic procedures and testing democratic government, not on the basis of clichés but on the basis of its ability to perform, its ability to put on the statute books and to put into effect programs which will enhance human life, raise the standard of living and improve the quality of life for the ordinary citizen. If we are not able to do that, then the day will come in this country when men will begin to question the value of parliamentary government and will begin to think in terms of other kinds of government. That is why I think it is important that in this debate we avoid recriminations and seriously try to face up to this problem, which is the responsibility of all of us, that is, how we can organize the work of parliament so as to do the job that we were sent here to do? If we are not successful in doing that, then the people of this country will hold us responsible, and justly so.

Proposal for Time Allocation

Some two and a half years ago the members of the New Democratic party first called for a series of reforms in our parliamentary procedure. In closing I want to put on the record eight proposals which I have just released as being what we think is a reasonable basis for approaching this whole question of reorganizing the work of parliament. These eight procedures are as follows:

1. The annual session of parliament should be divided into sections, with provision for periods of time between such sections, when committees can meet and deal with matters referred to them by the house. This proposal calls for the planning of the parliamentary year and for arrangements to deal with all categories of business in a definite order. This will also enable the country to know the time of the year when various items will be considered. The government has a responsibility for giving leadership in an orderly planning of the business of the house.

2. There should be instituted a practice of prior allocation, by all-party agreement, of a maximum time for each stage of debate.

3. The role of parliamentary committees must be strengthened by giving them time to meet when parliament is not sitting, by appointing small, effective committees related to the present-day business of parliament, by providing them with the means and staff to do their work properly and by providing for their reports to be considered by parliament. Final decisions would have to remain with the house. But committees should be enabled to do their work and to make their reports in such a way that the ground covered in committee would not have to be covered again.

4. The present method of entering departmental estimates in committee of supply by a fixed number of motions at times determined by the government should be replaced by one such motion early in the session, and provision made for a maximum of six special debates per session, when such debates are asked for, on notice, by ten or more members.

• (5:10 p.m.)

5. Speeches made while Mr. Speaker is in the chair should be limited as follows: The Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, and any other speakers who now have unlimited time, to be allowed not more than 60 minutes for any one speech; The leader of a party other than the government or official opposition, or the first speaker for any such party, to be allowed 40 minutes; all other speeches to be limited to 30 minutes.

6. The resolution preceding a money bill should be eliminated. This would still leave three stages of debate on all bills, namely, second reading and third reading, together with the committee stage, during which the details of the bill should be discussed.

7. Arrangements should be made to provide the caucus of each recognized party in parliament with adequate research and other staff, the cost to be related to the number of members in the caucus. This new measure would involve a modest total cost and would give members of parliament a much better understanding of the business coming before parliament and thus enable them to

serve more effectively their country and their constituents.

8. The quorum of the House of Commons should be increased. The present figure of 20, established on a temporary basis in 1867, is far too low.

We are not wedded to these proposals, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Pearson: May I ask my hon. friend a question? Has he managed to get the support of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) for all these proposals?

Mr. Douglas: I am glad to say that not only do they have the support of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre but he was chairman of the caucus committee which drafted these proposals. I feel the government will have no difficulty in getting his support as well as the support of all members in this group with regard to the proposals I have outlined.

I am not saying these proposals are the final word. There are others who will have other proposals, some of which may be better than these. All we are suggesting is that the committee on procedure, which has already suggested to the house in a report with which we shall be dealing in a few days that the provisional standing orders carry over to the next session, ought to be convened as soon as the next session starts. I suppose it could begin its work now and could look at these questions in order to bring in proposals as early as possible in the new session. In this way we could overhaul our antiquated procedure so that we would have some hope that in the new session we will be able to complete the legislation which I am sure all members are agreed is absolutely essential for the welfare of this country.

It had been assumed early in the year that probably we would get a long holiday because of the centennial celebrations. However, anyone who takes a look at the list of legislation the Prime Minister read a short time ago, and who adds to it the legislation he did not enumerate, will recognize that the likelihood of a long holiday is most remote. I say that I cannot think of any better centennial project for the Canadian parliament than the overhaul of its rules in 1967 in order to deal with the largest legislative program that has ever been dealt with by any parliament in the history of Canada.

Mr. Churchill: The hon. member said he would accept a question when he finished. Will he do so now?

Mr. Douglas: Yes.

[Mr. Douglas.]

Mr. Churchill: While the Prime Minister is here I should like to ask this question. Would the hon. member support the proposal I put forward with regard to postponing the present bill on unification, which cannot go into effect as we have been told by the minister, by General Allard, and by the adjutant general, until the regulations are completed in about four to six months? Would he support the postponement of clauses 2 and 6 on the suggestion that the department go ahead and draft the regulations?

While the hon. member is thinking that over, may I ask him a second question? Would he support me in proposing that this debate come to an immediate conclusion, that we postpone clauses 2 and 6 of the unification bill but pass all the rest of the bill between now and six o'clock, go on with adult training tonight, complete the adult training bill, the rules committee report and interim supply by tomorrow night? Will he support me in those proposals because of the tremendous program of work that faces us this year?

Mr. Douglas: With regard to the proposals made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill), we must deal with the first one because the second is contingent on the first. I would support the hon. member's proposal for postponing the debate on clauses 2 and 6 if I were convinced the hon. member would agree to an allocation of time when clauses 2 and 6 came up for consideration.

Mr. Churchill: I do agree, and you can reduce the consideration to two days instead of three.

Mr. Douglas: If the hon. member is prepared to accept an allocation of two days next October, then I cannot see what value there is in the postponement of this debate from now until October. If after all this discussion the hon. member wants two days for debate, then it seems to me we will not be any more ready for a vote after those two days of discussion next October. I really suspect my hon. friend wants to wait until next October to get his second wind. If the length of time that has been taken on the first wind is any criterion, I would hate to think what would happen with his second wind.

Mr. Baldwin: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question with regard to an alternative proposal which he might consider and which I should say is my own proposal? Would the hon. member give consideration, provided

clauses 2 and 6 were passed, to agreeing that they should not be proclaimed until the minister and the government have had an opportunity of preparing these regulations? These proposals would then be brought back into the house for debate at a future time.

Mr. Douglas: My understanding is that the government has indicated already it has no intention of proclaiming the act for about six months. It seems to me that if the official opposition or other opposition parties want to ask the government during those six months to prepare regulations so we will have a chance to see them prior to proclamation, then this is something for the government to decide. However, I understand the proposal has already been rejected by the official opposition.

Mr. Lewis: The proposal of the hon. member has been rejected by his own party.

Mr. Baldwin: I indicated I was putting this forward as my own suggestion.

Mr. Douglas: I can see no objection to it, but it is a matter on which the government should express an opinion.

Mr. Pearson: I wonder whether I could ask one question? Is the hon. gentleman aware of the fact that seven out of the eight points of his very interesting proposals to amend the business of the house have already appeared before Mr. Speaker's committee on procedure and it was not possible to get them adopted?

Mr. Knowles: All eight of them have appeared.

Mr. Brewin: Why doesn't the government put them through?

Mr. Douglas: Since the Prime Minister has put this in the form of a question, may I say that merely putting words into the rules does not necessarily change procedures unless some action is taken. We have already altered the rules to provide for the establishment of a business committee. If the government does not make use of the business committee and the business committee does not function, and if there is no allocation of time or planning of debates, no matter how many proposals are made by the committee or how many proposals the house adopts the procedures of the house will not be any more efficient than they have been in the past.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Would the hon. member permit another question? Is the leader of the New Democratic party aware that the defence committee evidence, which was not objected to by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer) at the time, shows that the government will not have any decision whatever to make about proclaiming this bill. It is not their decision to make.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Perhaps I should clarify my question for the leader of the New Democratic party.

Mr. Olson: Order. You do not have the floor.

Mr. Douglas: All I can say is that I am not aware of it, and I do not think anybody else is except the hon. member.

Mr. Olson: When the time comes for the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. MacInnis) to make his contribution to the debate, Mr. Speaker, he can raise this matter at that time. The first point I want to deal with is the eight very interesting proposals which have now been advanced by the leader of the New Democratic party. As the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) pointed out, they are not new because every one of them was presented to the committee on procedure not only this year but at meetings in the past and some of them were partially accepted.

The point that must be made is that these ideas did not originate solely from the N.D.P. Many of them were put forward by members of all parties in this house. I am a little surprised to hear them advanced at this time on the floor of the House of Commons because I was under the impression that the meetings held were in camera and that the proposals to be made by the committee would be in the form of either a majority or a unanimous report. I am a little disturbed, if nothing else, that all of these suggestions, or many of them, about certain aspects of parliamentary procedure should be advanced at this time as being policies of the New Democratic party.

Mr. Barnett: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Olson: I will when I have finished my speech. As I said, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a disservice to the purpose and intent of these

in camera meetings, which were conducted in an informal way, to have one party come along with practically all of the ideas advanced by various members and lay claim to them.

Mr. Douglas: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member is suggesting that the proposals which I enumerated were purloined from the committee and that somebody on the committee representing our party transmitted confidential information, then I want to say that such a suggestion is completely inaccurate and fallacious. As a matter of fact, the eight points that I enumerated today I outlined at a press conference two and a half years ago, and they were advocated by our representative on the committee. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, they could hardly have been purloined from the committee because we took them to the committee. Members of other parties may also have taken them to the committee, but I resent any suggestion that there has been some breach of confidence on the part of our representative on the committee.

Mr. Olson: After having the leader of the New Democratic party remind us that he did in fact present most of these points some two and a half years ago, Mr. Speaker, an even more serious question of privilege arises so far as I am concerned. If my memory serves me correctly, these eight points—I believe that in fact there were 11 put forward at the time—were contained in a press release which was issued between the time the subcommittee discussed them and the time the report was to be brought to the whole committee for further consideration. Therefore there is some kind of breach of propriety so far as I am concerned in the hon. member advancing these points now, and there was an even more serious breach of propriety at the time because almost all of them were in fact discussed by a subcommittee of the procedure committee. As I say, they were issued in a press release by the New Democratic party even before they had been discussed by the whole committee.

Mr. Brewin: And why not?

Mr. Olson: The hon. member asks why not. It seems that that is all the regard the hon. member has for the confidentiality of in camera meetings. I respect the nature of such meetings. It is useful to hold informal meetings conducted on a basis of confidentiality and without press releases being issued, because I happen to believe that far more gets done in that way.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I am speaking now as a member of the New Democratic party caucus. I want to tell the hon. member that to my own knowledge the proposals which we put forward publicly through our leader two and a half years ago and which he has again presented today were hammered out in good faith by the members of this party meeting together. I point out that the ideas that were set forth were ideas that we individually and collectively put forward in our own caucus and about which we reached certain conclusions. As I understand it, that is the manner in which they were again put forward by my leader today. He put them forward as a proposal in good faith, with the honest hope that putting them forward in the context of this debate might improve the procedures of this house. I must say I am surprised that a member such as the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) should suggest that these proposals were put forward in any other context. As my leader has said, we certainly do not claim exclusive parenthood for any or all of the ideas contained therein.

In concluding my question of privilege, may I say that we regard these proposals as being worthy of serious consideration by the members of this house no matter in which part of the chamber they happen to sit. We only hope that the hon. member for Medicine Hat and other members will consider them worthy of support.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I did not want to interrupt the question of privilege but I would remind the hon. member for Comox-Alberni that his remarks were out of order because he is not in his own seat.

Mr. Barnett: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I am in my own seat.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, on the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni I should like to make one or two comments, perhaps in a rather obtuse way. I realize that the hon. member for Medicine Hat has the floor, but since the question of privilege has been raised, and in view of some of the things said by the hon. member about honesty, I should like to make a few comments.

The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam talked about obstruction and repetitive speeches in the nice fashion in which he usually delivers his remarks. However, one of the things he said was that free expression cannot be monopolized by a select few. I should like to ask the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam to comment in all honesty on what he feels about the self-discipline of the hon. members for Skeena and Timiskaming who for over two years, by means of obstruction and repetitive procedures, prevented the subject of divorce being considered in this house and caused a great deal of concern to the people affected. I should like to ask the leader of the N.D.P. what his reaction is to two of his own members who made a goodly number of repetitive speeches because of a principle they believed in. Does he think that the time then was monopolized by a pretty select few?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I think the house is now getting beyond the limits of the question of privilege that has been raised. I would point out that the hon. member for Medicine Hat has the floor.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings will contribute to this debate later. The question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni is not valid. The hon. member suggests that his party is advancing proposals which might be accepted by other members. Most of his proposals, however, were advanced in the business committee by hon. members not of the New Democratic party on an occasion more than two years ago. There needs to be no more discussion on the point.

Having disagreed with the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam on one point, I now wish to agree with him on another. The hon. member suggests that the business committee should have been set up a long time ago to consider the allocation of reasonable times for many items of government business. It is unfortunate that under provisional standing order 15A the business committee should have been convened only at a critical stage of a controversial issue. It is unfortunate that other matters have not been referred to that committee.

It can be argued that when the house leaders meet their informal discussions are much the same as those that would be carried on in the business committee. Nevertheless, as far as I know no other item of legislation has been referred to that committee and then been the subject of a motion. Techniques ought to be developed for sending matters to that committee so they may be discussed and unanimous agreement on allocation of time for various matters may be reached. I say that because when there is a filibuster and debate continues for a long time with arguments being advanced not once but four or five times by the same speaker, an effective means of closure is implemented.

The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) complains that his group has not had an opportunity to discuss all the clauses in Bill C-243. That may be true. Yet his party has taken 13 days to discuss clause 2 without discussing any other clause. The hon. member says that we ought to stand clause 2, not pass it and go on with something else.

Mr. Churchill: Will the hon. member permit me to say something, because I think he has been most unfair? The time the house has spent discussing the bill has not been solely taken up by members of the Conservative party. More than 30 members of other parties have spoken, including members of the hon. member's party.

Mr. Olson: That is correct. We made one speech.

An hon. Member: Two.

Mr. Olson: I am referring to the 13 days spent in discussing clause 2. I have observed that for several days on end only members of the Progressive Conservative party have spoken. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre gave an undertaking, though he had no right to give it, that there would be no discussion later on clauses 2 and 6 provided parliament could reach the stage where only those two clauses would be left for the next session. He had no right to make such undertaking on behalf of the opposition or even on behalf of his own party. The hon. member's position is false. No member of the house knows better than the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre that if clauses 2 and 6 are not passed during this session they die, that if the bill does not pass it also dies.

There are rules that may restore a bill to the position it once held on the order paper. Should clauses 2 and 6 not be passed, that would be the end of them. Should the bill not be passed, the hon. member knows that that would be the end of it. The hon. member is pretending to be magnanimous by saying that the other clauses will be allowed to pass by

six o'clock if clauses 2 and 6 are stood. It is magnanimous of the hon. member's party which has spent 13 days discussing one clause to offer to pass all other clauses in so short a time. The hon. member offered also to put all stages of other bills through within a few hours. Yet always the hon. member advances conditions that must be acquiesced in, his attitude being that he is acting with a spirit of genuine concern—

Mr. Churchill: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is imputing motives. The suggestion I made, and I will repeat what I said to the government house leader, was that if clauses 2 and 6 were stood we would by agreement put the unification bill back on the order paper and it would occupy the position on the order paper it now occupies. Things like that can be done by agreement in the house and frequently are done.

Mr. Olson: The chairman of the business committee, the Minister of Public Works, said that it was impossible to obtain any kind of agreement relevant to the motion before the house. Is the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre denying that?

An hon. Member: South Centre.

Mr. Olson: I beg your pardon. Is the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre denying that?

Mr. Churchill: I have already answered the hon. member.

Mr. Olson: The hon. member now says that he will do this, that and everything else provided clauses 2 and 6 are stood. He knows full well that that portion of the bill would die once the session is prorogued. It is easy for the hon. member to be generous when he has included a hooker in his offer.

Mr. Churchill: That is very unfair.

Mr. Olson: Our party believes that careful consideration was given to including provisional standing order 15A in the rules. We believe that this provisional standing order should be used from time to time. This session began 16 months ago on January 18, 1966, and still important legislative items remain. It is unreasonable for the official opposition to attempt to usurp the responsibility of the order of the business of the house. That is the government's responsibility, and it should call legislation on the order paper as it sees fit. After all, the government party is the largest

[Mr. Olson.]

of the minority parties in the house and it has the right to govern and to assume the responsibilities and privileges of government. One of those rights is to say when each item of business shall be brought before the house.

● (5:40 p.m.)

I believe the right of the majority of the members of this house to make a decision is as important as the right to be heard—and both are important. Surely we have spent enough time in committee of the whole on the clauses of this bill, taking into account the time which was spent discussing the same subject in the standing committee and in various other debates this session. Therefore I say we have reached the stage when a vote should be taken. The majority of members indicated by their actions in this house several days ago that they are ready to reach a decision.

I am not criticizing hon. members for attempting to persuade not only members of the government but others in this house into thinking as they do with regard to Bill C-243. But there has to be some time limit placed on this process of persuasion. The most decisive way in which the members of any party can indicate their opinions on Bill C-243 is by voting on it. Several speeches each having been made on the same subject by many hon. members, I suggest we should now give members who have taken part in the discussion the opportunity to record their votes.

It seems to me there is something wrong and that a change is taking place in the practices of this house as can be seen by looking at the record over the past two years. Unless and until a minority is persuaded that it is going to win a vote, those belonging to it seek to prevent everybody else from voting. In my view this is a wrong interpretation of the parliamentary process. The government may be judged, and in most cases is judged, by the application of the policies it has brought in, and the majority in parliament should not be prevented from bringing in the policies they desire to bring in provided there has been a reasonable period for discussion. I do not believe a small minority has the right to frustrate the government and a majority of those in parliament in their desire to implement a legislative program.

Surely the point has long since been reached when anything further could usefully be said about clause 2. It is therefore my hope that this proposal will be approved before 9.45 p.m.—certainly by that time—and that we shall then conclude our deliberations on

this bill and proceed to deal with other measures which are also of great importance to Canada and to Canadians.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, we have just heard a representative of a small minority in this house lecture the house and tell us that parliamentary business should not be prevented from going through because of the actions of a small minority. He himself is one of the best examples of the delay which sometimes characterizes this house, representing as he does only five members or possibly just himself.

Time and time again the hon. member who has just spoken rises to take part in debates in this house. He should be heard from on a proportionate basis, about once a week. Yet the house very kindly permits him to stand up and give lectures on the rules, to speak on points of order, to participate in debates. He has spoken twice during the debate on unification, though without adding anything to it. In my party of 96 members—it is not a small minority in the house—we never take the time which should be allotted to us. It is distributed. I am surprised that the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson), representing this rump of a party—

Mr. Olson: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question? Does he consider he has any greater right to speak in this house than I have? I believe he has spoken five times in the unification debate thus far.

An hon. Member: Six.

Mr. Churchill: Well, I believe I have a little more knowledge of the subject than the hon. member has. In any case, there are 96 members of this party who have a right to speak before the hon. member is heard. But that is not the way we operate. We are more charitable. We allow him to rise and speak and we suffer, generally in silence.

I will make one comment with regard to another remark of the hon. member for Medicine Hat. He attempted to leave it on record that when I made certain proposals with regard to the unification bill I was concealing the fact that it could not be placed on the order paper again in the same position it had formerly occupied and that I was being hypocritical in the offer I made. This, I deny. When I made my offer last Friday and when I repeated it on Monday to the house leader I said to him that part of the package deal would be an agreement as far as our party was concerned to put the unification bill back on the order paper in exactly the same position as it is now, in committee of the whole house. There is nothing hypocritical about that.

I raised this matter in a further question today. I referred to it again in a question to the leader of the New Democratic party while the Prime Minister was here. I extended the offer in the interest of getting on with the business of the house, impressed by my knowledge of what is to be done and impressed by that enormous list of two years' work that the Prime Minister read, being just as keen to get on with the business of the country as anyone else but opposed to having parliament subjected to pressure in connection with a bill which is not urgent. There is no urgency at all about the unification bill.

The Minister of National Defence has told us it will be several years before Bill C-243 becomes fully operative. The real reason for the proposal I put forward with regard to its postponement was contained in the evidence given by General Allard and by the adjutant general before the defence committee as well as the answers given by the Minister of National Defence himself in the committee and here in this house, namely, that this bill will not be proclaimed until the regulations have been written and approved and that these regulations will not be ready for some four to six months. Then we should also consider the fact that until the bill is proclaimed it is not law. General Allard assured us in the defence committee that not one single step with regard to unification other than planning would be undertaken before the bill is proclaimed. That is the whole basis of the proposition I have put forward for the postponement of the bill. There is absolutely no urgency with regard to it.

Mr. Hellyer: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. Churchill: Yes.

Mr. Hellyer: The adjutant general made it very clear that it would be impossible to draft the regulations until the precise wording of the act was known. The hon. gentleman wanted to allow clauses 2 and 6 to stand. Let us hypothecate for a moment. If there was suddenly some change in clauses 2 and 6, of what relevancy then would regulations be which had been prepared on the basis of the original draft? It was primarily for this reason that the legal branch of the department and all responsible officers of the department have

insisted that we require parliamentary approval now, before regulations are drafted, so that they can be based on the parliamentary bill rather than on merely a draft which could be changed subsequently, which would have the effect of undoing any work done in the meantime.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Mr. Churchill: I heard the adjutant general state that case and the minister repeated it briefly on April 14. That is a good point. It is a technical point. The assumption is that the House of Commons might alter the wording in clause 2 and clause 6. But the Minister of National Defence has disclosed to us over months and years that he will not alter a single thing, and with regard to this bill I think it incredible that he will effect some alteration in line with our suggestion on clause 2. In other words, if we suggest that he rewrite into that clause the Royal Canadian Navy, The Royal Canadian Air Force and the Canadian Army, is he going to accept our suggestion? We are not so stupid as to believe that. The adjutant general raised a straw man and the minister has made use of it. There will not be one word changed in clause 2 or clause 6 unless the minister says that there shall be a change.

The minister has his supporters in his own party. He has the N.D.P., the Social Credit rump, and the Créditistes marching along led by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) who announced publicly—it is in a newspaper headline today—that he will support the Liberal government. He might just as well join the Liberal party. This is a straw man which has been raised. In any case, let us not be ridiculous about this, although the minister is being ridiculous.

Members of the departmental staff are accustomed to drafting bills and regulations and making subsequent alterations when they find they have made a mistake. It so happens that in the defence committee when the bill was under study the adjutant general brought forward half a dozen changes which he himself had discovered, and one or two were made in response to questions that we raised. There is nothing unusual about making a draft and having it changed. I have suffered the penalty of drafting material and having it not only changed but thrown out. But you survive, and I think the adjutant general could quite safely go ahead with his drafting.

As a matter of fact, if we pass, as I have suggested, all the other clauses of the bill, even if they are passed on division, there will be an inference that the bill as a whole will go through unchanged by parliament, and with the declared intention of most of the New Democratic Party to vote for it, plus the Social Credit rump and the Créditistes, the government is relaxing and the adjutant general might also relax. That, sir, is the reason I have made this proposal.

The bill does not become law until the regulations are approved. They will not be approved for four to six months. Until they are approved the bill will not be proclaimed and until the bill is proclaimed unification cannot take effect. So I say, postpone it. We will let parliament make a gesture by passing 99 per cent of the bill and we can postpone clauses 2 and 6 until the fall. The government can then bring the bill back into the house in the same position as it is now, and we publicly consent to that being done without raising any objections, points of order, or anything else. If the government then insists upon imposing its allocation of time closure procedure, let it go ahead.

I suggested in the Prime Minister's presence that so far as our party was concerned—and I am pretty sure my colleagues will support me—that an allocation of two day's time might be made next fall instead of three. I also suggested that we go ahead with these other matters of business and wind up this session on Friday of this week, starting the new session at the convenience of the government but certainly by May 1.

May I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that on Tuesday I introduced a motion that we move from the unification bill to the adult training bill. Technically it was out of order and the Speaker so ruled, but he did say that by unanimous consent that motion could have been adopted. Had the government agreed we could have discontinued discussion of the unification bill and we could have spent Tuesday and Wednesday on the adult training bill. I did not do that as a trick. I did it seriously and responsibly because we had received notification then that we would be under allocation of time and it had been intimated to us that the allocated time would run through Friday, Monday and Tuesday. In those circumstances we said among ourselves, "Why then continue the debate on unification on Tuesday and Wednesday?" The house could have gone ahead with the adult training bill. But the government is only concerned about introducing this method of closure and imposing a restraint on freedom of speech.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that the government has twice made a very serious error. On the very day that closure was imposed in the flag debate we had reached the conclusion in our caucus to terminate the debate. But the government stupidly imposed closure.

Mr. Matheson: The country did not think so.

Mr. Churchill: It stupidly imposed closure. It thought that would gain it a victory in the next election but here it is, still sitting as a minority government. Once again in this debate, instead of coming to an agreement as could have been done the government rushes ahead with closure, so keen is it to impose its will on the house.

I see it is six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, and I wish to state I shall have a few other things to say because I want to discuss allocation of time. I want to say something about the business committee and deal with a few other matters with respect to parliament. May I call it six o'clock.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: the hon. member for York-Scarborough (Mr. Stanbury), Housing—Toronto—inquiry as to action to relieve shortage; the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. Muir), Veterans Affairs—Camp Hill, N.S.—reported lack of hospital accommodation.

The house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions (papers), private bills and public bills.

Mr. McNulty: Mr. Speaker, may we by unanimous consent stand notices of motions 145, 137, and 128 and resume the debate on No. 200 in the same of the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

• (6:00 p.m.)

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION—PAYMENTS MADE TO JOHN T. SAYWELL AND/OR JOHN C. RICKER

The house resumed, from Thursday, March 9, consideration of motion of Mr. Cowan:

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of all correspondence, telegrams or other correspondence dated since January 1, 1961, exchanged between the Secretary of State or any agency or department of the government of Canada relating to payments made to John T. Saywell and/or John C. Ricker by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and a list setting out in detail each such payment to each such person.

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I made a few remarks in support of the motion of the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) when this matter was previously before the house. At this time I should like to refer to a specific situation in respect of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. In view of the fact we will have other opportunities to discuss this whole question I shall confine my remarks to this specific matter.

Since the matter was discussed last I have seen a number of articles in newspapers regarding the amounts of money paid to various people employed on a permanent or temporary basis by the C.B.C. One article to which I wish to refer appeared in a number of newspapers in the Thomson chain. The author is Mr. Patrick Nicholson, a member of the press gallery. The article pointed out that one telecaster for the C.B.C. receives the large sum of $35,000 per year. It also gave more detail in respect of other salaries and amounts paid by the C.B.C. to various individuals.

It seems strange to me that when we as the elected representatives of the people request information regarding money paid by the C.B.C. we are inevitably informed that this is none of our business and such disclosures would not be in the public interest. After all, we are only the people who established this creature of parliament. We are not permitted to obtain these facts but the newspaper media, the fourth estate, obviously has access to this information. Obviously the information is obtained from the corporation. I am glad it is provided because at least in this way we can find out indirectly how much is being paid to various permanent or temporary employees.

I should like to know why we as members of this house cannot obtain this information by placing questions on the order paper. Whenever the estimates of the C.B.C. are

placed before the house, and this is the case in respect of the estimates of other departments as well, we are asked to push them through. I think we are entitled to this information and I support the motion of the hon. member for York-Humber. I hope other hon. members will also support this motion. The disclosure of such information will not damage the C.B.C., although it might embarrass those people who authorize the payment of these excessive amounts.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy LeBlanc (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, under a democratic system of government such as ours, I feel that members of parliament should be able to obtain all the necessary papers for their information, so as to be in a position to play their role properly as legislators and representatives of the people. This is a general rule.

At the point where we resume this debate, I deem it necessary, even though the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) concluded his speech started in early March, to restate the problem, to set the situation in its true light, to put forward the present policy of the government and of the C.B.C. and to comment that policy.

Last January, the member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) moved the following motion:

> That an order of the house do issue for a copy of all correspondence, telegrams or other documents, dated since January 1, 1961, exchanged between the Secretary of State or any agency or department of the government of Canada relating to payments made to John T. Saywell and/or John C. Ricker by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and a list setting out in detail each such payment to each such person.

On February 1 last, the Secretary of State (Miss LaMarsh), minister responsible for the C.B.C. to the government and parliament, in her answer to the hon. member for York-Humber, said that there was no correspondence between the Department of the Secretary of State or any other agency or department of the government with respect to that matter, and asked him to withdraw his motion.

The hon. member for York-Humber asked that the matter be transferred for debate, adding that he had asked not only for the tabling of correspondence and telegrams but also other papers.

For my part, I assume that the Secretary of State, in saying that there was no correspondence, meant also that there were no telegrams or other papers. Had there been telegrams or other papers, I am of the opinion, knowing her frankness and integrity, that she would have admitted it simply, specifying, if necessary, the reasons of her refusal to table them.

• (6:10 p.m.)

On the other hand, if the services of Messrs. Saywell and Riker were retained by the C.B.C. either for talks or news commentaries or historical research, there must be somewhere in the C.B.C. files correspondence, telegrams or at least papers such as contracts, agreements or the like on fees or honorarium, etc.

However, going back to the text of the motion, I wonder if the member for York-Humber was explicit enough under the circumstances. Especially in view of the facts that he will mention in the course of the debate, and his numerous experiences to which he will allude:

In the motion, he mentions:

> —the Secretary of State or any agency or department of the government of Canada—

Why did the hon. member not mention also the C.B.C. as possible holder of the papers he was interested in?

Perhaps the minister's answer would then have been quite different. Perhaps also he would have had an answer along the lines of the words from the C.B.C. which he quoted in the debate. Here are those words:

> We don't give out information. Such information is not in the public interest. Such information is not divulged to parliament.

These personal comments which came to my mind, first after the response of the hon. member for York-Humber to the minister's answer, give a great deal of support to my remarks at this point.

Mr. Speaker, the debate requested by the mover of this motion began last March 9. Contributions have been made by the hon. member for York-Humber, the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) and the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), who concluded his remarks a few moments ago.

When re-reading the mover's speech, I note that, right at the beginning, he answers the question I had asked myself, namely: Why did he not mention the C.B.C. in the text of his motion?

In fact, he said and I quote:

> I would not have had the temerity to move a motion asking for information from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation having had many years' experience of requesting information, which requests have been met with the bland answer: "We don't give out information. Such information

is not in the public interest. Such information is not divulged to parliament".

The mover's argument could be summed up as follows: the C.B.C. will continue to ask for money but will not give us any information. And he stressed a statement made by Mr. Alphonse Ouimet, president of the C.B.C., about the von Thadden incident:

This action does not mean that the corporation will abrogate—

I am quoting Mr. Ouimet—

—its responsibility in terms of the principle of the right of the Canadian public to information.

That statement seems at first to be inconsistent with the usual policy of the C.B.C.

In short, the hon. member is questioning the impartiality of Messrs. Saywell and Ricker.

He has pointed out with sincerity, I think, why he disagrees with them, when those gentlemen criticize the tendency to centralization, that is the centralization of our press, but why does he disagree with them, when they praise the C.B.C.? And in order to control the situation, he asks that the said papers be tabled in the house.

The member for Timiskaming supported the member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan), insisting on the fact that the hon. Secretary of State should have a greater authority over the C.B.C. which would allow her to report more adequately to hon. members or to parliament.

Also, the member for Oxford felt that certain government organizations, among which the C.B.C., had avoided the control of parliament, although their funds were provided by taxpayers, that it seems nobody has any authority over them, that they are responsible to themselves only and that they are neither responsible to the public nor to the house.

Moreover, when the hon. member for Oxford concluded his speech a while ago, he drew a parallel between the means of information for reporters at large and for members of parliament.

It appears, however, that the subject matter of the present debate on the policies of the C.B.C., as concerns information given to members or to parliament, has always been within the purview of the internal policy of the corporation.

Generally speaking, every personal and confidential paper must remain so, whether it be at the level of governments, public corporations, private companies or private individuals.

If the necessary papers really exist in the records of the C.B.C., but if they are of a confidential nature, we understand that we would not have access to them.

Furthermore, since the C.B.C. is a public corporation and, therefore, under the same system, as I understand it, as any other crown agency, such as the Canadian National Railways for instance, it is appropriate that it should pattern itself, in some respects, on the behaviour of private companies in general, and especilaly private radio and television companies, so that unfair competition may be avoided.

Besides, complex problems might arise if, in some cases, a person who takes part in a television program—a television star, for instance, who will be paid, let us say $1,000 for a show—realized that another who, in his opinion, is not more qualified—which can be a moot point between people of the trade—gets two or three times more money than he does.

It seems that, under existing legislation, when a question of bias within the C.B.C. or any other aspect of internal policy is involved, the minister, who is only the spokesman for the corporation in parliament, must leave any other authority to the governors of the corporation.

It has been said that, since the corporation is, for a major part, financed by the taxpayers, parliament should obtain all the necessary information to control the activities of the corporation.

In fact, this national radio and television service is financed by parliamentary appropriation and by business revenues. For instance, for the year ended March 31, 1965, business revenues accounted for about 27.5 per cent of the corporation's income, while the appropriation voted by parliament in 1964-1965 for our national broadcasting service amounted to about $85,900,000.

Therefore, this means that hon. members have every reason to make sure that the public, in short the taxpayers, are fully protected.

The administration of radio and television seems a very complex question, at least as far as I am concerned.

Ever since I came to this house, I have found that the standing committee on broadcasting, films and assistance to the arts, was most active. On the other hand, a white paper on broadcasting was brought out by the hon. Secretary of State (Miss LaMarsh) as regards the passing of new legislation I believe, and

a special committee of the house tabled a report on that white paper on March 21 last.

I noticed that the hon. member for York-Humber sat on those two committees. Knowing how outspoken he is, I suppose that he must have put forward, at times, some good reasons for granting the minister more control over the C.B.C.

In the present situation, I think I understand why the hon. member failed to obtain the required papers, if they are available at the C.B.C.

However, following the thorough studies I mentioned earlier, I do not doubt that the present government will make sure that the public interest and the interest of our fellow-citizens are always protected and will avail itself—I mean the government—of every opportunity to amend or improve the legislation to that effect for the specific purpose of always safeguarding the public interest.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (6:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. member who has just addressed the house whether he does not consider a cheque to be a document.

[*Translation*]

Mr. LeBlanc: Mr. Speaker, I feel that cheques—I have always considered cheques as papers.

[*English*]

Mr. Andrew Chatwood (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, the motion of the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) for the production of correspondence, telegrams or other documents relating to payments by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to Professors John T. Saywell and John C. Ricker is very interesting in that it concerns the rights of so many people. It concerns the rights of the individual member of parliament, the rights of parliament as a whole, the rights of the Secretary of State (Miss LaMarsh), the rights of the C.B.C., the rights of Professors Saywell and Ricker, and the rights of other people who work for the C.B.C. and who from time to time appear on television or are heard on radio. In this debate we must decide whether or not it is right and proper that these documents should be produced at this time. I am assuming that what the hon. member for York-Humber is seeking to obtain is information as to the amounts paid to Professors Saywell and Ricker, thereby making this information available to the public as a whole.

The hon. member for York-Humber, in speaking on his motion, quoted from the book "Nation and Province" which was, I believe, circulated at one time among the schools of Ontario and in which, he said, sharp attacks were made on the printed word. In the course of my speech I should like to quote from other books written by Professors Saywell and Ricker. In two of these books these gentlemen collaborated with other authors. In this way I hope to give some indication of the type of people these gentlemen are, which will give us some background with which to consider whether or not the payments made to them by the C.B.C. should be made public. The first is a book entitled "Canada, A Modern Study" by Ramsay Cook in collaboration with John T. Saywell and John C. Ricker. This book is basically a history of Canada. I quote from it briefly.

> The successful defence of British North America in the war of 1812 brightened the future prospects of the British North American colonies. Moreover, the war once more confirmed the direction that the economic and commercial development of the area would follow. The Treaty of Versailles in 1783 had cut Canada off from the rich lands of the Ohio valley. While furtrading posts had been retained in the area south of the Great Lakes for more than ten years after that, the merchants of Montreal were beginning to look more carefully at the lands north of the lakes. Then Jay's Treaty in 1794 and, more emphatically still, the hostilities of 1812-14 made it clear that the United States had no intention of allowing British and Canadian traders to ply their trade south of the lakes. It was to the west and north that the merchants of Canada, who were mostly based in Montreal, now had to look.

On page 41, speaking of the Liberal ministry which Laurier formed in 1896, the author writes:

> Macdonald had laid the framework for the Canadian nation. Laurier knew that to complete the structure he would have to heal the sectional and racial conflicts that had divided and weakened the country. His main aim was always to bind French and English speaking Canadians together in a common nationality, by following a path that was neither narrowly English nor French, Roman Catholic nor Protestant, but broad enough to win the acceptance of all groups. As he told a friend:
>
> "My object is to consolidate Confederation and to bring our people, long estranged from each other, gradually to become a nation. This is the supreme issue. Everything else is subordinate to that idea."

Sometimes the way in which the C.B.C. appears to spend its money puzzles me at least a little. I do not think it would be

irrelevant at this time to comment on certain other expenditures made by the C.B.C. which perhaps would give us a point of reference from which to consider the payments made to these professors concerning which papers are being asked for. Later I shall deal with the question of whether or not I feel the papers should be produced.

At times it is easy to agree with the hon. member for York-Humber but at other times it is perhaps a little more difficult. Concerning the question of the C.B.C's expenditures, I feel it would be impossible to expect any given program presented by the C.B.C. to delight or excite all the people of Canada. A sports program is of interest to some while others prefer the news. Some prefer one type of music, others prefer another. It would be unreasonable to expect all programs to please all people. Even if we take people with similar tastes in that they prefer sports, we may find that some may consider a particular television sports program to be very good while others find it to be of no interest or even distasteful.

The C.B.C. spends what would appear to be considerable amounts of money on television and radio programs. It brings in controversial figures over long distances and in some cases pays them for their appearance. Yet there are vast areas of Canada, particularly in the Canadian north, where the people rely for English language broadcasts on Radio Moscow in order to receive world news. There are also vast areas in Canada which are not covered by any Canadian radio service, nor are they covered by Canadian or any other television.

I suppose that the evaluation of the amounts paid to these two professors who appeared on the C.B.C., and who of course could not be heard in the areas which the C.B.C. does not reach, is to assist us in considering whether or not it is right that many Canadians do not have the privilege of receiving C.B.C. broadcasts, whether we consider the content good or bad. One sometimes wonders whether, if we did not have the C.B.C., we would not have to create it.

The question which comes to my mind is whether, if we do make public the amount paid to these individuals, we will really be in a position to say that it was too little or too much. Of course these amounts will have to be compared with the amounts paid the same people for other services in other areas. They will also have to be compared with the amounts paid to other people appearing on or performing services for the C.B.C. To decide whether or not these amounts are justified we would have to consider the opinions of the people who have seen or heard the performances of these two gentlemen and perhaps get an evaluation of whether they were overpaid or underpaid. Of course there is always the possibility they were not paid at all.

• (6:30 p.m.)

I should like to quote from another book in which these two gentlemen took a part in the authorship. The book is entitled, "The Modern Era" and was written by John C. Ricker, M.A., John T. Saywell, Ph.D. and Elliot E. Rose, M.A. It is a historical book and I give this reference so that hon. members who may wish to pursue their interest in these particular authors can consider some of the points which have been raised by the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) concerning their attitude toward the communications media. The introduction to this book reads, in part, as follows:

> The years from 1900 to 1914 form a distinct period in the history of Great Britain, the United States and Canada. In its own way, each country passed during these years from the old world of the nineteenth century to the modern era. At the beginning of the period, Great Britain was a mature industrial nation with a vast empire; yet she had passed the peak of her power and faced "a time of troubles" at home and abroad. The United States was just emerging as a powerful industrial nation, young and confident, rough and untamed, and was embarking on an empire-building experiment of her own. In 1900, Canada first began to develop her rich heritage of natural resources in real earnest. Although still a colony, she was becoming conscious of herself as a nation. When the twentieth century began, each country had reached a different stage of national development. As a result, the specific problems each faced in the new century were different.

I turn now to page 379, where I read:

> History is an unending process; today's newspaper headlines may be history tomorrow. At the same time many of today's headlines will never be important historically, while events that have been hidden in the back pages of our paper might be. In other words, many of the events that seem so important today may not be considered important ten years from now. It is difficult to determine the historical importance of events that have occurred close to our own times; yet looking back at the years between 1900 and 1960, it is possible to see some evidence of tasks completed, as well as of problems unsolved that remain for this generation.
>
> One of the most striking developments in the modern era has been the alliance of the three English speaking democracies that border on the Atlantic Ocean. At the beginning of the century, the United States and Britain were divided. Canada was beginning to assert her independence of Great Britain and, during the Alaska boundary dispute and the election of 1911 on the reciprocity issue, showed her resentment against the United States. Yet in the face of dangers common to

all three—the first world war, the second world war, and the threat posed by the communist world after 1945—the three countries have drawn together in arms and spirit. That alliance has in the past helped to preserve the democratic tradition in the modern world. We hope that it will continue to do so in the future.

The references to the press, Mr. Speaker, do not appear in this book. There are, however, references in another book to which I will refer later. In evaluating the expenditures the C.B.C. may or may not have made to these gentlemen, we are led to a consideration of the other expenditures the corporation may make. We are brought also to a consideration of whether or not it is desirable that we should consider the amounts the C.B.C. may have paid to individuals. Are we, in parliament, in a position to decide upon the individual wages due to these individual people? The indemnities paid to a member of parliament are of course a matter of public knowledge; but we are public servants. The people who know our indemnities are, in a general sense, our employers.

Comments are made from time to time on the size of the crews the C.B.C. sends out to cover a given story. It would appear to me that sometimes these crews are large. It would appear to me also that sometimes they do not go into all the areas of this country, and thus fail to give the whole picture. However, there are experts within the industry who perhaps can decide these things which are, in the large sense, too small to be debated fully in parliament.

It has been said that the C.B.C. can do a tremendous job with eight men in four days which could be done by other companies with a crew of four men in two days. I am not in a position to judge the accuracy of this statement. However, it does seem to me from time to time that some of the crews the C.B.C uses on special projects are excessive. I think it may be fair to say that the C.B.C. has no vision of the future of Canada. It has spent a given amount, we do not know how much, on this program. I do not say we should know the amount paid to these individuals. However, it does appear from the size of the program and the number of people the C.B.C. fits into this program, that the corporation is spending money which could more properly be spent on giving service to areas which at this moment do not have service at all, or have limited service from the C.B.C. and other stations.

The question of the C.B.C. paying or not paying is a matter of some interest. There is an area in my own riding where for many years the news announcers and people appearing on special programs have not been paid at all. They are volunteers. Even today, there are only one or two programs on that particular station for which the C.B.C. pays wages. The station operates in collaboration with the United States Air Force.

However, the fact that the C.B.C. does not pay wages in an area does not mean that they should not pay to bring people on television in the larger areas. It will always be necessary to pay to get the type of people the corporation wants on these national programs. It comes back again to the question of evaluating the two things, one, the price that should be paid and, two, whether that payment should be made public. In order to establish the price that should be paid, I believe it would be necessary to ascertain what other people in the industry are being paid for a given time. It would be necessary to establish what these gentlemen are paid for other services. I cannot say that I envy the job of the C.B.C. in establishing the amount to pay those various people, especially guest stars. I am led to understand that at times they can become temperamental and want the same payment as another star, or possibly a better time for the program. I would not like to have to decide the amount to be paid to one star in relation to what is paid to another.

While I feel that from time to time the C.B.C. may be spending some of its money less efficiently than I should like, I do not believe the amounts paid to individuals should be announced publicly, any more than the wages paid an individual in private industry should be made public. The amount an employer pays to his employees is not generally a matter of public knowledge. He does not generally announce it to the other employees, nor does he publish it in the newspapers. This is something the employee of course knows, and the employer knows.

• (6:40 p.m.)

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, a member of parliament's indemnity is known to him and his employer, which is the public. However, the people's earnings are a matter of concern to themselves alone and are not necessarily public information. I need mention only the secrecy of the income tax form. An individual taxpayer's income is not generally a matter for the rest of the world to know about, unless of course he wishes to make it known.

I suppose it could be said that the amount spent on producing a given program for a season or the total amount paid to performers

for a given number of programs is a matter to be considered. However, the amount paid a particular individual concerns only him and his employer.

I would not want to have the responsibility of setting these rates, and I know that the C.B.C. has a difficult job in deciding upon rates for different people, depending upon how much they are in demand. For that reason I presume they would not want to release these individual figures. I believe these figures in question are too complex to establish the efficiency or otherwise of the operations of the C.B.C., though I concede it is the responsibility of parliament to ascertain that the taxpayer's money is well spent and that all Canadians receive at least minimum television and radio coverage.

Mr. John M. Reid (Kenora-Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I am a bit hesitant about entering this very lively debate on a most important subject because I happen, just by accident, to have a personal relationship with one of the two people who are mentioned in this request for documents that the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) is putting forth. I refer to Dr. John. T. Saywell.

When I was attending the University of Toronto between 1961 and 1963, Professor Saywell was my professor in Canadian history. He was also for a short period my thesis director. Unfortunately our relationship was broken off when he accepted a promotion and moved over to York University to become dean of arts, a position which he now holds. During the period when I was attending Professor Saywell's classes, I found him a very invigorating teacher, an excellent seminar leader, and a man with a most interesting knowledge of Canadian history. I should say, too, that he and I did not always agree. I can recall some very interesting conversations which took place in those seminars concerning the relative merits of various policies and ideas of the government during the period 1961-63. I suppose in retrospect, Mr. Speaker, that three year period was one of the most exciting politically that we have ever had in Canada.

The point at issue here is a motion for the production of certain papers, specifically documents outlining the amount of moneys paid to Professor Saywell and Mr. Ricker by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, documents that set out in detail the amount of such moneys paid these individuals over a period of time.

The position that some members of parliament have taken is that the C.B.C. should not have to provide parliament with this type of information. My understanding of the way parliament operates is that other crown corporations must provide information of this type to parliament, when it is requested. I have heard from officials of the C.B.C. that there is no objection to providing this kind of information to the House of Commons if the House of Commons asks for it. But these officials do have objection to providing this kind of information when it is asked for by an individual member. They make a distinction between the rights of the House of Commons as a whole and the rights of the private member.

It seems to me that some consideration could be given to this point of view. The justification for the stand of the C.B.C. or for its point of view is simply that if the C.B.C. were to give in and to provide this information at the request of a member of parliament, then because of the nature of the operations of the C.B.C., they would be completely inundated with requests for this type of information. We have only to recognize what happens to members of parliament when the C.B.C. comes up with a juicy bit of information which does not please members of parliament, or broadcasts a program which does not please them. We all know the type of reaction we get from members of parliament. The feeling of the C.B.C. is that if they were to provide this type of information to individual members, the C.B.C. would lose its freedom of expression. They would not dare to go into controversial areas; they would not try to illuminate the dark areas of our society; they would be nothing less than a sounding board for the preservation of the status quo in Canada.

To develop that argument a little further, Mr. Speaker, one of the difficulties that we have in making a judgment of the C.B.C. is that we have precious little to measure it against; for the role that we have set out for the C.B.C. is quite different from the role the C.T.V. has taken unto itself, or the role in which the American networks function. Further, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is a great deal of similarity between the operations of the C.B.C. and the operations of the B.B.C. in Great Britain.

One of the problems that we face is this: How do we know we are getting our money's worth in this particular example the hon. member for York-Humber has

put before us? For example, do we know that the C.B.C. is attempting to present all sides of the argument, and not just one side? When we are dealing with the media of broadcasting and television, what counts in getting a particular point of view across is not necessarily the words used, but the tone of voice, the particular stare or smirk of the person uttering the words, the particular type of background he may be outlined against, the type of music which is used in accompanying his remarks. All of these have an effect on the message that is received by the viewer or listener.

The use of the printed word, however, is quite different. It has a much different impact on the reader, for he is concerned with words and the choice of words. Printed material, too, can be twisted by the subtle use of words. Some write better than others. For example some newspaper stories coming out of Ottawa do not reflect what went on; some correspondents invent phrases that remain in the minds of the public.

• (6:50 p.m.)

In 1962 or 1963, Charles Lynch or Charles King—and I may be wrong in this—invented the phrase "Diefenbucks".

An hon. Member: That was the Winnipeg *Free Press*, with a cartoon.

Mr. Reid: I believe a newspaper reporter started it. That phrase stuck more in the minds of the electorate than most of the logical and legitimate arguments against the government of the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert.

When the hon. member says that the C.B.C. is biased but that the printed word is not, I disagree with him. Bias takes many forms.

Mr. Cowan: May I rise on a point of order. If my hon. friend will read my remarks on this matter he will see that I said it is a case of the pot calling the kettle black.

Mr. Reid: I read the hon. gentleman's remarks of March 9, 1967, when he introduced his motion. He talked about the bias of the C.B.C., and how its programs were biased. In effect he said that as members of parliament we wish to prevent bias and therefore we ought to exert our authority over the C.B.C. and obtain certain documents to gain greater control over the programming content of the corporation. I see the hon. member nodding his head in agreement.

An hon. Member: He is falling asleep.

[Mr. Reid.]

Mr. Reid: I will agree that many C.B.C. programs are shoddy. Yet we in this house are not always first class. We have our good days and our bad days, and the C.B.C., as an organization, suffers from the same defect.

Mr. Cowan: Speak for yourself.

Mr. Reid: The hon. member for York-Humber has elevated himself to a status above that of a mere member of parliament or of the human race. It is refreshing to see persons of such high calibre sitting here.

The hon. member implied that the bias of the printed word was minimal. That is true in part, yet it is not quite true. In reading old newspapers, during my historical researches, I saw how on the front page of a newspaper a political speech would be printed in full, and on the editorial page it would be torn apart. I suggest that that is good newspaper reporting. But that sort of thing seldom happens now. One may call the editorial page biased, but at least the newspapers of the past had the courtesy of announcing their bias on the front page; they were for the Grits or for the Tories. In the old days you got the facts; now you do not get them.

How often are the complete speeches of political leaders reprinted? Hardly ever, I suggest. Today journalists interpret what was said and the original words are seldom reported to the Canadian people. In that way the newspapers are biased, and modern newspapers are just as biased as our broadcasters.

I see the hon. member for Lotbinière wishes to speak. To maintain my good relations with hon. members from Quebec I shall yield the floor to him. Those good relations will vanish, probably, after the start of tonight's game.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I listened with the greatest interest to what was said this afternoon, and I understand the emotion of the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) when deploring the C.B.C.'s temerity, often displayed in programs which we could very well do without.

I am thinking, for instance, of last Sunday's program "Sunday" where we saw the hon. member for York-Humber. There I understood how the C.B.C. had bold programs.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the request submitted by the hon. member is quite justified.

It is a fact recognized by a number of people that it is becoming increasingly difficult and well-nigh impossible to exercise any

control or any sort of authority over the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, which is becoming altogether too bureaucratic an organization.

There is a lot of talk about democracy, but when some extremists attempt to put it into practice, democracy itself is destroyed. There are some flagrant cases, and this is where I understand the attitude of the hon. member for York-Humber. For example, the C.B.C. could be asked how a certain René Lévesque, a member of the provincial legislature today and a former minister, came to take a trip to Paris at the expense of the C.B.C. to interview Prime Minister Pompidou, when there are C.B.C. correspondents in Montreal.

Who is paying for that, if not the taxpayers? The Paris correspondent is then sent to interview a French publisher in Montreal. Abuses of this kind justify motions like the one we have before us today, Mr. Speaker.

I can very well understand why the hon. member for York-Humber complains that the C.B.C. is always showing presumptuousness and even contempt, as regards the parliamentary institution.

Mr. Speaker, if I were to go to my constituency of Lotbinière and tell the people there: "We are going to take the $123 million alloted to the C.B.C. and we are going to use them for family allowances—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order.

Mr. Choquette: —the electors of the Lotbinière constituency would vote as one man in favour of family allowances and against the C.B.C.

I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that my time is up. I deeply regret it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order. I thank the hon. member for Lotbinière for abiding by the clock and I also thank him for his co-operation with the Chair.

The hour for consideration of private members' business being over, the house resumes the debate interrupted at six o'clock.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Pursuant to the order of the house of April 6, this sitting is suspended until eight o'clock.

SITTING SUSPENDED

SITTING RESUMED

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Proposal for Time Allocation

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MOTION FOR TIME ALLOCATION RESPECTING DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. McIlraith:

That an order be made allocating the time on the committee of the whole stage and all remaining stages of procedure on Bill C-243, An Act to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof (as amended), being government order No. 107 on the order paper and that the motion will provide that two days shall be allocated for the completion of discussion on the committee of the whole stage on Bill C-243, An Act to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof (as amended), and that one day shall be allotted for the completion of the third reading stage on the bill.

Mr. Churchill: You and I, Mr. Speaker, and a few hon. members will maintain a quorum in the house while the hockey match is in progress, and I will continue what I was saying before six o'clock.

I outlined then the proposition which I put forward to the leader of the house in order to speed up the business before us. In the presence of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) I asked the leader of the New Democratic party for his support with regard to that proposition. So the Prime Minister, the leader of the New Democratic party, the minister of defence, the house leader and all members of the house who were present are now aware of the proposal that I put forward starting last Friday, repeated on Monday and repeated again today—a proposal designed to speed up and advance the pressing business which needs to be done by parliament. I quite agree that we should use our time in this house effectively and usefully. I regret very much that the leader of the New Democratic party failed to support the proposal that I put forward because with his support, and the support of his party, I am sure the government would have been persuaded to change its mind and postpone clauses 2 and 6 of the bill until next fall.

By that time the government would have the regulations ready and would be in a position to proclaim the bill immediately after its passage through this house. But the leader of the New Democratic party, who has not participated in the debates on the unification bill so far and who, like the Prime Minister, has rarely been present here during our discussions recently, failed to go along with my suggestion.

What I find strange about the New Democratic party as represented by their leader is that outside this chamber across the

country the pretence is made that that party is opposed to the Liberal party. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Gordon) in his turn goes about the country, as do others of his cabinet colleagues, putting up the pretence that they are against the N.D.P. Thus they confuse the people and fool them. Yet here in the House of Commons the Liberal party is consistently supported by the New Democratic party and sustained in office by that means. It is only on occasions when a rapid counting of heads is undertaken, and the N.D.P. group discover that it is safe for them to vote against the government, that they do so.

Today we were given an example of their support for the Liberal government. They are pretending they are a different party: They are the same. Mackenzie King, wrong in so many ways, was perfectly right when he said the C.C.F. was only the Liberal party in a hurry.

An hon. Member: Mr. St. Laurent.

Mr. Churchill: Yes, Mr. St. Laurent. That is the situation today. They are two parties with different names but the same ideas here in the House of Commons. The N.D.P. people go along with the Liberals.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Ask the new parliamentary secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. He knows that.

Mr. Churchill: The best example is what has happened in connection with this unification bill. The members of the N.D.P. know very well—and I recognize they are people of intelligence—that the advice of those military experts who gave evidence before the committee, almost all of whom have been thrown out of office, is better than the advice given to this house by the Minister of National Defence. Yet they are co-operating with the minister and sweeping aside all that evidence in their anxiety to support the government. That is another object. They like the idea.

• (8:10 p.m.)

Mr. Winch: Would the hon. member allow a question?

Mr. Churchill: Certainly.

Mr. Winch: Is the hon. member discussing what he may think is the way we are going to vote on the issue of bringing this matter to a decision, or is he saying now how we are going to vote on clause 2 and on clause 6?

Mr. Diefenbaker: You have said it.

[Mr. Churchill.]

Mr. Winch: The question before the house now is the matter of bringing the issue to a vote. It is not a discussion on clause 2. If the hon. member thinks he knows how we are going to vote on clause 2 and clause 6 I think he is a little confused, because I do not believe he has the foggiest notion.

Mr. Churchill: I know the hon. member is going to vote against the bill; he has expressed opposition to it. The hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) has said publicly in the defence committee, and here, that unless the foreign policy of the government is clearly established he cannot support the bill, and I think the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge) is going to oppose the bill. I am not sure about the other members of that party, but I am surprised they would support the allocation of time proposal that came up today, since I suggested this other method of dealing with this particular problem and getting the House of Commons out of a difficulty. Be that as it may, we will see what happens when the time comes.

It is regrettable that an issue like this cannot be solved by agreement. Sitting on both the other side of the chamber and on this side, I have seen innumerable agreements arrived at, when difficulties were amicably settled in the lobby behind the curtains. These things are not recorded in *Hansard*. Neither are they recorded in the press, but experienced members of the house know how the house works. There is a tremendous amount of work done by agreement. This is how legislation goes through, unless we run into legislation that is controversial, such as the unification bill.

On many of our items of legislation there is an exchange of information, party to party, as to how many people are going to speak and how long they want. This is never publicly pronounced, but when you get a controversial bill you run into trouble. When a controversial bill is before the house the government should assess the opinion of the house, and should not press on with such a bill to the point that we have reached now, where it is going to impose closure, which is a restriction on freedom of speech.

We have not entered upon this debate lightly. We are not conducting a filibuster. Our opinions on this bill are soundly based, firmly held and rooted in conviction. We think the bill is bad for the country, and we are supported by the opinion and sound judgment of a great many former military personnel who

held high office under the present government. This is not a light question at all. We are within our rights as an opposition in putting forward our arguments against the bill.

What are we to do—just collapse because we know that the smaller parties to our left are going to vote with the government and that therefore we cannot defeat the bill? Are we just to say, "We are going to be defeated anyway; let's give up?" This is not the purpose to be served by an opposition. If we have strong convictions on a subject under discussion we must present them. If there is a volume of opinion in the country opposed to a measure which comes before us, it is our duty to bring that fact to the attention of the House of Commons in the hope that the government will modify its bill, or postpone it, or withdraw it. That is the situation we have reached right here.

This idea that just because the government brings forward a measure the whole House of Commons should act as a rubber stamp, is something I will not accept. This is the idea behind allocation of time, Mr. Speaker. We have had the proposition put forward by the Prime Minister and by the leader of the N.D.P. that there should be allocation of time before—I wish I could underline this in *Hansard*—before a debate commences. Nothing could be more ridiculous; nothing could be more unsound.

Not until a debate commences and is carried on do you sometimes discover the peculiarities and the weaknesses of a bill before the house. I have seen this happen time and time again. For example, if we had had an allocation of time on the transport bill before the debate commenced, and had been restricted to two days in committee of the whole house, we would have had a far worse bill than finally emerged, because the amendments which poured in from both sides of the house transformed that bill. All those amendments took time to present and to be discussed. That is one of the reasons why I am opposed to the allocation of time idea.

Sir, I have made survey after survey of sessions in this house. I have put this on *Hansard* before and I do not want to keep repeating things I have said in the past. None the less it has been the case in session after session that legislation has always gone through, and gone through without much trouble except in those instances where a highly controversial bill was before the house. Over a period of 15 sessions that I have reviewed I have discovered that from 40 to 60 pieces of legislation were put through each session. On other occasions I have suggested that within the framework of 150 days to a session the house should be able to complete the major portion of its work and pass from 40 to 60 pieces of legislation if the planning is carefully done.

We are having this session one of the longest sessions in Canada's history, and one of the most poorly managed sessions in Canada's history. It is simply ridiculous to go for 245 days, as we have done in this session, running over the year, starting in January and ending perhaps in May of the next year. It is just nonsense. This session which was started a year ago last January should have ended in December. A new session should have started in January of this year, the centennial year, and we should have had a respectable and good session for centennial year. In such a year I would have kept out of the session controversial matters such as this.

I think it is a crying shame that in our centennial year we in this house are forced to put through a bill which is unsound, on which there is no need for haste, and which has brought on closure, or a restriction of speech in the house. Centennial celebration. What a farce the Prime Minister has made of parliament.

The session should have ended in December. I suggested at that time to members on the other side that although we still had before us the railway transportation bill and the unification bill we were prepared, again by agreement, to put those bills on the order paper in 1967 in the same position that they were in in 1966, if the session had closed in December, and not to go through all the committee proceedings with regard to the transportation bill, not to go through the second reading and things of that nature, but to put it back into the house in the same position as it was in in December, cut the session off, start afresh with a new speech from the throne and proceed then in an orderly fashion with supply motions and with estimates.

Look at the situation in which we are in now—245 days, talking about starting a new session some time in May, and we have the Prime Minister fumbling with regard to what we do between then and July 1. He has said that perhaps we will have to sit all July and August, and he laid out a list of legislative items as long as your arm, which will take another two years to accomplish.

In this session we have already passed 85 pieces of legislation. Obviously it has been

two sessions crowded into one, according to the order paper, and there are other pieces of legislation still to come forward. I am not counting appropriation bills which follow supply. It is a good achievement. No one can complain that we have been holding things up. If you want to take it on the average, that is only about two days per bill.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Time and time again we have passed three small, minor or unimportant bills in this house in one day. Obviously a complex bill requires more debate. In any event the record of this house, so far as passing measures is concerned, has been good. The minute the government conceives the idea that it should force something through the house it begins to refer to allocation of time and closure. Government members begin to complain about the opposition talking about certain measures. Much of the difficulty experienced by the government in this regard could be avoided by agreement and I gave two examples before six o'clock. I am sure, for example, we might have used Tuesday and Wednesday of this week for the consideration of other legislation. I made a suggestion to the house in this regard on Tuesday, but it was rejected.

Before six o'clock I suggested that we could end this session promptly by postponing our consideration of certain parts of this bill until the next session. In this way we could pass the remainder of the bill, complete our consideration of the measure on adult training, pass interim supply and deal with the report of the rules committee. Before six o'clock I went so far as to suggest that this could all be done by tomorrow. But the government is inflexible and is bound to force its will on this House of Commons by closure.

The government does not have the support of the country on this matter of unification, because it was not a subject for discussion during the last election. There has been no mandate forthcoming from the people in respect of the destruction of the Royal Canadian Navy, the Royal Canadian Army or the Royal Canadian Air Force. Unification was not a plank in the platform of the Liberal party during the election of 1965. This whole matter has been brought on since then by the Minister of National Defence, and against the advice of his senior officials he intends to push it through. That is why we maintain our right to present our case now.

Not everything that should and will be said about this measure has been said, and it is

[Mr. Churchill.]

ridiculous to suggest, as the leader of the New Democratic party suggested, that the discussion on the bill has been exhausted. That hon. gentleman has not participated in the debate. I do not believe he has read the evidence of the committee or that he knows anything about this matter. In spite of that he says everything of value has been said. How does he know that? I have more to say about this measure, and I am sure others have contributions of value to make.

We in this House of Commons are constantly faced with this sort of situation. Some people want to curtail freedom of speech. Surely that is unnecessary. Year after year this house has passed important items. There have always been certain things which must be done. There has always been a great pressure to accomplish certain things of importance, and over the years we have restricted the amount of time for debate on certain matters such as the throne speech debate, the budget debate, supply motions and estimates. These restrictions have all been put in as a result of agreement. We have cut down on the time allotted for speeches during the committee of the whole house stage, and we have limited our question period. There may be other limitations we will have to bring about in order to facilitate the business of this house, but surely these limitations can be imposed by agreement rather than by arbitrary action on the part of the government. Surely these limitations should not be made by government ukases.

A few years ago changes of the kind I have mentioned were made as a result of the unanimous agreement of an all-party committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Speaker. Such changes were made under the chairmanship of Mr. Speaker Beaudoin and Mr. Speaker Michener. That is how things were done a few years ago. Useful and helpful compromises were reached. In contrast, under this autocratic government the house is being forced to restrict its freedoms.

To my knowledge five members of the cabinet have been telling the public outside this house how parliament must be reformed so that its work may be expedited. They have told the public that things should be done in a different way. I hope the public will realize that it is the government's intention to muzzle the opposition. All we in the opposition want is to debate government proposals. On the other hand the government wants to present its legislation to a completely silent opposition, which will act as a rubber stamp.

That is the government's thesis expressed in simple terms.

Members of the cabinet colour this plain and simple objective by certain phraseologies. They talk about modernization, streamlining and speeding up of our procedures. I am not aware of any period of time since I have been around here when there has been a greater degree of mismanagement by a government of the business of this house than there has been in the last few years. Items have not been brought forward on the order paper although they have been mentioned in speeches from the throne. Even when they are brought forward they are in such bad shape they have to be withdrawn, modified and changed to a great extent. Whenever one finds scores of amendments to a bill he must conclude that the government has prepared that bill badly. The members of the opposition have bailed out the government on numerous occasions during this session in order that measures could be passed. This has happened on so many occasions it would be difficult to recount them. This has been a session of mismanagement and it is being mismanaged now.

The leader of the New Democratic party suggested that the business committee set up last week should be left to arrange the business of this house. Let me remind him of the house committee which meets frequently to make arrangements in this regard. The business committee appointed last week met on Friday. It did not meet on Monday but met on Tuesday at 2:15 and reported to the house at 2.30. The only purpose of that committee was to decide whether we should consider this bill for two, three or five days during the committee of the whole discussion, and one or two days during third reading. It was hoped that I would bring forward the suggestion at that business committee that we should limit the number of days to the number suggested by the government.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question regarding the number of times the business committee met? Does he not feel that he should state that certain representatives of various parties on the business committee were in accord and that the committee felt it was necessary to meet more often? Will he not also admit that discussions continued with the hon. member on behalf of his group during the intervals between the meetings?

Mr. Churchill: The government house leader can place whatever interpretation he likes on what happened. In my opinion a business committee should meet on each of the three days set aside for that purpose. There should not be individual consultations. I do not know what took place during discussions between members of that committee and the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette), for example. That hon. member did not attend the meetings, nor did any member of his party.

The proposition I put forward earlier had nothing to do with what took place at the meetings of the business committee. I put forward a Conservative party proposition to the government house leader. This suggestion was considered by the business committee as a matter of interest and, perhaps, importance. It involved a package deal in respect of the general business of the house.

• (8:30 p.m.)

I am not sure that the business committee has been of any great value. The house leaders can do all this without going through the motions of calling the business committee. It should be decided whether we should spend one or two days on the bill in committee of the whole house, and how much time should be spent on third reading. The government should make that decision. If the government proposes to impose closure through allocation of time, let them say exactly how much time they are going to give the house. This is all I would ask of the business committee. If the government has the assurance of support from the New Democratic party, the Social Credit party and the Créditistes, naturally the Conservative representative has to give in because he is only one in a committee of four.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to dwell on that aspect of the matter and will conclude by saying that I think it is unsound to attempt to enforce closure on the House of Commons. Freedom of speech in this chamber should be carefully guarded. An opposition that yields to a restriction on freedom of speech is derelict in its duty. This is basically why we must oppose closure, no matter what name it comes under. Whether it is called allocation of time or anything else, it is none the less closure; it is an imposition on freedom of speech, and we are expressing our opposition to it.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Churchill: Yes, go ahead.

Mr. Winch: I want to be very clear about the proposal of the hon. member; therefore I would like to ask him whether my interpretation of his proposal is correct. I gather he has made this proposal more than once. As I understand it, the proposal of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) is to the effect that clauses 2 and 6 should be held in abeyance and that the official opposition are prepared to deal with the other clauses of the bill at this time. I believe this proposal has been made because of repeated statements by the government that it will take at least four months to draft the regulations and have them approved before the bill is promulgated. I think the suggestion is that in October or thereabouts clauses 2 and 6 would come back to the house and would at that time be passed.

If my assumption is correct, I should like to ask the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre whether this necessarily means—it does to me—that the official opposition are prepared to have a government department working on and producing regulations, the passage of which involves orders in council, without legislative authority having been given. In my opinion, that is what the suggestion must mean. Then, I gather, in October we would come back to clauses 2 and 6. Are we to assume that the regulations having been drafted in the interim period and the remaining clauses of the bill having been passed, clauses 2 and 6 would automatically carry? I am sure the hon. member understands the point I am putting forward.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I dealt with this matter before six o'clock. The hon. member is pretty well correct, but quite briefly I will put it in my own words. I suggested that clauses 2 and 6 should stand until the fall, and I gave the reasons for making this suggestion. First, the regulations have to be prepared and they cannot be ready for four to six months. Evidence given by General Allard and the adjutant general, and agreed to by the Minister of National Defence, was that until those regulations are drafted and approved and the bill is proclaimed, this legislation is not law.

Until this bill is proclaimed and it is law, the regulations cannot take effect; and General Allard said he cannot take any step toward unification until the bill is proclaimed. That puts this matter off until October. I suggested that in the circumstances we pass the rest of the bill now. By inference—and I got that word from the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) out in the corridor one day—this would give the adjutant general the assurance that he could safely go ahead and draft the regulations and the bill would not be so materially changed in respect of clauses 2 and 6 that his regulations would be thrown out.

[Mr. Churchill.]

Then I suggested that by agreement we would put this bill back on the order paper. As the matter now stands, the bill is in committee of the whole house. I said if this were done we would raise no objection, no points of order and would not participate in debate, and in the fall we would conclude the discussion of clauses 2 and 6, and third reading, in the same amount of time that the government is providing on this occasion, if they desire to impose closure. I also said that no harm would be done in that event and we could deal with other business at this time. I suggested that in exchange for this concession we would advance very rapidly with the adult training bill, the report of the rules committee and interim supply; and I went so far as to say that we would do all these things by six o'clock tomorrow night.

Mr. Winch: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but the question I asked has not been answered by the hon. member.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I must point out to the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) that the time allotted to the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges C. Lachance (Lafontaine): Mr. Speaker, hearing the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) speak of freedom of speech a few minutes ago leads me to reflect that each member may have a personal opinion on this matter just as anyone who takes the trouble of speaking about it.

Recently, I read in a newspaper an article by Mr. Dean, well-known correspondent and newspaperman, in which he wrote about those who preach freedom of speech in order to curtail it in others. I believe that if freedom of speech carries certain rights, it also involves some obligations.

The leader of the government (Mr. McIlraith) introduced a motion under standing order 15A suggesting the allocation of time, specifically two days, to complete debate on Bill No. C-243 in committee of the whole.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Standing order 15A was introduced on June 11, 1965, when the house agreed to certain amendments further to various reports of the committee on standing orders, on which it was my privilege to serve.

When this amendment was passed, there was considerable discussion in the house. Needless to say, the special committee on standing orders, after sitting nearly a year, had seriously considered the advisability of amending standing orders.

This afternoon, I heard the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas), leader of the New Democratic party, recite once again the list of suggestions his party favours for the proper conduct of the business of the house.

I think it was the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) who remarked that these suggestions have already been made. Personally, I have no objection to the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam or any other making suggestions to improve the proper functioning of the house.

Obviously, it was almost a repetition of the press release dated September 22, 1964, by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam. I found a copy in my files and I read it during the supper hour.

However, I have noted that the government had implemented a number of the proposals made by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam on September 22, 1964. If the government has not yet been able to find the miracle solution to get ahead with the business of the house, then let each and every one of us blame only himself.

The right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), following those proposals put forward by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, had answered on September 23, 1964, that he was very pleased to have the support of that hon. member as far as reform of the parliamentary procedure was concerned.

The Prime Minister repeated this afternoon that a system of allocation of time must be set up for the debates of the house, so that it might consider urgent matters.

Thus, after all the proposals made previously, the government finally submitted to the house amendments to the procedure in 1965. After a lengthy debate, most of those proposals were passed on June 11, 1965, including this standing order 15A about the allocation of time for consideration of any legislation.

I understand the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) when he says that the business committee has not met perhaps as often as it should have. As I said earlier, however, there may be a lack of sincerity and good will, since the house had agreed to provide in its standing orders a means to cope with the present situation.

That the government should have decided as a last resort to apply to existing rules and standing order 15A in order to allocate time for the study of Bill No. C-243 should not come as a surprise, and all members present must admit that a decision has to be reached with regard to that bill.

I understand that it will likely not meet everybody's wish, but after hearing quite a large number of speeches by the official opposition, some of which were quite thorough and others maybe less interesting and repetitious, I think that a solution had to be found and that the hon. leader of the government had no alternative but present the motion which he moved today.

Mr. Speaker, I should like, however, to make a suggestion and voice a personal opinion; if we do not want too much bitterness to prevail following this debate, it might be a good idea to come to an agreement and set clause 2 aside and go on with the study of the other clauses of the bill.

Under this motion, examination of the bill will have to come to a conclusion, and a vote will be taken, and without anticipating the result of that vote, I have no doubt that we shall vote on that question in the very near future.

I feel that it is in the interest of the country that we, as members, should have the opportunity to study the other clauses of this bill.

If the house decides that this motion is to become operative, I see no other logical solution, Mr. Speaker, than to agree to suspend consideration of clause 2 and proceed immediately with the other clauses of this bill.

I think we would show maturity in following this course.

[*English*]

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, anything I had intended to say in this debate must be changed to some extent as a result of the intervention and of the interesting observations made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) this afternoon. He said then what I have heard on so many occasions from

other distinguished members of the cabinet, not only during the present government's tenure of office but also when other parties held the office of government, that things must be done; we must get moving; the business of the country must be attended to. We received a long list of legislation which must be passed dealing with almost everything conceivable. I think the right hon. gentleman did forget to suggest that we should add some fitting words to the Sermon on the Mount, that we should amend the Ten Commandments and rewrite Hamlet's soliloquy. I suggest that the right hon. gentleman had everything in his speech.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Mr. Knowles: What about Hebrews 12 and 16?

Mr. Baldwin: I believe that intervention is superfluous because that matter is being attended to already. I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that there is an urgency about some matters. We must bear in mind today, however, that with the division in the political parties there is bound to be feeling. This is an actual part of the political process. In the course of the last two or three years the government which the right hon. gentleman leads has seen fit to introduce certain measures which have reawakened latent hostilities and strong dislikes. It will be for historians at a later date to say whether this was the appropriate time or whether it may well have been more appropriate to wait a longer period of time. The fact remains that in the country, and reflected in this house, there are stronger feelings of hostility than usually prevail.

Consequently, in assessing the necessity for introducing and dealing with legislation, there must rest upon the government the very grave burden of undertaking to give priority to measures which are less controversial. I do not expect there are many matters that will be dealt with in this house without controversy. It is in that atmosphere that the government now seeks to curtail debate on this bill by means of this motion. In the light of what the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) has said, and according to my interpretation of events, much of the difficulty we are experiencing today must be laid at the door of the government.

In the fall of 1965, with a long period ahead of us and with urgent legislation to deal with, with the estimates for that fiscal year untouched, the government saw fit, for reasons which it considered sufficient but which obviously were not acceptable to the country, to call an election. Ever since that election the business of this house has not been properly ordered. Over and over again we have experienced situations in which legislation has been postponed, where ministers charged with responsibility for completing certain items have left on political safaris or for other good reasons. As a result, we have had to postpone these measures and deal with something else.

These postponements and delays have been the cause of uneasiness, and a feeling that there has not been that degree of advance which there should be in the legislative process here. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is a liability upon the government. After all, they are charged with the responsibility of so ordering the affairs of this house that we will know what we are doing, that when we start a matter we will have an opportunity to carry it through to completion. I believe these are some of the reasons for the feelings which have been generated in connection with this debate, and for which the government must accept a substantial degree of responsibility.

The right hon. gentleman spoke about changes in the legislative process. He mentioned certain matters, with some of which I would agree. We must bear in mind, and I think the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) referred to this, that there is an equal responsibility resting upon the government to ensure the rights of private members. It is not enough simply to give to the grasping hands of government the right to use more power to speed up the legislative process for purposes which they consider necessary.

In the last few weeks, Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion to read some of the reports made by a special committee in the United Kingdom House of Commons, where they have been plagued with some of the difficulties with which we are faced. Running through the transcript of evidence are the same stories which we hear concerning the frustration of members and the desire of the government to introduce more and more legislation, often ill-conceived and therefore likely to be ill-digested. Some of this legislation, which the government thinks it wants, is not necessarily the legislation which meets the requirements of the country.

They have a very interesting arrangement there, Mr. Speaker, and in this connection I disagree to some extent with my colleague from Winnipeg South Centre. There, Mr.

Speaker appears before the committee along with the whips of the various parties and some of the prominent members of the parties, and they give their views. They are faced with precisely the same kind of problems with which we are faced. One of the major problems is one which was mentioned I think by the right hon. gentlemen, who had served on both sides of the house, namely the fact the government attempts to introduce legislation beyond the capacity of the government and the country to digest. This is a very serious difficulty.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that basically one of the major responsibilities of the government is to look carefully at the priorities. We would all like things to be done, I am sure, having in mind the situation which we occupy and what we have done during the course of political campaigns. We all have ideas we would like to see incorporated in the legislation, probably in many cases better ideas than the government has. We must recognize that the government has the responsibility and to that extent there must be a determination to assess the capacity of the country to absorb these legislative enactments. This has not been the case with this government.

I want to deal to some extent with some of the comments made by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas). I agree with many of the proposals he has brought forward. I must say, with all due respect, that in my view the rules of this house do not belong to the government. They do not belong to any political party: They belong to the members of this house. I honestly do not believe it adds to the likelihood of free and unihibited discussion which we must have, not only in this house but in the committees, if there is any suggestion that any particular proposal for changes in the rules is the property of any party.

I accept the fact that the hon. member put these suggestions forward in good faith. However, I do not feel this is likely to be conducive to the type of change which we must have if parliament is going to survive as an active, viable and useful force. Equally I say to the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson), who intervened in this connection, that his definition of the allocation of time—I will have more to say about that later—if carried through to its logical conclusion would mean a great many changes. To what extent are some of the smaller parties of this house prepared to accept on motions—and in my humble opinion the government makes far too many motions that need not be made—an allocation of time in the form of not making statements on announcements which are made, with the right reserved to them to ask questions on orders of the day? This is a practice frequently followed in the United Kingdom. Personally I think it is a useful practice, because you precipitate a far more intelligent approach to a subject matter if, the minister having made a statement, an opportunity is given to ask questions. However, that is something the committee on procedure will have to discuss at a later stage.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Dealing with the particular motion before us, Mr. Speaker, I think I have been objective in my approach to the subject matter of this problem. I have not intervened or spoken in the debate up to this time, though I think I did say something on the resolution stage. I must be perfectly honest and say there are undoubtedly aspects of the debate which have appeared up to the present time which would justify one in taking the position that it might be a good idea, if not to bring the debate to an end, at least to arrange for a more orderly completion to the discussions we have had.

There have been invitations to impose closure and threats to do so. To my thinking, there has been repetition on all sides of the house which has been unnecessary and has not enlivened the debate. Statements have been made which I think should not have been made. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that we are not attending a tea party in the House of Commons. Feelings do run high, as they should and must. People do have a point of view to present and they feel very strongly about certain issues. I would be both surprised and unhappy if in the course of our debates we did not see these strong views and representations reflected in language which perhaps the following morning the hon. member who had used it might wish to correct. I have no objection to a little blood flowing, but I prefer blood and not garbage.

As a result of the continuance of this debate in this way, I think one of the problems has been our inability to get into some very critical and important issues which are involved in various clauses, the necessity for moving amendments and for joining issue, for coming together in conflict, on matters which have not been dealt with so far. If this debate ends without this being done, I think we will be doing less than our duty.

Finally in this regard, as advocate for the plaintiff, as it were, may I say I dislike dictation. I dislike tyranny. I dislike the tyranny of a government which imposes closure. Equally I dislike the tyranny of members who use more than their allotted time to present their views over and over again, preventing other members from having their opportunity to speak. But having said that, Mr. Speaker, I must say that what the government is now proposing is the wrong move at the wrong time in the wrong way and for the wrong purposes.

The hon. member for Lafontaine (Mr. Lachance) who has just resumed his seat was one with whom I had the privilege of serving on the committee on procedure. Let me make it quite plain that what has been referred to as the allocation of time rule has no connection at all with what was proposed by this committee, on which I had the honour to serve some years ago. Any resemblance is purely accidental. I would certainly deem it a breach of privilege if I were accused of being in any way even part author of this particular rule. I would think the only way to find out who sponsored it would be to provide terms of reference under the children of unmarried parents act.

However, Mr. Speaker, as I say, this proposal is not an allocation of time. The allocation of time, as I construe it, is a measure which would not be used very frequently. The original proposal was one fairly mild in its application, and I do not think it would apply to too many measures. Those who promised us such great things are, I think, wide of the mark. But there are a number of measures we always have in every session in respect to which agreements made by the house leaders are not always observed, though not through the fault of the house leaders.

These are measures where it would be possible, through the agency and under the aegis of the business committee, to work out in detail an allocation of time, provided there is complete frankness on the part of the government in disclosing the legislation. I think that would have to be a condition precedent. I think it would involve as well a practice somewhat similar to that in the United Kingdom of filing all amendments to Mr. Speaker's ruling in advance of moving the amendments, ruling out duplications and those which are not in order, so we would know precisely what was involved in the debate and the areas which were controversial. However, I think it would be possible in some few measures to work out in advance an allocation of time, and I think the house would be appreciative of it and that it would do a great service.

This was the only intent of the committee on procedure when it proposed this step several years ago. It is my clear understanding that in respect to any step beyond that, the government must still be prepared, if it feels it has a good case, that it has the support of the country and it feels it must do so, to move closure, and to move it not under the guise of an allocation of time. That is their rights. If the government is justified in doing it, I for one would have no hesitation in supporting it in a proper cause. But the government must be very sure they are right, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest it is completely erroneous to exercise this right as they have done here, and to use the allocation of time rule at this particular period.

If the government is satisfied that this debate has gone on long enough, and if in the exercise of their discretion and in the carrying out of the duties and functions of the government they feel that they are acting in the best interests of Canada, then it is their duty to move toward and to impose closure, not this half-way measure which was never intended to be applied to a situation of this kind.

I know there are other members who want to follow me before the axe is honed and sharpened and put into the hands of the headman, but there is another reason that I feel very strongly about this, in spite of what I said at the beginning of my remarks. I think it is an issue which has been completely forgotten, and I think we should have the opportunity to discuss it in the course of this debate.

• (9:10 p.m.)

That is an illustration of the continuing growth by governments toward arrogating more power and more authority unto themselves to do by order in council, regulation and ministerial order in the dark recesses of cabinets and ministerial offices that which they do not dare do on the floor of the House of Commons. Lord Hewart called it the new despotism, in the form of anaesthetic.

We have talked about unification and integration. I will be quite frank and say that I oppose the government's action with some reluctance. I oppose it because involved here is the desire by the minister and the government to take unto themselves the right to change the structure of the armed forces of

the country by regulation, order in council and decree.

We do not know what the government intends to do. The suggestion is made that there will be structural changes and important, fundamental and basic alterations. It is incumbent on the government to bring to this house before those changes are made the decrees, regulations and orders in council containing its proposals.

We are the most medieval, antedeluvian, anachronistic member of the democratic nations of the Commonwealth in our approach to this matter. Most countries, and I refer to Australia in particular, conduct themselves differently. In most Commonwealth countries nearly all orders in council and most regulations are brought back to the House of Commons for consideration or revocation.

I recognize that governments must have power, mobility, the right to move quickly, and flexibility. But hand in hand with that must go the right of this house and of parliament to check, to examine, to scrutinize and, where essential, to revoke and rescind orders in council and decrees. That principle is involved in this measure. I wanted to enter the debate last Monday, during the committee stage, but because so many members wanted to participate I could not. I wanted to propose what I thought was a suitable compromise—not along the lines of that suggested by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, but in many ways similar. I put this to the minister for his consideration—and I asked a question of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam earlier embracing this suggestion. Let the bill pass, but add to section 6 (1) a provision that any proclamation in any way affecting the separate identity of the army, navy and air force shall not be effective until it comes back to this house, accompanied by the regulations or statements containing the exact proposal which the government seeks to introduce. At present we do not know what that is. The government asks us for carte blanche—for a blank cheque. That is dangerous, and we have had far too much of that.

Let me give an illustration. The President of the United States sought sanction for what is known as the Tomkin resolution, giving the executive power to increase the armed forces under varying circumstances to take care of the situation in Viet Nam then existing. This was to be done without any declaration of war. I am convinced from what I have read and from the people I have talked to—members of the United States Congress and Senate—that the members of those bodies would never, under any circumstances, have endorsed this request of the president and given the executive the authority under which the escalation of the war in Viet Nam has come about.

In a different way this is what the minister and the government are asking us to do. They want a blank cheque. They say: "We are the great white father, benevolent, all wise, all seeing; trust us; trust our discretion. The changes we make will be good; they will be helpful; the country needs them."

I have not that much trust in any government.

Mr. Nesbitt: Particularly not in this one.

Mr. Baldwin: And particularly not in this government, which has a predilection, because some of its members on the treasury benches have had experience in the civil service, to realizing the benefits arising from repairing mistakes in the dark, without ever bringing them to the light of day.

I say this to the minister: Many of our difficulties date back to the reasonable request that this bill be sent, before second reading, to a committee. Many of the problems which have been generated, many of the difficulties which have occurred can be traced back to the refusal on that occasion. Had the minister agreed to that request I should have been perfectly happy with an order allocating time. That was when the minister ought to have acted. He should have sent this matter to the committee on national defence.

Had the minister done so I submit that it would not have been necessary for the opposition to press certain changes; the government would have suggested them. The government would not have taken the hard position it has since taken, and from which it is unable to move.

Because of these things, though I have had grave reservations about the course of this debate, I cannot in conscience say that the government's action now is wise or necessary.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, like others I regret the impasse reflected in the motion that is before the house for debate and decision today. Even so, I suggest that this day is not a dead loss. It has been good for us to take a hard look at some of our procedures. Indeed, I dare to hope that the debate that has taken place

today will be of assistance to the members of the special committee on procedure, when we meet again either in this session or in the new session that should start soon.

Another advantage, although for the moment I might have to put that word in quotation marks, that flows from today's debate is the interesting list of items of business the Prime Minister gave us this afternoon. I hope that that list was not given merely as a debating point. I can tell the Prime Minister—and his remarks are now on the record—that members in all parts of the house will insist on government action on the many important issues he listed this afternoon.

Mr. Lewis: In 1967, too.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Mr. Knowles: As my hon. friend reminds me, the inference was that this was business which should be done for the people of Canada in 1967, and I say that this commitment on the part of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) will have to take priority over any suggestion of a long holiday or anything else which might crop up.

Like others, as I have said, I regret this impasse. I believe it could have been avoided. One of the ways in which it could have been avoided would have been for the government to have acted completely in the spirit of standing order 15A by calling together all the house leaders, or the members of the business committee, to try to plan the length of time to be allotted to this debate before it started. I know that when I use that word "before" the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) will probably want to remind me of his statement a few moments ago, that nothing is more ridiculous or nonsensical than to try to plan the length of a debate before it starts. I can only say, then, that the way in which they carry on debates in the United Kingdom must be ridiculous and nonsensical, because the fact is they determine the time to be allotted to practically every debate which takes place in the mother of parliaments.

Mr. Hellyer: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question? While I believe nearly all hon. members would agree with him that it would be better at some time in the future to regulate all the business of the house by referring it to the business committee and reaching some agreement as to the time to be allotted to each measure, does he not believe that had this rule been used at the outset before the commencement of discussion, the government would have been accused at once of applying closure, even before consideration of the measure began?

Mr. Knowles: I do not agree with that assumption. I believe that had there been an honest attempt on the part of the house leaders or of the business committee to arrange, in advance, a reasonable time for this debate, we would not have found ourselves in the trouble we are in today. I proposed this myself in a television program on Sunday, April 2, before the debate started and I proposed it at a meeting of the house leaders on Monday, April 3. But the other house leaders thought it was not necessary.

I think the day must come when we plan our debates as well as the work of the parliamentary session generally, in advance, and I see no advantage in continuing to put that day off because of the fear which the Minister of National Defence has just expressed.

In the debate today we have before us two main issues. One of them is an immediate issue. The other is a long range issue. The immediate issue is very clear: Has the time come for the House of Commons to take a decision on Bill C-243. Surely, even after we have had our say about the rules and practice of the house, this becomes a matter of judgment—and it is a judgment which individual members will be called upon to exercise in about 20 minutes from now when Your Honour will, no doubt, apply "closure" to my own remarks. In my judgment and in the judgment of my colleagues this matter has been before parliament and before the country long enough for members to be in a position to take a decision.

We cannot liken this debate to the pipe line debate of 1956. I looked up the record today, though I hardly needed to look it up to recall it, and I found that in committee of the whole on that bill we spent practically no time at all debating its clauses. We were in committee of the whole for a few days, but at the very start closure was threatened and it was soon moved, with the result that we spent most of the time fighting closure or discussing points of order. We had practically no discussion at all in committee of the whole on the pipe line issue. On this occasion we have already spent 13 days in committee of the whole on Bill C-243, and even if the motion now before us carries, there will be two more or a total of 15 days. This, in my judgment, plus the time spent on second reading, plus the time spent in the committee on national defence, plus the time which was spent on interim supply is

sufficient for members to be able to reach a decision. This issue being one of judgment I believe we should make up our minds at a quarter to ten this evening.

Mr. Churchill: Would the hon. member permit a question? Coming as he does from Winnipeg, he is very fair. When he mentions the discussion of this issue on interim supply is he not overlooking the fact that it was not until expert evidence was produced before the committee on defence that we really got to the root of the matter? The discussion earlier was a confused discussion because the minister could not give us accurate information.

An hon. Member: Why have it, then?

Mr. Churchill: It was the fault of the minister. He was confused.

Mr. Knowles: I will be fair to my hon. friend from Winnipeg. I am quite willing to remove from our consideration the number of days spent on defence when we were on interim supply. I submit that the time left, the time spent on second reading, in the committee on national defence and in committee of the whole, is sufficient to enable us to exercise our powers of judgment on this bill.

But I think the other issue which is before us, the long range issue, is even more important. This matter has been referred to a number of times today, but like others I feel very strongly about it. I refer to the necessity which faces this parliament of finding a way, in a year which contains only 12 months, to deal with the amount of business which must come before us on behalf of the people of Canada. We often say that there is a great deal more to be done nowadays, and sometimes when we say this people think we are only generalizing. I would therefore like to give one or two facts in support of my contention that this is a very real problem.

If one takes the trouble, as I have done, to check the sessions of parliament going right back to 1867, he will find that before the turn of the century no session of parliament ever lasted more than four months—most of them lasted from two and a half to three months. If one looks through the records of the early part of this century he will find that but for the session of 1912-13 which extended over six and a half months—

Mr. Churchill: In 1903.

Mr. Knowles: No, but for the session of 1912-13 there was none of any great length. The 1912-13 session was the longest in the early part of this century. Most of them lasted for four or four and a half months. Even during the first world war the limit was about four and a half months. To come closer to modern times, some of us were here for the sessions during the second world war and we thought they were long. The fact of the matter is that although the sitting extended technically over the full calendar year, so that parliament could be recalled immediately in case of need, the total sitting time never exceeded six and a half months. I heard an interjection. Yes, some of us were here during the sessions I have just mentioned.

Since that time the length of sessions has increased. Until four or five years, the average was of the order of eight or nine months. Now for the second time in this decade we are in a session which has gone more than 14 months. Surely it is clear that the amount of business has so greatly exploded that we have to find some way to cope with the fact that there are still only 12 months in a calendar year.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, I would like to think I might be the last person in the house to judge what we do by dollars, and yet I think even dollars can sometimes be an interesting measurement. I find that in the first years of Canada's parliament the amount of money that had to be appropriated, all told, was of the order of $20 million to $25 million. By 1900 that had doubled to $50 million. By 1939 it was still only $500 million, but today it is $11 billion. Let me put those figures in a slightly different way so that they can be compared with each other: in 1867 $20 million; in 1967 $11,000 million, an increase of 550 times.

Dollars do not tell everything and a lot of that, of course, is inflation, but surely the length of time we have had to spend dealing with the nation's business and the amount of dollars we have had to collect and appropriate suggest that our business has exploded to such an extent that we have got to take this problem seriously.

An hon. Member: A welfare state.

Mr. Knowles: My hon. friend says the problem of the welfare state comes in. He simply reminds me to point out, if I have time, that in addition to these evidences of what has happened, the fact of the matter is that parliament, which used to be concerned with roads, post offices and a few other things, is now concerned with everything under and

over the ground, under and over the sea, and on into outer space, and with the life of man from cradle to grave.

The amount of business we have to cope with emphasizes the problem of time. That obviously is a prelude to suggesting we have to find ways of planning the use of our time. We have to find ways of regulating the amount of talking we do on the various issues that are before us. That of course immediately leads one to suggest that we must not orget the purposes of parliament.

I am reminded that the purposes of parliament, in the main, are twofold. There are a lot of incidental ones that we seem to produce as we go along, but there are two main ones. On the one hand it is our function to discuss the proposals that the government of the day places before the house, and a parliament that does not have free speech, a parliament that does not have the right to discuss those proposals as adequately and as sufficiently as necessary, is no parliament at all. But the other function of parliament is to make decisions, to decide whether or not the proposals placed before it by the government should be put into effect, and I say with equal vigour that a parliament that is denied the opportunity to make decisions on proposals that are placed before it is likewise no parliament at all.

I urge therefore that we should keep these things in balance. As a matter of fact, that is what the development of rules and procedures is all about. That is our constant struggle, to try to find the kind of rules that will achieve a balance between the right of free speech and the right of parliament to make decisions. The whole idea that in order to do this we have to do something about speaking time, whether it is the speaking time of an individual member or whether it is the time that the House of Commons spends on a motion or on an issue is, of course, not new.

We already have many time limits built into our rules, which we have come to accept without any question. For example, we have a 40 minute rule on speeches made while Your Honour is in the chair. When that 40 minutes is up the member speaking is through. Sometimes by unanimous consent he is allowed to go on, but the rule says that the member has had his say. There is no denial of free speech in that. The member must sit down so that another member can speak, and that applies whether it is the 40 minute rule when the Speaker is in the chair, or whether it is the 30 minute rule in committee of the whole.

[Mr. Knowles.]

We have accepted the proposition that the debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne should be limited to eight days. No one shouts closure when the eighth day comes and Your Honour announces from the chair that the vote must be taken. No one says this is a curtailment of free speech. The same thing applies with respect to the Budget debate which is limited to six days. The same thing applies with respect to supply motions which are limited to two days. The fact is that freedom of speech does not mean licence to talk forever. It means the opportunity for some people to express their views, with due opportunity for others to speak, and this can be worked out only by rules and regulations that are fair to all concerned.

Therefore I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we are being quite consistent with the practices we have already established when we face the fact, as I hope parliament is doing, that we are going to have to accept not only limitations on individual speeches, not only limitations on perfunctory debates such as the address in reply, and the debate when Mr. Speaker is in the chair on the budget, but we are going to have to accept time limits on debates, on measures and bills that are brought before us.

I want to say again, as my leader said this afternoon, that doing this to me is not nearly as much a form of closure as it is for debate to be unlimited. I believe the most effective form of closure on other subjects is for the house to go on forever on one subject. I think one of the tragedies of the 1964-65 lengthy debate on the flag issue was that we spent so much time on it that we were not able to get at some other measures. I think if we had not spent all the time on the flag issue we might have got medicare in 1964. Someone said to me the other day, when I said this in another context, that there would not have been any more chance of getting medicare then than now, since it has been put back until July, 1968, in any event. In reply I would remind the house that in 1964 we did not have the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp), and if we had had time to get at the medicare bill then we might have had it in effect a couple of years ago.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Knowles: Certainly.

Mr. Churchill: Is it not a fact that in 1964 we gave up our summer recess in order to deal with the flag, and if we had not been on that we would have been away and not much other legislation would have gone through?

Mr. Knowles: Even having given up the summer recess and staying here, I would point out that the session started in the early part of 1964, in January or February, and did not end until the end of March or the beginning of April, 1965, so that in addition to giving up the summer recess we stretched the session to 248 sitting days. I suggest that is a perfect example of what a lengthy debate does by way of closing out debate on other important issues.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, we are going to solve this issue, but not just with respect to the matter now before us. The issue before us today is far more important than just the question of whether or not the final vote will be taken next Tuesday night on the defence bill. I think the question really before us is this: have we the wit to plan the rules and procedures of the house so that we will be able within 12 months to do the tremendous amount of business that is facing this country every year?

I see my time is running out, Mr. Speaker, not 40 minutes but because the vote on this motion must be taken at a quarter to ten. However, I would like to say just a word to the effect that the rule we are now operating under certainly needs to be improved. It is not the kind of allocation of time rule some of us produced in a committee a couple of years ago. It is one the government brought in instead, but even though this is not the best kind of allocation of time rule it is a great deal better than the old closure rule, No. 33, which I hope will yet be taken out of our standing orders. Indeed, I am as opposed to it now as I was in 1956 and in 1964. But may I remind hon. members that closure rule No. 33 is unilateral in its practice, whereas under provisional standing order 15A there is consultation between the government on one side and representatives of the opposition parties on the other.

• (9:40 p.m.)

The old closure rule, No. 33, when it came into effect was immediate. There was a vote at the start of the day and the debate was concluded that night. Those of us who experienced it in 1956 and again in 1964 know what it is all about. That rule allowed no room for negotiation as to the amount of time which might be allowed. Rule 15A, even with its imperfections, does provide for consultation and negotiation in respect of the time allowed. I suggest therefore that to try to compare the situation now with the situation of 1956 is a little bit far-fetched.

Some people suggest that what is being done now is the same thing, but one cannot make something the same as something else merely by making the assertion. The plain fact of the matter is that we had practically no discussion in committee of the whole on the pipe line bill in 1956, whereas we have already had 13 days and will have two more, a total of 15, in the committee of the whole on this bill.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is the answer to those who attempt to say that the application of this provisional standing order is the same as closure. Fifteen days of discussion is not the same as practically no discussion at all. Even when this rule was invoked last Thursday it provided, by the time element built into it, a number of days for further discussion. That was not at all possible under the old closure rule used in 1956.

May I say that I hope this house will approve of this motion tonight, to set the reasonable time limits proposed with respect to the further debate of this bill. I hope once we have done that we will all realize that the walls of parliament have not crumbled, that we have not limited free speech or ended democracy by adopting a limit of 15 days debate in the committee of the whole.

It is my hope that the matter will not end here, but that we will go on to improve provisional order 15A, or whatever number we may finally call it; because if we are going to cope with the problems that now face us we must adopt some allocation of time proposal that will really work, and will be fair to all concerned. One of the ways to make this work is to adopt a rule package which relates to the whole parliamentary year. It is not good enough to go on for eight or 12 months muddling through the business of the house in the way we have done and then invoke this rule to cope with a crisis. There should be a co-operative arrangement between the government and the opposition from the beginning of a session. The whole session should be planned in its entirety so that arrangements can be agreed upon as to limitation of time for individual debates.

Because this provisional rule has been invoked I will not complain if Your Honour

Division

tells me that it is 9:45 and that I must sit down. That is the rule, and I accept it. I do not believe the 40 minute limit on individual speeches is closure. I do not believe the eight day rule on the debate on the address is closure. If we have the intelligence to agree on the times to be allotted for various debates, that will not be closure. Rather, it will be the sensible planning of the parliamentary year so that we can carry out the business of this nation as grown men and women. I hope this is what we will soon do in this House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to section 6 of standing order 15A it is my duty to interrupt proceedings at this time and forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of the main motion.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. McIlraith) which was agreed to on the following division:

• (9:50 p.m.)

YEAS

Messrs:

Allmand
Andras
Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe)
Badanai
Barnett
Basford
Batten
Béchard
Berger
Blouin
Boulanger
Brewin
Byrne
Cadieux (Terrebonne)
Cameron (High Park)
Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Cantin
Cashin
Chatwood
Choquette
Clermont
Côté (Dorchester)
Côté (Longueuil)
Côté (Nicolet-Yamaska)
Cowan
Crossman
Davis
Deachman
Dionne
Douglas
Émard
Ethier
Faulkner
Fawcett
Forest
Foy
Gauthier
Gendron
Gilbert
Godin
Gordon
Goyer
Gray
Guay
Habel
Haidasz
Harley
Hellyer
Herridge
Honey
Hopkins
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jamieson
Johnston
Klein
Knowles
Lachance
Laflamme
Laing
LaMarsh (Miss)
Langlois (Chicoutimi)
Laniel
Laprise
Latulippe
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Leboe
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard
Lewis
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacInnis (Mrs.) (Vancouver-Kingsway)
Mackasey
McIlraith
McNulty
McWilliam
Marchand
Mather
Matheson
Matte
Mongrain
Morison
Neveu
Nixon
O'Keefe
Olson
Orange
Orlikow
Otto
Patterson
Pelletier
Pickersgill
Pilon
Prittie
Prud'homme
Reid
Rideout (Mrs.)
Rochon
Rock
Roxburgh
Saltsman
Schreyer
Simard
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart
Tardif
Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Thompson
Tolmie
Tremblay
Trudeau
Tucker
Turner
Wahn
Walker
Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Whelan
Winch
Yanakis—124.

[Mr. Knowles.]

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alkenbrack
Allard
Ballard
Bell (Saint John-Albert)
Bigg
Bower
Brand
Cantelon
Chatterton
Churchill
Coates
Code
Crouse
Danforth
Diefenbaker
Dinsdale
Forbes
Forrestall
Harkness
Horner (Acadia)
Howe (Wellington-Huron)
Jorgenson
Korchinski
MacDonald (Prince)
MacInnis (Cape Breton South)
MacLean (Queens)
MacRae
McCleave
McCutcheon
McIntosh
McKinley
McLelland
McQuaid
Madill
Monteith
Moore
Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Muir (Lisgar)
Nasserden
Nesbitt
Noble
Nowlan
Nugent
Ormiston
Pascoe
Pugh
Rapp
Régimbal
Ricard
Rynard
Scott (Victoria (Ont.))
Sherman
Simpson
Southam
Stefanson
Thomas (Middlesex West)
Valade
Wadds (Mrs.)
Watson (Assiniboia)
Webb
Winkler—62.

• (10:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene); otherwise I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted in favour of the motion.

Mr. Hales: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. Pennell: Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Pennell: There is an echo in the chamber. Naturally, Mr. Speaker, I meant to say that had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. McLean).

Mr. Groos: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Skoreyko). I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin). Had I voted I would have voted against the axe.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, would the house leader clear up an uncertainty and inform us of tomorrow's business?

Mr. McIlraith: Tomorrow we propose submitting item No. 107 on today's order paper to the house for consideration, and at the conclusion of that, item No. 134.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

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

HOUSING—TORONTO—INQUIRY AS TO ACTION TO RELIEVE SHORTAGE

Mr. Robert Stanbury (York-Scarborough): Mr. Speaker, two days ago I attempted to direct a question to the Minister of Labour about the housing situation in metropolitan Toronto. All members of that area, I am sure, are aware of the housing shortage, and particularly of the shortage of housing within the reach of the average citizen.

Recently the president of the Toronto Metropolitan Home Builders Association directed attention to the urgent need for overcoming difficulties blocking the supply of private and multiple dwellings in the Toronto area. The association outlined the basic reasons underlying the shortage in this way: first, insufficient serviced land; second, unstable mortgage financing conditions; third, an inequitable tax base and fourth, restrictive construction bylaws and conflicting building codes.

The association proposed solutions. It called for the provision of building lots in adequate supply for the mass production of homes by planning that would extend water and sewer facilities into areas of raw land. It suggested that modification of the educational tax burden was essential to allow municipal freedom in opening raw land for development without worrying about where the educational dollar was to come from. It demonstrated the need for the universal adoption of the national building code of Canada, which would allow more builder efficiencies and help to reduce red tape at the municipal level.

The association suggested the streamlining of the whole land development process, and the adoption of a sane policy with respect to land use. It said that builders in the metropolitan Toronto area are ready and able to provide family types of multiple housing, needed particularly in the area, but that the way had to be cleared by a change of attitude on the part of mortgage companies and municipalities—mortgage companies which preferred to finance downtown highrise apartments and municipalities which do not encourage multiple housing because of inherent education costs involved in connection with accommodation for families with children.

• (10:20 p.m.)

It is clear from this analysis that the housing crisis in Toronto is not one which lends itself readily to solution by federal authority. The recently retired president of the Urban Development Institute is reported in this evening's Toronto *Telegram* as saying that the Ontario government is toying with the housing crisis and derelict in its duty. Addressing the South Peel real estate board Mr. Grant Duff termed the housing problem an absolute disgrace and called on the provincial government to face up to fundamentals. He said—and I quote from the news report:

> Removal of the bulk of education costs from property will do more to solve our housing problems than any other single remedy.

Mr. Duff went on to say that recent provincial action in the housing field demonstrated that there is no recognition of the fundamental problem. The provincial government had

apparently not recognized the effects of its policies on the land market. He pointed out that land costs in the metropolitan Toronto area were the highest in North America, adding:

> There could be no better solution to high land prices than an over-supply of residentially owned and usable land. Resulting competition would be of the greatest benefit to the public.

He went on to say there was a lack of adequate housing policies to which planners should conform.

Again it seems clear from the comments of this housing authority that the problem is not primarily one within federal jurisdiction. Yet a housing shortage in one of the great urban areas of Canada must be of concern to the federal government.

The Canadian Welfare Council in a recently published issue of its magazine *Canadian Welfare* said this:

> The disjointed approach to low income housing in Canada has produced far too much grief; far too few houses.

The author of that article, Mr. Michael Wheeler, called for a co-ordinated national approach to the problem. It does seem to me that when the environment of our people is becoming increasingly urban, when life in our cities is becoming the dominant kind of life that Canadians lead, the federal government must take a more active interest in the co-ordination of policy for improving the living conditions of our city dwellers.

I have suggested in the past that the federal government should have a housing and urban development ministry. I hope this will come soon, but in the meantime I would ask the Minister of Labour once again what steps the government has taken to relieve the shortage of housing in metropolitan Toronto and, if steps have been taken, what effect they have had up to this date?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to say how much I appreciate the approach that has been taken by the hon. member for York-Scarborough (Mr. Stanbury) in dealing with this problem. It is the type of question that in my opinion should be asked more frequently because too much has been said, there has been far too much talk about Canada's growing housing problem—too much talk, I might say, by ill-informed people, people who have not taken the trouble to ascertain the real facts. That is why a question such as put by the hon. member tonight merits a complete answer.

[Mr. Stanbury.]

I am very pleased to be able to inform the hon. member that largely as a result of action already taken by the government there has been a marked improvement, a significant improvement, in our housing picture during recent weeks, and I am also very happy to say that no part of Canada will benefit from this improvement more than metropolitan Toronto. Again I say this is in no small measure due to steps taken by the government in December last, and shortly thereafter.

As of April 14 of this year, in effect in the first 100 days of this year, there had been more N.H.A. activity than there was during the whole of 1966, and that as I say again was largely a direct result of introducing a realistic rate at which the institutional lenders of money, those that provide most of it, will make it available to those who are interested in building or in purchasing homes.

But not only has this encouraging activity been in the field of direct loans, it has also been in the field of insured loans, and approved lenders have applied for roughly three times as many loans in the first 100 days of this year as they did in the same period last year. Already there are about 1,200 or 1,300 more applications in the first 100 days of this year than there were in the whole of 1966, and a large percentage of these are in metropolitan Toronto.

In addition to that, when it comes to direct loans you will recall that one of the other steps the government took was that it announced a special program to encourage house building during the spring months of the year, a special loan program, to begin April 1, or 20,000 loans. As of April 14, 17,000 loans have been applied for—that was before the middle of April though the loans were to cover the period April 1 to May 31.

In addition to this special spring lending program, where there is no presale requirement, for the first time in the administration of the National Housing Act, the C.M.H.C. have continued their normal direct loan program. As a result of this move there has been 300 per cent more N.H.A. housing activity in Canada in the first 100 days of this year than last year, and most of that is reflected in the metropolitan Toronto area.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I must interrupt the hon. gentleman to advise him that the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, the most significant fact that I would like—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Unless the hon. gentleman would like me to ask whether there is unanimous consent of the house. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

• (10:30 p.m.)

Mr. Nicholson: The most significant fact is that in the last 20 years conventional lenders have provided more than two thirds of the money that has gone into the construction of houses. There has been very significant activity in this field.

Today I had lunch with a number of representatives of the lending institutions. They informed me of their plans for the future and we reviewed what has transpired during the past three months. The present trend would indicate that last year's drop in housing starts, roughly 32,000 to 33,000, will be more than made up this year as a result of this activity, apart from the additional government activity to which I referred.

I should not like anyone to think there are no housing problems facing us, but developments in the N.H.A. field and increased activity on the part of conventional lenders has been particularly encouraging during recent weeks.

Let me say one more thing in respect of public housing. We naturally are concerned with the situation referred to by the hon. member for York-Scarborough, which exists in Toronto and other cities. We are aware of the difficulties facing young married couples and others who are attempting to find homes in these cities. Whether we like it or not we are rapidly becoming a nation of apartment dwellers. This is a trend that is taking place in Germany, Sweden, Holland and the United States. There is a great movement of people from farms, and of new immigrants to our cities. With the limited space in our cities a greater percentage of our people are living in apartments. There are methods to correct the situation and each province is adopting its own program to do so. The federal government is, to a large extent, limited in what it may do by the actions of provincial and municipal governments. They are the authorities which pass the building and zoning bylaws which restrict the availability of land for individual home construction.

Mr. Knowles: Time.

Mr. Nicholson: Before I sit down I should like to thank hon. members for their indulgence. I would like to have dealt more fully with the progress that is being made as a result of federal initiative, but I have already taken advantage of the indulgence of hon. members.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, April 21, 1967

The house met at 11 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

FELICITATIONS TO PRIME MINISTER ON BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if the house will permit me to do so I should like to extend my congratulations to the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) on his birthday anniversary, which is the day after tomorrow. The house will not be sitting then so I take advantage of this opportunity. While there have been occasions when I have not been in complete agreement with the Prime Minister, I have always belonged to that group which believes in doing honour to those, regardless of political beliefs, who make their contribution to their country and the world.

I couple with my congratulations the expression of the view that his distinguished career both nationally and internationally is worthy of mention on this occasion when he joins me in celebrating his seventieth birthday anniversary. Age does not weary, and I conclude by expressing the hope that he will now realize that those old age pensioners, who have not received the additional amount over and above $75 per month, cannot properly live on the amount they are receiving.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted on behalf of my colleagues to extend birthday greetings to the right hon. Prime Minister and to say to him how pleased we are to see him in such good health and good spirits. He has a very arduous year ahead of him during our centennial celebrations, and we are pleased that he is able to tackle his long list of commitments and to continue to be so effervescent here in the house. We hope his good health will continue.

• (11:10 a.m.)

I noticed earlier this week that the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Gordon) expressed the hope that the Prime Minister would continue as leader of his party. I should like to support that hope. When I look around at some of the prospective candidates for that office I feel that we would rather bear the ills we have than flee to those we know not of, or perhaps some that we know only too well. I would say to the Prime Minister that on this auspicious occasion we are happy to join in extending birthday felicitations to him, and hope he will continue to enjoy many more years in which to receive the appreciation of the Canadian people for his long years of public service.

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Lest the Prime Minister think that we wish him ill rather than well, we in the Social Credit party join in the expressions of congratulation and best wishes on this very important occasion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my group I should like to join with the other party leaders to wish the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) the happiest birthday ever. I hope that he will direct as much as possible the business of the house toward social legislation liable to get the support of most hon. members, if not all.

[*English*]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, lest it be thought—

Mr. Pearson: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I should like to move closure on these tributes.

Mr. Pickersgill: That is one occasion, sir, when I am not going to pay any attention to the Prime Minister's wishes, because I feel I should pay attention instead to the wishes of his followers. I should not like it to be thought that the good wishes that have been expressed from the other side of the house were not every bit as sincere from this side of the house. Perhaps I could remind Your Honour that tomorrow is the fourth anniversary of the formation of the Pearson government, and we on this side of the house look forward to another four years of constructive activity for Canada under the same Prime Minister.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): It will be clear now, Mr. Speaker, why I moved closure. These family matters, about

the prolongation of a particular individual or a particular party, should be discussed within the family. Perhaps the house will forgive me if I just mention that yesterday we did have a discussion of my birthday and all that it meant to my colleagues. They were good enough to make me a presentation, and it was not what I expected. They had asked me what I would like to have and I said perhaps the most appropriate thing to have would be a hair shirt, but it is better than that.

I would be less than human, and I do not think I am less than human, if I were not deeply appreciative and moved by the expressions of good will toward me on this occasion. There is nothing, Mr. Speaker, like a death or a birthday to make you realize you have virtues which are not always noticed by everybody. I am, if I may say so, particularly touched by the good wishes of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition. It is a wonderful and refreshing privilege to be able to join heartily with him in something, for as the right hon. gentleman has indicated, we are together now in our seventies, and I am catching up with him. Whatever may happen in the future to either or both of us, I shall always remember that as I entered this most important decade in a man's life, even more important than going from his teens to his twenties, I entered it with his good will and his expression of personal friendship.

As the right hon. gentleman has said, naturally we do not often agree in this house. We have been in opposition to each other politically for many years. I sometimes get the impression when I read the newspapers and magazines that this kind of feuding which goes on is almost unequalled in Canadian history. I only wish these writers could read about what it used to be like in the nineteenth century in the Canadian House of Commons and in Canadian public life.

The reason we rise above these differences, difficulties and controversies in public and political life is that whatever we may think of each other politically, and whatever we think of our political views, we always have an appreciation for each other. This is because we know we are here for one purpose and one purpose only, and we are joined in that purpose; that is, service to our country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Pearson.]

DRUGS

PROVISION FOR OBSERVATION AND TREATMENT OF ADDICTS

Mr. Milton L. Klein (Cartier) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-292, respecting observation and treatment of drug addicts.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Klein: Mr. Speaker, developments in the fields of medicine and psychiatry tend to establish that drug addiction, when it occurs, results from some type of mental illness or disorder. It does not appear to be any longer appropriate to punish persons who are drug addicts; it is rather advisable to treat the said persons as being sick, mentally or otherwise.

The purpose of this bill is to remove the stigma of a criminal conviction attached to drug addiction by drug addicts, and to protect the public and such persons from possible subsequent addiction by assuring that observation and treatment follow the laying of charges.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the said bill be read a second time?

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the house, which I understand from the hon. member for Cartier will probably be forthcoming, may I move that this bill be referred to the committee on justice and legal affairs?

Mr. Speaker: I think there would have to be unanimous consent of the house to return to motions. Is this the wish of the house?

• (11:20 a.m.)

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, there has not been an opportunity to discuss this matter with the chairman of the committee. I wonder if the request could not stand until Monday.

Mr. Brewin: Certainly, if the minister prefers it that way.

Mr. Churchill: Let us see the bill.

TRANSPORT

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND CAUSEWAY—POSSIBLE CONSTRUCTION CHANGES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. Will the minister say whether a spokesman of his department was revealing

government policy when he said on Wednesday that the railway part of the Northumberland crossing may have to be dropped, or the whole project may be shelved?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, no spokesman from my department made any such statement.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister of Public Works assure the house that the government has not changed its commitment to proceed as rapidly as is reasonable with the construction of this project?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Much concern has been shown by hon. members representing areas near the Northumberland crossing, as well as by other persons, because of some speculative newspaper stories that have appeared during the last two days. Perhaps I can best answer the hon. member's question by saying that tenders for phase I of the crossing were opened on March 30. These are complex, and require extensive analysis and study. This analysis and study, which is normal, is now being made by the engineers and is not yet complete. Decisions cannot be made or anticipated prior to its completion. It may well be that when it is complete some adjustments or modifications may prove desirable. This cannot be anticipated at this time. Notwithstanding the possibility that some adjustments or modifications may be required, the government has every intention of proceeding with the construction of the crossing.

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister assure the house that these analyses will not result in the delay of the project's completion date?

Mr. McIlraith: The analyses have not been completed, and until I see them I cannot give information other than that just given. It would be wrong to give speculative answers, I think, to speculative questions.

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I ask the Minister of Public Works whether he will not discuss with his colleague the Secretary of State the incredible gaff made when C.B.C. television news described this causeway project as a reconsideration of the Canso causeway.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Melvin McQuaid (Kings): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to that asked of the Minister of Public Works regarding the Northumberland strait causeway. There seems to be a little too much smoke around this issue for there not to be some fire. I direct my question to the Prime Minister. On behalf of the government will he assure the people of Prince Edward Island that contract bids exceeding the cost contemplated by the government will not result in the deferment or abandonment of this project?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is simply repeating or restating a question which was asked previously.

VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL TRAINING

PROPOSED CHANGE WITH RESPECT TO LIVING ALLOWANCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): In the absence of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. It has to do with the new regulation, effective as of April 1, which will deny living allowances to persons, without dependants, who have not been continuously employed for at least three years. As this new regulation will have the effect of refusing living allowances to young people under 20 years of age, childless wives, widows, and new immigrants, I ask the Prime Minister whether protests about these regulations have been received and whether the government is considering altering them.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have not myself, to my knowledge, received any such protest. Whether the minister has I do not know, but I shall make inquiries. I ought to add that this matter was discussed carefully before action was taken. I shall be glad, however, to bring the hon. gentleman's question to the minister's attention and to discuss it with him.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question. Could the Prime Minister tell the house under what authority this regulation was enacted, since the act itself has not been passed by the house?

Mr. Speaker: I doubt whether this question is in order.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Douglas: On a point of order, I am simply asking under what authority the regulation was passed since the act itself is not in effect.

Mr. Speaker: That is why I felt the question was not in order.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): May I ask the Prime Minister, when he discusses this matter with the minister of manpower, to call attention to the fact that the impact of this regulation falls largely on new immigrants, and that this seems to be inconsistent with the terms of the white paper.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is making a representation.

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): A supplementary question. In view of the fact that the minister of education of the province of Ontario has made a strong protest in this regard, stating that some 7,000 people under this program will be seriously affected, I should like to join with the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam in strongly requesting—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for York South. I trust this will be a question and that the hon. member will not join in representations made by other members.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): I think your wish will be observed, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he will be good enough to discuss with the minister of manpower the possibility of tabling a copy of the regulation and the authority under which it was passed.

Mr. Pearson: I will be glad to do that.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—REPORTED PREPARATION FOR PEACE KEEPING OPERATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): I should like to address my question to the Prime Minister and ask him whether the government has instituted a crash program, as has been reported, to prepare for possible peace keeping operations in Viet Nam.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker. The normal planning is going on.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): I should like to ask the right hon. gentleman whether he or anyone in the government has expressed any regret or made any protest in connection with the most recent and most dangerous escalation of this war by the bombing inside the territory of Haiphong.

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, I have made no protest, nor would I even consider doing so until I had detailed information as to the nature of this particular operation.

[*Translation*]

TRANSPORT

QUEBEC—SALE OF BAIE COMEAU-RIMOUSKI FERRY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Has he received representations from the Baie Comeau chamber of commerce about the sale to the British Columbia Ferries of the ferry *Père Nouvel* which provides service between Baie Comeau and Rimouski?

[*English*]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I am not sure whether I have received any protest from that particular organization, but I have received some representations and these are being considered at the moment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Would the minister say whether grants have been asked from the federal government for the Nord-Sud Company in connection with the ferry service?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I suggest the hon. member place his question on the order paper.

[*English*]

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

QUEBEC—PROPOSED CREATION OF DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Some weeks ago I asked the Prime Minister, when the legislation was before the legislature of Quebec, whether his attention had been drawn to what has been called the external affairs law empowering the government of Quebec to deal directly

with governments of other countries. Has the Prime Minister looked into this question? What is his viewpoint regarding this legislation? Is the legislation along the lines of that suggested by Mr. Lesage when he was premier of the province? What attitude did the government take then, and what does it take now, toward this unusual piece of legislation?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there is a question on the order paper dealing with this specific point to which a more detailed answer than I can give orally will be given, I believe on Monday. Meanwhile I would only say that the legislation in question to which my right hon. friend has referred does not, in our view, infringe the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal parliament and government over external affairs.

TRADE

EFFECT ON CANADA OF POSSIBLE U.K. ENTRY INTO COMMON MARKET

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Yesterday the Secretary of State for External Affairs was reported to have stated in effect that Canada must revise her traditional relations with the United Kingdom as the interests of the two countries now often differed. Does this mean that Canada disapproves of the suggested entry of the United Kingdom into the European common market, or does it mean something else? Perhaps the Prime Minister could elucidate.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it certainly does not mean that we have changed our views in regard to the United Kingdom and its possible entry into the common market, and it certainly does not mean we are weakening in any respect, or desire to weaken, our relations with the United Kingdom.

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): As a supplementary question, may I ask the Prime Minister whether any survey is being made by the Department of Trade and Commerce or any other department of government to ascertain what Canadian commodities will be affected should Britain enter the common market?

Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Exhaustive studies have been made as to the possible effect of British entry into the common market. It is very difficult at this moment to come to any specific conclusions as to what that effect would be until we know the terms covering Britain's entry, if in fact that takes place.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): As a supplementary question, the terms under which entry may be made into the common market have been agreed upon by the member countries. On the basis of the present terms would Canada's agricultural preferences be seriously affected unless provision were made by the member countries of the common market to make an exception or an exemption in part?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, we are doing our very best to protect the interests of Canadian producers, agricultural and otherwise, in respect of any changes that might be brought about by Britain's entry into the common market.

Mr. Korchinski: As a further supplementary question, may I ask the Prime Minister whether the industries that might be affected will be forewarned in the event that they will no longer have a preferred market in Britain?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

WATER RESOURCES

PARTICIPATION BY CANADA IN "WATER FOR PEACE" CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Can the minister inform the house the number of federal and provincial government representatives who will be attending the water for peace conference in Washington from May 23 to May 31 this year, and can the minister inform the house whether these delegates will have an agreed Canadian position on water policy, water pollution and water waste?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This question should be placed on the order paper.

GRAIN

PROTEST AGAINST SLOW MOVEMENT FROM LAKEHEAD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. K. Andras (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the

Minister of Transport. Has the minister received a telegram from the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks local 650 expressing concern about the slow start of grain movement from the lakehead, and has he looked into this matter?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is yes. I did receive such a telegram this morning. I made some inquiries of the St. Lawrence seaway authority and, in the absence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, of the Department of Trade and Commerce. I am advised that at the moment the wheat board is in negotiation with the shipping companies about freight rates, and I prefer to express no opinion whatsoever about these negotiations. But while the loadings have not been as great as they were last year, I am informed that a vessel was loaded yesterday and others are expected to be loaded today.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

HAL BANKS—INQUIRY AS TO EXTRADITION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General but in his absence I shall direct it to the minister assuming his duties for the day. It has been reported by a cross country news service that senior officials of the R.C.M.P. have met with the attorney general's office in the province of Ontario to deal with the case of extradition for perjury against Hal Banks. Could the minister report on the results of this meeting?

Hon. P.-E. Trudeau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I shall have to take this question as notice. I am not aware of the results of the meeting.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Justice now give the answer to the question I addressed to him a few days ago on the same topic?

Mr. Trudeau: I think at that time, Mr. Speaker, I said something about the administration of justice being in the area of jurisdiction of the province, and that if there were any special circumstances in this case I would have them looked into. I presume they are being looked into.

[Mr. Andras.]

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL

INQUIRY AS TO GRANTING OF TITLE "RIGHT HONOURABLE"

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, two or three days ago the Prime Minister announced a system of Canadian honours. I now ask him whether there was cabinet authorization for the granting of the title of right honourable recently given to the distinguished Canadian which in the past has been exclusively restricted to members of the imperial privy council? Does this mean that from now on some Canadians may expect to receive the title of right honourable without becoming members of the imperial privy council?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the title of right honourable as applied to the Governor General was agreed to by Her Majesty the Queen and the table of titles amended accordingly on the recommendation of the government, specifically on my recommendation as Prime Minister. This recommendation concerns the Governor General only. It had the effect of giving the Governor General the title of right honourable and divorcing that particular title in respect of this particular appointment from membership in what my right hon. friend has called the imperial privy council. It has no other effect and covers nobody else.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is it the intention of the government that no longer shall membership in the imperial privy council be granted to Canadians?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, membership in the imperial privy council, so-called, which is indeed the United Kingdom privy council, is normally as a result of recommendations made respecting Canadians and others by the United Kingdom government and accepted by the Queen. The initiation of these does not come from the Canadian government.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I realize that neither my right hon. friend nor I would have been members if it had not been the cabinet of the United Kingdom which made the recommendation to the Queen, but the Prime Minister apparently forgot the specific question that was asked. Is it the intention of the government of Canada no longer to have the right of Her Majesty the Queen to award to Canadians the title of right honourable, as members of the imperial privy council?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, this is a question that cannot be answered on orders of the day.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why?

Mr. Pearson: Certainly there have been no such memberships granted in the four years this government has been in office except membership of myself as Prime Minister of Canada, which I have always considered as a kind of honorary membership in the United Kingdom privy council.

Mr. Diefenbaker: An honorary membership?

Mr. Pearson: There has been no recommendation made in those four years, and I do not anticipate we will be making recommendations of that kind in the immediate future.

CANADIAN CENTENNIAL

REPRODUCTION OF COAT OF ARMS ON MEDALLION FOR PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, a week ago the Leader of the Opposition raised a question as to the design of the coat of arms used on the centennial medallion, and characterized it as an emasculated neuter. The use of this particular design, I am now informed, is supported by leading authorities on heraldry. The revised edition of Boutell, for example, states that the shield of arms—and that is what appears on the medallion—constitutes the whole of a coat of arms. The rest of the design, not on the medallion, is considered additional heraldic material and not essential to the coat of arms itself.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. An explanation like this should be made on motions. I would ask that the house revert to motions, because a simple statement of the minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The answer by the Secretary of State appears to be commensurate with the question asked. Unless it is beyond the usual limits of answers I do not think we should revert to motions for that purpose.

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Speaker, the government has received similar advice on the question from Mr. Alan Beddoe who, as the house knows, is a former heraldic adviser to the navy. I am sorry the right hon. gentleman is not anxious to have this answer—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, this is exactly why we should revert to motions. I want the opportunity to answer this—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think there should be a debate on this matter at the present time. Perhaps the Secretary of State would like to limit the reply as much as possible. I suspect that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition perhaps will have a supplementary question to ask.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker—

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman should remember that this design was adopted by order in council and cabinet decision of September 5, 1957.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege because of a statement which is without foundation. The coat of arms of Canada was given at Buckingham Palace on November 21, 1921, in the twelfth year of the reign of George V. That is the basis on which the coat of arms was issued to the government of Canada.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, what has been introduced—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We should attempt to have some order. My impression is that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition is rising on a question of privilege and will be stating that question of privilege.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It will be very shortly stated. The document which was issued respecting the centennial medallion states:

> The obverse or front side of the medallion (left), the Canadian coat of arms with the word 'Canada'—

That is not the Canadian coat of arms. It has been denuded to meet the Canadianization ideas of this government which is trying to separate everything—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of privilege I should like to read—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether we should go further into the matter. I fully appreciate that the Secretary of State wishes to reply to the suggestion made by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition. However, the right hon. Leader of the Opposition rose on a question of privilege and I have to rule that there is no question of privilege. Having done this, I doubt whether the minister should pursue the question unless she has her own question of privilege.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Speaker, as a privy councillor, surely since my report given to the house has been called into question this should sustain a question of privilege. There should be no question about this because I have in my hand the record of the cabinet decision, which consists of about three lines, to which is attached a memorandum by the then secretary of state, Hon. Ellen Fairclough. I should be pleased, so there may be no question about this, if I could be allowed to read it—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I again rise on a question of order. Let us return to motions. I have here the document giving the arms to Canada—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There obviously is disagreement at this time as between the Leader of the Opposition and the Secretary of State. It seems to me that even if we did revert to motions we would not settle the difficulty. So perhaps we should go on to another question.

STORMS

HURON AND PERTH COUNTIES, ONTARIO—ASSISTANCE FOLLOWING TORNADO

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron): Mr. Speaker, I have a question which I have been advised should be addressed to the right hon. Prime Minister. It has to do with the tornado which went through Huron and Perth counties earlier this week as a result of which there has been loss of life and much property damage. A fund has been started by local residents to aid the victims of this tornado. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he would consider matching from the federal disaster fund the dollars raised by the local residents or, in whatever way he might see fit, give federal assistance. I am sure any assistance would be gratefully received.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend no doubt is aware, although serious enough to those affected the decision with regard to relief measures in this connection is in the hands of the provincial government. If the provincial government feels that federal aid is required the provincial government then gets in touch with the federal authorities. However, the department concerned, the Department of Agriculture, has already sent a telegram to the minister of agriculture in Toronto asking whether he would send to the federal authorities an outline of a provincial proposal for an assistance program. When this is received the government will know what part it should play in this relief program.

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I should like to mention in passing that on Tuesday an announcement was made in the Ontario house to the effect that representations were being made to the federal government on behalf of the victims of the disaster in Perth and Huron counties, and I understand an emergency fund has been organized and set up. I think application has been made to the national revenue department to the effect that donations to the fund should be tax free. Will the minister look into this matter with all haste so the organizers of the fund may inform donors that their donations will be tax free?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has made his representation to the minister.

Mr. Monteith: I am asking the minister whether he will look into this matter with all possible speed.

EDUCATION

REPORTED REQUIREMENT THAT SCHOLARSHIP RECIPIENTS SWEAR ALLEGIANCE TO U.S.

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I give an answer which I think is commensurate with the question addressed to me the other day regarding the policy of the United States government in requiring loyalty oaths in respect of scholarships being awarded to Canadian students. This particular question was directed to me by the hon. member for Saskatoon and was based on a message received from a student. That student since has been in touch with my office by telephone to say that he wished me to know that his complaint turned out to be unfounded.

On the general question, we have been in touch with the United States government—the state department—and have been informed that it is against the policy of the United States government to require loyalty oaths from foreign students. There is only one exception to this policy. Under the national defence education act foreign students who apply for fellowships and indicate at that time their intention to become United States citizens must take the loyalty oath. With that exception, should evidence be provided to the

effect that a United States university is failing to abide by this policy, the United States state department is prepared to take steps to prevent the administration of loyalty oaths to any foreign student.

[*Translation*]

FOOD AND DRUGS

REQUEST THAT LABELS BE PRINTED IN BOTH LANGUAGES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Has he received any protests in connection with the federal food and drugs act provision that directions be written in English and is he contemplating an early amendment so that the said directions be compulsory in both official languages of the country?

Mr. Speaker: I do not think the question of the hon. member is urgent and I suggest it be placed on the order paper.

Mr. Allard: At ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION

HALIFAX—DEPORTATION ORDER RESPECTING POLISH NATIONAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, because of the urgency of this matter, in the absence of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration and the Secretary of State for External Affairs may I try not to make a representation but rather to ask the Prime Minister whether he will immediately look into the matter of a deportation order against one Stanislaw Lubaszko, a Polish nationalist who is being held in isolation in Halifax?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will look into it immediately.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. To my colleague's question might I add that this man faces deportation this week, which gives the matter some urgency. I would also ask the Prime Minister whether the former policy of granting refuge in Canada to people from communist countries still applies, or has it been altered?

Mr. Pearson: To my knowledge it has not been altered, Mr. Speaker.

Inquiries of the Ministry

HEALTH AND WELFARE

REPORTED HIGH DEATH RATE OF VETERANS WHO SMOKE CIGARETTES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the health and welfare report, as reported by Canadian Press, that veterans who smoke cigarettes are dying at a rate 54 per cent higher than non-smoking veterans, would the minister indicate whether he proposes to take any further steps to meet this grave threat?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think this question is much too general and should not be asked on the orders of the day.

AIR TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR BAN ON USE OF HIGHLY INFLAMMABLE FUEL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the request of the International Transport Workers Federation that jet airliners be prohibited from using JP4 because of the high inflammability of this fuel, is the minister considering taking steps to ban the use of this fuel by Canadian air lines?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I do not think I could answer that question with a simple yes or no. I think it is not, therefore, the kind of question that can be dealt with on the orders of the day and perhaps the hon. gentleman would put his question on the order paper.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we can deal with it at ten o'clock Monday night.

COAL

CAPE BRETON—IMPLEMENTATION OF ANNOUNCED GOVERNMENT POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. I wonder whether the right hon. gentleman is in a position today to advise what progress is being made in regard to the takeover by the government of the coal holdings of Dosco-Hawker Siddeley, relative to his announcement of December 29 last.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to make an announcement today. The matter is proceeding as rapidly as possible. As soon as I or the minister concerned can make an announcement we will be very anxious to do so. I hope we can do so before long.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

INQUIRY AS TO APPOINTMENTS TO FILL VACANCIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): Mr. Speaker, I also have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister. Can the right hon. gentleman assure us that the appointment of the new chief of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation will soon be made, and thus dispel the alarm caused by a statement made at the annual meeting of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters by the hon. member for Burin-Burgeo (Mr. Jamieson), that the government is having great trouble finding a man for the job because who wants to be nineteenth man on the totem pole, and that so many people have been approached that few persons of stature seem interested any more?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think the alarm expressed by my hon. friend has no validity. I am sure we will very shortly be able to find good men and true to take on these very difficult posts.

NATIONAL FILM BOARD

INQUIRY AS TO APPOINTMENT OF PERMANENT HEAD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the right hon. Prime Minister. Has Professor Hugo McPherson of the University of Western Ontario been appointed head of the National Film Board?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question is not in order.

FINANCE

REGULATIONS UNDER DEPOSIT INSURANCE LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last the hon. member for Edmonton West asked a question of the Acting Minister of Finance, the Minister of National Revenue, concerning the referring of the regulations under the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act to the finance, trade and economic affairs committee. The minister took the question as notice at that time. I wonder whether he is now prepared to answer it.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Acting Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I shall have to continue to take the question as notice until Monday, and I will have an answer for the hon. member at that time.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

REQUEST FOR STUDY OF INTRODUCTION OF METRIC SYSTEM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. O. Bower (Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. We seem to be overworking him on his birthday. Has the Prime Minister received representations from the Canadian Council of Professional Engineers urging the government, with cogent reasoning, to establish without delay a representative national body or commission with the necessary authority to carry out a study in depth of the possible implementation and adoption of the metric system in Canada as our standard of measurement? If so, can the Prime Minister assure the house that the government will take this step introducing, if necessary, appropriate legislation in the next session of parliament?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's question should be placed on the order paper.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

INQUIRY AS TO LEGISLATION RESPECTING ABOLITION

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Prime Minister referred to the question of capital punishment. Last night various news media reported that the government had come to the decision that it was going to bring in a measure to abolish capital punishment. If this is so, in view of the number of people in the jails of our country under sentence of death, does the Prime Minister not feel that this measure should be introduced at once? If the government has come to the conclusion reported there is no reason why

the overhanging fear and horror that rests on those condemned should be continued.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat, and perhaps I should put this on the record again, the exact words I used yesterday as reported at page 15135 of *Hansard*. The right hon. gentleman asked me a question which he introduced by saying:

A little earlier in his remarks he said that capital punishment might be discussed.

The right hon. gentleman was referring to myself. I have not been able to find those words in what I said. However, I went on to say in answer to the right hon. gentleman's question:

I mentioned this as one of the problems which the government has been considering. It is not a matter which can be dealt with this session—

For reasons which I tried to indicate yesterday.

—but I would hope it could be dealt with this year in a responsible way.

I hope this can be done, and done as quickly as possible.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I realize the weight of responsibility that rests on the Prime Minister in matters such as this. I ask him this. If the government has made up its mind, does it intend to follow the practice of granting commutations; for it would be very difficult to explain why anyone should be executed if the government intends to abolish capital punishment at the next session.

Mr. Pearson: As I understand it, and I would like to have this confirmed, there is no request for commutation likely to come before the cabinet for decision for a number of weeks. I would also like to emphasize that in any decision the government may take on this matter, and any method by which it may discharge its responsibility, there will be no interference of any kind with the complete freedom of all members on the government side and on all sides of the house to vote as their conscience dictates.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, does that last statement mean that it is not going to be a government measure, whatever is introduced?

Mr. Pearson: That is not necessarily the case, as my right hon. friend will know if he recalls the procedure that was adopted in the United Kingdom.

Inquiries of the Ministry

PILOTAGE

INQUIRY AS TO REPORT OF ROYAL COMMISSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I may ask a question of the Minister of Transport. It is a question that I like to ask him at least once a month. Can the minister indicate when he expects to table the report of the pilotage commission?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): No, Mr. Speaker.

EXPO '67

REPORTED INSISTENCE ON U.S. FUNDS AS PAYMENT FOR ACCOMMODATION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer a question asked of me the day before yesterday by the hon. member for Battle River-Camrose (Mr. Smallwood) which I think ought to be answered. The hon. member referred to a newspaper article which stated that certain motels and hotels in greater Montreal were reported to be refusing accommodation except when deposits were made in United States funds.

I think it would be wise for me to clear up that misunderstanding, in the absence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I am told that this statement originated in a publication from a trailer camp organization intending to draw American tourists to their campsite. All it said was that prospective tourists could make deposits in United States funds. It was not intended to imply that they had to be made in United States funds. I was incredulous when the question was asked, and I am glad my incredulity was justified.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SUGGESTED RENEGOTIATION OF MIGRATORY BIRDS CONVENTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that no proposal for renegotiating the migratory birds convention was included in the long list of parliamentary business announced by the Prime Minister yesterday, will he indicate the government's intention in this regard?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend knows this is an extremely difficult and complex matter which requires discussion. Discussions are taking place with various interests in Canada as well as with United States governmental authorities, and they must be concluded before any decision can be taken. As soon as these discussions are complete we will be in a position to know what to do. Because of the complexity of the discussions I felt this was not a matter I should mention as something we should do this year. I doubt that it will be possible to renegotiate the convention this year.

Mr. Simpson: I have a supplementary question. Will the Prime Minister not agree that it would be a good idea to clear up this matter during our centennial year?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question is argumentative.

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

AMALGAMATION OF NAVY, ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The house resumed, from Wednesday, April 19, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof—Mr. Hellyer—Mr. Batten in the chair.

The Chairman: When the committee rose on Wednesday, evening, April 19, clause 2 was under discussion.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, the other evening I suggested that clause 2 should stand. I thought there was agreement to this suggestion on the part of the minister and members on the government side. That being the case I again suggest that clause 2 stand and that we proceed with clause 3.

Mr. Hellyer: That is agreeable, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Does the committee agree to stand clause 2 and proceed with clause 3?

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Chairman, I want to draw one matter to the attention of the committee. In the event that clause 25 is never reached for consideration because of the arbitrary allocation of time I should like to point out now one rather silly typographical error which should be corrected here rather than in the other place.

[Mr. Simpson.]

The Chairman: Is it agreed that the committee stand clause 2 and proceed to the consideration of clause 3?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

On clause 3—*Commissioned officers.*

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Chairman, clause 3 deals with terms of service. The first part states that commissions of officers in the Canadian forces shall be granted by Her Majesty during pleasure. This is the same as the section in the present act except for the deletion of the names of the three services and the substitution therefor of "Canadian Forces".

Subsection 2 of new section 21 states:

> Persons shall be enrolled as subordinate officers or men for indefinite or fixed periods of service as may be prescribed in regulations made by the Governor in Council.

That is a change from the present act which states that persons shall be enrolled as men for fixed terms of service as may be prescribed in regulations made by the Governor in Council. It was pointed out by a number of witnesses before the defence committee that an indefinite term of service so far as the men are concerned will likely have serious consequences and therefore is a questionable provision. On December 7 the minister dealt with this matter during introduction of the bill and he had this to say regarding the length of engagement periods for men:

> If they join, it normally will be for an initial engagement of five years. If this engagement is mutually satisfactory, they may, under the provisions of the bill, be re-engaged for an indefinite period. If they want to be released later, this can be done with six months' notice, except in an emergency or during periods of obligatory service.

Admiral Landymore was the first of the witnesses who appeared before the committee to point out some of the difficulties which may arise as the result of putting into effect such a regulation. He stated, as found on page 1055 of the committee proceedings:

> This is an invitation to have trade unions in the armed forces. Let us say that a group of technicians is dissatisfied with some aspect of their service. They can, under this concept of engagement, en masse, give six months' notice, in order to exert pressure to have their wishes fulfilled Here is subtle, silent, collective bargaining, entering the armed forces. This has no place in the services. I am not objecting to trade unions or collective bargaining in industry or in civilian life but this form of activity is not acceptable in the armed forces, for very obvious reasons, however democratic we might wish to be.
>
> I cannot tell you how often this type of unlimited engagement has been considered and, in wisdom,

not adopted. This concept has the further disadvantage that men will naturally always be thinking of opportunities elsewhere, and this, in turn, will lead to higher wastage rates in the forces—particularly amongst tradesmen whose skills are in demand in industry. We will live to regret this concept, if we allow it to become the practice. In an effort to have similar engagement periods for the three services, this has been jumped at as the answer. It is a foolish step to take.

Throughout a man's service he should be required to re-engage at set intervals. The initial engagement of five years is excellent. This should be followed by a second and third engagement of five years, each with a final engagement to pension. This spacing provides an essential safeguard and is fair to everyone.

General Foulkes also pointed out some of the disadvantages inherent in an indefinite term of service which can be terminated on six months' notice. His remarks in that regard can be found on page 1225 of the evidence. I will not take the time of the committee to read them.

There was also a considerable exchange between General Moncel and myself on this same matter, which can be found on pages 1339 and 1340 of the evidence. There is no question but that a provision of this kind will provide the opportunity for a group or several groups of tradesmen to leave the service to take up employment in civilian life. This is particularly true if these groups of tradesmen are dissatisfied and employment in their particular skills is available. These groups could leave on six months' notice. So far as some units are concerned, the result of this change would be that they would be unable to carry on effectively and perhaps not be able to carry on at all. This might be the case particularly so far as the operation of ships is concerned. If six months' notice were given by a considerable number of tradesmen, there would not be sufficient tradesmen to be able to send ships to sea. Under these circumstances I hope the minister will be prepared to move an amendment removing the indefinite term so far as the men are concerned and leaving the provision for a fixed term as it has been in the past with the governor general in council being able to set the term of service.

• (12:10 p.m.)

General Foulkes in his evidence pointed out the many disadvantages of this provision. One was that it may not be possible to operate a unit at all. Many training difficulties are created. If a commanding officer does not know the length of time the men in his unit are going to be in the service, it presents great difficulties so far as training programs are concerned and carrying on the technical, fighting training of that unit.

As I say, I can see no advantages. In fact, the committee was not told of any advantages when evidence was put before it in relation to an indefinite term of service. Under these circumstances I hope the minister is prepared to move an amendment to eliminate the indefinite period of service for the men and restore the situation to what it has been in the past.

Mr. Hellyer: The change in the law, Mr. Chairman, is really based on recommendations made by those who made the manpower study. A study was conducted on all aspects of terms of enlistment and the employment of other ranks. It was undertaken under the chairmanship of Admiral Hennessy, with representatives of the other services. They came to the conclusion that it might be desirable to have a policy whereby, after an initial period of say about five years, a decision would be made on the part of the service and on the part of the individual. The service would decide that the individual was acceptable as career soldier, sailor or airman and the individual would decide that he would like to make his career in the armed forces. This recommendation was included in their report and we included the necessary legal authority in the bill now before us.

I think it is fair to say that the defence staff is not wedded to this concept. In other words, there is no guarantee that it will work satisfactorily. It is, however, their judgment that it would be worth trying and worth implementing. If the provision does not work I am sure we would have no hesitation in changing it and using the authority which would be in the law to enroll men for a fixed rather than an indefinite period. I should point out, however, that the six months' notice by those who have signed on for an indefinite period is a matter of policy, not a matter of law. Once they have signed on they are in exactly the same position as officers, that is, they serve at the Queen's pleasure.

Under normal conditions we would allow them to give notice and to leave the service as we do at the present time for those who have signed for fixed periods if they have served three years of their engagement. In the event that a whole group of men gave notice simultaneously, obviously the policy would then have to be changed. It could not be permitted. This is a theoretical abuse which would not be acceptable. I agree with my hon. friend completely that a situation

would be created which would not be in the interests of the forces and therefore could not be allowed. It is not likely to arise, but in the event that it did some new policy would have to be implemented at once.

This situation may be considered along the same lines as the way banks operate deposit accounts. From their experience they know that a certain number of people withdraw money on any given day. This is, basically, an acceptable point of view. If, of course, all depositors simultaneously want their money the system would not be viable and extraordinary measures would have to be implemented at once. Under these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I believe we would prefer to have authority to follow either course. In other words, we should like to implement the recommendation of the minister's manpower study or, if in the long run that should prove not to be the best policy, to be able to revert to the previous one. This would give us more flexibility than if we were restricted merely to definite terms of engagement. I would prefer to have the legal authority to have a choice in so far as other ranks are concerned as we now have in so far as officers are concerned.

Mr. Harkness: I should like to ask the minister what advantages there are in having an indefinite term. As I said earlier, we did not receive any evidence in the committee with regard to any advantages in an indefinite term of service but received a great deal of evidence relating to the disadvantages. In view of the fact there is a potential danger in the provision, as the minister has admitted, I can see no good reason for including it. This is particularly true in view of the fact the regulations undoubtedly will be drawn up along the lines the minister has indicated. They will likely provide for six months' notice for a man to terminate his indefinite period, so the situation then becomes the same as with a fixed term. You would, in fact, have imbedded in the men's minds at least the idea that they have a right to give six months' notice and get out at any time.

The minister says that special measures might be taken in an emergency. However, if it happens that large numbers of people give notice at a time when there is no general emergency, and there are no emergency powers, I do not know what you are going to do about it. I think you are going to arrive at the point where you will not be able to put ships to sea or have communication units which can operate properly.

[Mr. Hellyer.]

Mr. Hellyer: You do not need emergency powers under these circumstances. The six months' provision is not included in the regulations; it is merely current policy which has been in effect for some time. In at least one case this policy has been altered and that is in respect of pilots. Perhaps I should leave any statement on the pilot situation until a little later. However, pilots are now required, with the exception of those who have been R.O.T.P. students, to serve a minimum of five years before the six months' notice provision comes into effect. This is for precisely the reason my hon. friend gives. Market conditions for pilots are so buoyant and there is so much opportunity for alternative employment that we require them to serve the minimum period of time to justify the expense of training them.

I do not believe my hon. friend's concern is one which is too serious. He asked what the advantages were in having this choice. I think the advantage is that the men would have the same security as the officers now have. They would know, once they had passed the initial stage of their careers, once they had completed their apprenticeship, that they would be accepted as career soldiers. Just as with the officers with permanent commissions, these men would know that barring misconduct or some other serious offence, some very major contraction in the size of the forces or something of that nature, they would have the security of continuous employment throughout their military career. This would give them a sense of security that they do not have with the fixed term engagement.

• (12:20 p.m.)

We also know from experience that this does make a difference. We have gone through this with the pilots and navigators. We found that short service commissions gave them a feeling of insecurity because they did not know in advance whether they would be offered a new term of engagement at the end of their present term. Thus they had no security in that they did not know after the second term whether they would get a third. A certain doubt was created in their minds and as a result they decided it would be preferable to take civilian employment rather than face the uncertainty of being given an additional short term of military service. This did become quite an important factor psychologically, particularly after the release of some short service air crew. For that reason all pilots are now taken on on a permanent commission basis.

I think there is a point in favour of having this indefinite period available to offer servicemen because it does give them the feeling of security and continuity that they would like to have so far as their chosen career is concerned.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the example the minister has given about short service commissions is a good one so far as the enlistment of men is concerned. The very term "short service commission" denotes that the commission is granted for a short period only.

Originally when short service commissions were granted the presumption was that these men would be released in most cases at the end of the term which was ordinarily five years with a short service commission. It has always been understood—this has been the regular custom particularly in the case of N.C.O.s—that when the period arrived to re-engage and these men wished to re-engage, then they would be re-engaged. I do not think there has been any uncertainty, let us say, in the minds of the enlisted men, particularly the N.C.O.s who were chiefly the ones re-engaged, about their ability to re-engage. Therefore I cannot see any advantage in this method. In view of its very obvious potential dangers, I still hope that the minister might be prepared to strike out this provision and revert to the former situation.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, I am not as concerned about the potential dangers as my hon. friend. I also feel that, the staff having recommended that we have the legal authority to implement this policy if it is deemed to be in the interests of the service to do so, I should therefore seek parliamentary authority to so implement it. I have often been accused of not taking advice. I must admit that in this case, as in many other cases, I got conflicting advice. But the consensus of the military staff, those who are responsible for the organization of the forces at the present time, is that they would like to have this authority so that the policy can be implemented if it is considered by them and by the department to be in the best interests of the forces.

Mr. Groos: Mr. Chairman, if I may add a few words in this connection may I say that I understand the dangers the hon. member for Calgary North has outlined. However, certainly so far as the naval service is concerned the engagement period has been changed many times over the years. In my early days a total engagement period of 21 years—I believe it is now 20 years—was required to qualify for a pension. The period of 21 years was divided into two sections, the first of 12 years and the second of nine. I believe the division then became seven-seven-seven. Then it was five-five-five-five, and I believe that now there is a three-years initial engagement period.

This further change is being sought now and personally I do not object to this departure. As I think all of us in this house agree, those of us at least who have been in the services at any time, morale is all-important. Morale varies in the services very much with the pressures of civilian life that are brought to bear upon servicemen. Regardless of the period for which a person is serving, I think he regards himself as being chained to the service for the rest of that period, and automatically bad morale sets in. The advantage of this clause is that it will make the defence department much more responsive to the changes in civilian life that occur from time to time, and I think that this is a good move.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, now that we are discussing these matters of great importance I hope the committee will realize that some of the matters that the pundits have told us have been repeated over and over again have really not been dealt with effectively in this house because we have not had the time to do so. This is one such instance. Here is a specific change in the act for which the minister has given no satisfactory explanation.

The minister has told us that if advantage is taken of the indefinite enlistment arrangement or if circumstances arise where a large number of men are going to give six months' notice and this would disrupt the service, the Department of National Defence would then take appropriate action. I think that is a very bad legacy to leave to the minister's successor. As of Tuesday night the minister will have the bill approved by the guillotine and the juggernaut, with the assistance of his friends to the left of me, and he will then be free to go to some other position leaving the mess to be cleaned up by somebody else. I think the minister should put the matter into better shape. Why saddle another minister of national defence with a bad policy?

The minister has said that he sometimes accepts advice. I wish he would give us instances which show he does. He has had advice, as the hon. member for Calgary North pointed out, from three men of experience and

long service, Admiral Landymore, General Foulkes and General Moncel. The hon. member for Calgary North quoted from Admiral Landymore's statement on this subject. Admiral Landymore made a very careful analysis of the proposals in this bill and General Foulkes also had something to say about it. I intend to quote from the evidence of General Foulkes and General Moncel.

• (12:30 p.m.)

I fully appreciate, having heard the Minister of Transport speak last week, that expert advice should be rejected out of hand. Only amateur advice should be accepted such as the amateur advice given by the Minister of Transport who made the silliest speech I have heard in this house in all the years I have been here. But despite what he said about experts I intend to put some remarks by experts on the record. Admiral Landymore, General Foulkes and General Moncel know something about service life and they know something about the necessities for keeping organizations together. We are not surprised that the minister will not accept their advice now, of course, because he has consistently refused to accept advice. He has adopted the policy of the Minister of Transport: Do not ask the expert; ask the amateur.

On page 1225, volume No. 21 of the committee evidence. General Foulkes was talking about this clause dealing with the career serviceman concept, as it is called. Subsection 2 of section 21 says that a person shall be enrolled as a subordinate officer or man for a definite or fixed period of service. The bill changes that wording. The proposed subsection will read:

> Persons shall be enrolled as subordinate officers or men for indefinite or fixed periods of service—

The word "indefinite" is used in addition to the word "fixed". As found on page 1225 General Foulkes said:

> For men and N.C.O.s the five-year engagement would look to be ideal from an age standpoint, but would create quite a training problem. To re-engage junior N.C.O.s and men for an indefinite period would tend to worsen the problem. A short engagement requires the commanding officer to make a reassessment of the man's capabilities for continuing in combat training for another period. The man's age is always considered carefully, and if there is any doubt the man is not re-engaged.
>
> By this proposed system, once a man is re-engaged he would have to be dismissed if he starts to slip at the start of his new engagement. I do not think this is very fair because if a man is dismissed it will place upon him a stigma which would not be an asset when seeking civil employment.

[Mr. Churchill.]

The general was considering the situation of individuals. The men of our services are not just statistics; they are individuals, as we are, entitled to their place in society, entitled to consideration, and entitled to the opportunity to retire from the services without any stigma being attached to their records, as General Foulkes suggests might happen.

General Moncel had some advice to offer about this matter—the advice of an expert, not an amateur. On being asked questions about this section he said, as found on page 1339 of the committee evidence:

> I would be against it. I just cannot imagine what Landymore is alleged to have said coming true in the service I knew, but it is a possibility, I suppose, but it is hard to imagine.
>
> Your great problem is that if you make it possible for people to go too easily you are apt to find yourself in very serious trouble. We have no guaranteed intake on a voluntary basis. It is extremely difficult to plan when you do not have the slightest idea how many troops you are going to have six months from now. In the United States it is relatively easy. You are invited by the government to come and serve, and it is not too difficult to sit down and estimate how many you are going to have in the force at a given date.

Applying those words to our situation in Canada, if it is open to a man in the armed services to give six months' notice, conceivably half a trained regiment could leave at the same time. I continue quoting General Moncel's evidence:

> From our point of view we keep them, in large measure, by good will, but we also have a contract. The chap is signed up. Now, in the course of our business you have to do a number of unpleasant things. This is part of the business, and you do unpleasant things because you are told to do them, and if you do not do them the penalties are very, very severe indeed. By design, if everyone has the option of saying on six months' notice, "I will soldier no more," you are apt to get into trouble because every time you get an unpleasant posting you say, "Thanks very much, I will not take this one," and off you go.

Mr. Hellyer: Was that from General Moncel's evidence?

Mr. Churchill: Yes.

Mr. Hellyer: If I remember correctly that policy was in effect when General Moncel was the vice chief. I am referring to the six months' notice. I am almost positive that was the policy then. If he was so concerned about this question when giving his evidence why was he not more concerned when serving as vice chief?

Mr. Churchill: That policy was not in effect, or at least authority for it was not in the act.

Mr. Hellyer: I thought my hon. friend was discussing the policy of six months' notice.

Mr. Churchill: Yes, that was not written into the act. What was done was done at pleasure. The minister has written this policy into the bill. All sorts of barrack-room lawyers in the services, with as much ability as anybody in this chamber, will soon discover the flaws in the act.

The minister now appears to be relying on General Moncel; yet a few days ago he dismissed him as a person to whom we should pay no attention. He checked the general out of the service when he had another six years of valuable, experienced service to give to our defence establishment. Obviously the minister adjusts himself to situations. Last summer General Moncel was useless. In this debate the minister said, in so many words, "Ignore General Moncel's advice". Now he says that before General Moncel left the service he favoured the six months' notice policy. In answer to that I can only say that in General Moncel's time the section authorizing that policy was not in the act. It has been written into this bill. I continue quoting from General Moncel's evidence:

> We went through this argument in great detail when we had the difficulties with the pilots and the rest of them and we had to buy their services.

As Terence Robertson said in the article I quoted the other night, the minister threw out 500 pilots, disrupting the air force, to show the air force, the service which had been most opposed to unification, that it must not in any way resist the government. According to Terence Robertson, after the 500 pilots were thrown out resistance toward the government subsided in the air force. Having denuded the air force of pilots the minister then had to buy back their services to fill existing needs. As General Moncel says, this is wrong. The general went on to deal with the pilots.

I am talking about men in the services and the proposal that they be enlisted for an indefinite period. The expert advice of Admiral Landymore and of Generals Foulkes and Moncel is that this is not a good idea. I support the hon. member for Calgary North in asking the minister to strike out the word "indefinite" and to leave the subsection as it was before.

I hope the minister will give us examples of co-operation during our debate on this bill. I hope he accepts some of the advice offered to him instead of continuing his pose of resisting suggestions. This is the minister who has said that every member of every chiefs of staff committee in the world is wrong that only he is right. He has tried to build himself up in Canada as the one who knows, as the only authority on defence matters. He has made himself *de facto* prime minister because the Prime Minister has abdicated in his favour.

I suggest that the hon. gentleman revert to his proper position and show some sense of co-operation in this house. As a first step I suggest he strike out this word "indefinite". I do so for the reason I have mentioned, to enable him to show some measure of co-operation. In the second place I suggest he do it because he has not put forward any real argument in support of retaining this word in the bill. Under the old act he has in effect a fixed term of service with a policy of giving six months' notice. Why cannot that be continued so as to avoid saddling the next minister of national defence with a situation which may be embarrassing and perhaps impossible?

• (12:40 p.m.)

The dangers have been pointed out. If this change is introduced the men in the services may very well get together in large groups, give their six months' notice and then be in a strong bargaining position in that they will be able to say they will get out unless such and such happens. I think this is quite wrong. In my opinion a fixed term of service with the flexibility the minister already has is satisfactory. I hope the next minister of national defence will not be saddled with this proposal. I take my seat making a firm request to the minister to accept a suggestion from this side of the house, and then we might proceed to consider the other clauses of the bill in a very agreeable frame of mind.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Chairman, I should like to speak on the same subject for a few moments before the minister replies. At the present time, as I understand it, service in our forces is on a voluntary basis. It will remain on a voluntary basis until this bill is passed. After that service becomes compulsory. I say it will be compulsory because of the word "indefinite" referred to by my hon. friend from Winnipeg South Centre. I should like to read the explanatory note again.

> The amendment to subsection (1) is consequential on the amendments made in clause 2. At present men are enrolled in the Canadian Forces for fixed terms of service. The amendment to subsection (2) would authorize their enrolment for indefinite, as well as fixed, periods of service.

Service at the present time is voluntary. But once this amendment is passed the men will be serving under a one-way agreement. I

am concerned about members of our armed forces who joined the army, navy or air force under what they felt was a two-way agreement. Now the minister can transfer them compulsorily into what is to be known as the Canadian armed forces. I believe that those who now belong to the services and who fulfil the present requirements should have the privilege of getting out on six months' notice if they so wish.

I was interested in the speech made by the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings. It was a long speech and I should like to put it all on the record again but time will not allow me to do so. He asked several questions which the minister should answer. I will read part of what my hon. friend said as reported in *Hansard* at pages 14944 and 14945. This passage illustrates a few of the problems the minister will encounter in dealing with the officers and men of our armed services. Once this bill is passed the minister will have serious difficulties on his hands. He may think he has had a problem dealing with the official opposition but it is only a foretaste of what will happen within the armed forces once this bill is enacted. I am afraid of what will happen to the defence of Canada as soon as the minister tries to implement a measure which will not work. This is what the hon. member said:

> I want to tell the minister that I have had letters from many serving officers, not colonels or commodores but flight lieutenants and petty officers. I have four or five of them in my hand now. Within the last two weeks these people have been told that they cannot get out of the service.

I should like to know on what authority they have been told they cannot leave the service. They have an agreement, which I understand is valid at least until the passing of this bill, enabling them to get out after six months notice. What power had the minister or the government to cancel this agreement? I can understand that after the bill is passed the government will have firmer ground on which to stand with respect to these applications. But at the present time there is a two-way agreement and I believe that if these men submit their applications they have a good basis on which to fight their case. Regardless of what the judge advocate general told us when we were in committee, I believe these men would be on firm ground and I would suggest to all of them that, though it might be costly, they fight their cases on this legal ground. I am not a lawyer, but if I were in that position I would contribute to the funds of those who wanted to fight their cases. This is a freedom for which they fought and

[Mr. McIntosh.]

I say that neither the minister nor the government has the authority to take it away.

My hon. friend said these applicants had been told:

> There is no longer the problem of transferring between the services because you do not have services now.

I say we do have services now and we shall continue to have them until the bill now before us is passed. Whoever wrote those letters had no authority to do so in those terms. There was no legal ground for sending such a reply as these people apparently received. It went on: "You now transfer from one environment to another". This will not be the case until after the passage of the bill before us. And further: "We are not a warlike country now, we are a peace keeping country". Many of the officers and men who make these applications forget that for some reason they are still considered as being on active service, and this has been the case since the Korean war. I cannot help wondering why this provision was never cancelled. My hon. friend went on to say in the course of his remarks on April 14:

> I think it was Moncel or Fleury who said that in his day, according to his terminology, peace keeping meant preventing war or fighting a war. Today, as I said before, we do not have services, or we will not have if this bill is passed. We have environments and interchange within environments. I should like the minister to stand up and deny the fact that there has been a freeze on the release of officers who under normal circumstances would be qualified to obtain their release—

• (12:50 p.m.)

I do not know whether the minister has made that denial or whether he intends to do so, but I believe that all applications for release made prior to the passing of this bill should be honoured. I think these people have made a reasonable request. I repeat that they joined a voluntary service. Now they are aware that they are in a compulsory service. They do not wish to remain with that type of service any longer and I expect that being young in years they are recently out of college or university and want to make preparation for their future lives. I do not think it is morally right for the minister to stop these people from taking up the occupations or professions they wish to follow.

These people have seen a lifetime vocation in voluntary service disappear. They want nothing to do with a compulsory service. The minister should let them get out so they may return to university if they so wish and become professional men. The hon. member went on to say:

> I will not read the names of these people because they are still serving officers.

We know what happened to serving officers once they expressed opinions and the minister heard about them.

I have here a letter from the wife of one of them dated March 29, 1967 in connection with his enrolment. She writes that he was told the policy would allow him release on request three years after graduation.

If this was the agreement the minister should live up to it and on six month's notice give that man his release after three year's service. The hon. member continued:

This is not a man who has been commissioned under the R.O.T.P. plan, whose education was financed by the government and who now wants to get out early. Every one of these letters is from a man who has served his time, in all cases over three years.

I see no reason why the minister should institute a freeze at this time unless he is concerned about what is going to happen after passage of this bill. I think he will see the greatest exodus from the armed services that Canada has ever experienced. But that may not happen if legally these men can be held after passage of the bill. However, I suggest that if they are held against their will the deterioration of our forces will be publicly seen in a very short time. The hon. member continued:

There is a certain regulation—I do not know the numbers of these regulations—to the effect that in normal cases six months' notice is sufficient to allow a release.

An hon. member interjected:

That is what the minister told us.

From my experience in debating this bill in the house I can say that the minister has told us many things and many times has apparently reversed what he told us in the first place. This has contributed to the confusion that has resulted in such a long debate on the bill. Whatever happens to our armed forces, and whatever actions personnel may take, will be brought on by the minister's own actions. It was his actions which have led to the lengthy debate on the bill, a debate which is now being chopped off by the guillotine. The bill could have been debated in much shorter time if the minister had been forthcoming with explanations and with answers to the questions we asked him.

The minister deliberately created confusion for a definite purpose. We have gone over this time and time again. It all goes back to the time of the white paper. The minister has said that unification was definitely mentioned in the white paper. In reply I say that the word "unification" appears only once in the white paper and has nothing whatever to do with what the minister now calls a single service concept. In the white paper it bore no relationship to the definition of unification that the minister gave us when we first asked him about it in the House of Commons. He gave us a jumble of words meaning nothing.

The hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings, replying to the interjection, continued:

I can believe that because the hon. member always makes good sense. These men are pilots and they want to get out. They entered the service under certain conditions, namely, that they could get out on six months' notice. The wife of one of them writes she has been advised that her husband has to complete two more years of service.

I wonder where this regulation came from? Is it a regulation or is it just a demand the minister is placing on those now serving in a voluntary force?

He has been serving for three years and has a commitment to a private firm which, of course, is jeopardized. This man is not one of those at the top; he is right in the ranks.

Another pilot writes under date of March 29, 1967 to the effect that last week officers had their release dates cancelled.

I cannot understand how this cancellation has come about. The minister has disrupted the lives of many men who want to get out of the service. These men have made commitments with respect to outside positions or have been promised outside positions. Now their future is jeopardized by the minister's action. This is very unfair.

Another member of the air force says that service policy resulted in a statement to the effect that all graduate pilots holding permanent commissions will be retained in the service until the completion of five years of qualified pilot service.

I wonder under what authority this directive was issued since we were told that prior to the passage of this bill a pilot could be released on six months' notice. I suggest that the minister has taken on more powers than he was granted by parliament. I repeat part of that last statement:

—will be retained in the service until the completion of five years of qualified pilot service. I am suggesting that at the time these pilots entered the service this policy was not in existence and it has resulted in discrimination. This man wants to go back to law school.

If there was no such regulation in existence when these men offered their services to the country and got their commissions in the army, navy or air force, then until this bill is passed the previous agreement should still hold. I ask the minister to explain what has taken place with regard to the applications of

those who want to retire from a voluntary service and not be subject to compulsory service as will be the case when the bill passes. On what authority has the minister instructed his officials to reply to these applications with a directive that the men must now remain in the services for a period of five years?

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to point out that no officer or man has ever had a right to release after six months' service, nor is it proposed that he should have such a right. As I understand it, the policy is that except in special circumstances applications for release will not be approved until six months have expired. Thereafter they will normally be approved, but this is subject to the exigencies of the service—

Mr. McIntosh: May I ask a question?

Mr. Hellyer: Let me finish my statement—

Mr. McIntosh: Did you not tell us they could get out within six months and is that not recorded in the minutes of the committee?

Mr. Hellyer: I said that is the policy but it is not a right. It is not a regulation, nor is it—

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I call it one o'clock. Surely closure is not to be extended to meal hours.

The Deputy Chairman: It being one o'clock, pursuant to the order made by the house on April 6 this committee stands adjourned until two o'clock.

SITTING SUSPENDED

SITTING RESUMED

The committee resumed at 2 p.m.

The Chairman: Order. When the committee rose at one o'clock clause 3 was under discussion.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, a point was raised this morning which had been raised earlier in the debate by the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings and the hon. member for Lapointe. Earlier in the week I undertook to give a reply. I was unable to do so and therefore I should like to do so now.

A policy was introduced in August, 1966 under which pilots are required to serve a minimum of five years following completion of aircrew training. This policy was extended to all aircrew in November 1966. This policy will not be applied to R.O.T.P. graduates who were not asked to accept this additional obligatory service before commencing aircrew training. In the future, that is, commencing with the 1967 graduating class, R.O.T.P. graduates will not be given aircrew training unless they are prepared to accept this additional period of obligatory service.

Aircrew training is costly and this heavy expenditure of funds is not justified for R.O.T.P. candidates who are not willing to accept, prior to undertaking training, additional obligatory service to that which they undertook when they entered the R.O.T.P. Those who do not wish to undertake the obligatory service required of aircrew will be employed in non-aircrew positions. There is a surplus of candidates for aircrew training and therefore no difficulty in filling all of the aircrew training spaces with qualified candidates to whom the five year obligatory service rule is acceptable.

From August, 1966 until the present time, during which staff consideration was being given to the application of the aircrew obligatory service policy to R.O.T.P., graduates, there was uncertainty among those R.O.T.P. graduates who had or were undertaking aircrew training as to whether the obligatory service they had undertaken when they entered R.O.T.P. would be extended. This has caused concern on the part of R.O.T.P. graduates in this respect and I trust that this will be cleard up now that the decision has been taken to apply the aircrew policy only to R.O.T.P. graduates who undertake aircrew which they were committed on entering the R.O.T.P.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about a principle which becomes evident in this clause. I do not suggest it is something new so far as this bill is concerned, that it results only from the minister's policies, or anything of that sort. I refer, however, to the situation where an individual enters into a contract by which he is bound in respect of service in any of the services concerned. There is a tendency, as the situation changes and as a matter of convenience, for the government through the Department of National Defence to change the contract to suit its own requirements. This would seem to be one of the most demoralizing situations in which a serving man or officer could find himself. Under the provisions for retirement a man may retire from the services by giving six months' notice. The hon. member for

Calgary North pointed out that under those circumstances there might be a situation where a great number of serving personnel might wish to retire at the same time. A group of personnel, for example, half a unit, might make application for retirement. They have decided they are going to retire under a certain set of circumstances.

The minister said that this is no problem at all, or words to that effect. I am paraphrasing. He said that under those circumstances the department would in effect change the regulations and not allow this. The serving man, however, assumes that he has this right, but if it is only a right which exists at the convenience of the service then it is not a right at all. This is a most demoralizing situation. I have heard the argument put forward that something might be done because it affected only a few and that therefore there was nothing wrong in doing it, that is, that any inconvenience which might be involved in carrying out the terms of the government's obligation was out of all proportion to the number of persons concerned. When it comes to a matter of keeping an obligation, I do not think in all justice that this should be based on convenience. The obligation which rests with the service to keep its side of the bargain should be just as binding as the obligation of the individual.

• (2:10 p.m.)

This is something which goes back a long time. Perhaps I may be excused if I cite an experience I had. This was one of the reasons I did not remain in the permanent force after world war II. In 1939 the R.C.A.F. started a program under which it granted some short service commissions because there was an apprehension that a national emergency might arise. Young men were offered short service commissions in the R.C.A.F. I was one of them. One of the requirements was that you were a university graduate; another was that you were in a certain age group, and so on. The terms under which we joined the service were that we would serve on active service for a period of four years, which could be extended to a total of ten years if a national emergency existed at the end of the four years. For taking this risk, as it were, in a kind of indefinite contract, part of the agreement of enlistment was that for every year served except the first year one was on active service, he would be given a gratuity of, as I recall, $500 a year until the end of the active service.

Two classes of aircrew were inducted into the air force and given commissions before the war began. These short service commissions were discontinued at that point or shortly thereafter. We had joined the service in the summer of 1939. After the war began there was a general raise in service pay which applied to the permanent force, to the people with short service commissions and to the special reserve, those people who joined the service after the war began, for the duration of the war. Naturally everyone accepted the increase in pay automatically and without question.

After about a year and a half we received a registered letter saying that since we were accepting the increase in pay we were no longer eligible for a gratuity at the end of our service unless we wished to return the increase in pay retroactively for the year and a half. We were a very small group. Quite a number had not been kept on—this was one of the terms of enlistment—because they were found not to have the aptitude to become flying instructors or aircrew members. After a year and a half quite a large number—I might say that these people kept their side of the bargain—accepted discharge from the service without question.

By the time the year and a half was up quite a number had been killed; only a very few survived the war. They kept their side of the bargain, but the government never paid the gratuity to the few who survived the war because they were a small, insignificant group. In my judgment, this is not something you can measure by numbers. It is a principle, a contract that must be honoured. I must confess that after the war, before I left the service in 1947, I was offered a permanent commission. I did not accept it, and one of the reasons I did not accept it was that I knew that a contract which I entered into in joining the service was binding on me but was only binding on the service as a matter of convenience and within certain limits. Actually, I am very pleased now—in fact, I have never been more pleased in my life—that I did not accept a permanent commission, because I can think of no more appalling situation to befall one than to be a serving officer under the present minister.

Mr. Forrestall: He would have thrown you out.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): He probably would, but that is neither here nor there. The point I

am trying to make is that when men volunteer, as they do in Canada, to serve in the armed forces they want to know, and it is only reasonable that they should know, that the terms under which they join will be honoured and binding no matter how inconvenient it is to the service. I can visualize a situation where a difficulty may arise in regard to the six months' notice. If a situation develops where it is tempting for a great many servicemen, because of a particular set of circumstances, to get out of the services, there will be an inclination to do this quickly because it will be the early birds, the ones who do it first, who will be allowed to go. After it becomes a strain on the service the rest will be retained. It will be a question of who will get there first.

This is an unhealthy situation. I do not say this in criticism of the minister, but I point out that in my judgment it is a matter of vital importance to morale in the services that the services should be bound by their side of the bargain just as much as the individual is bound by his side. Unfortunately that is not the case. If you have a situation where the six months' notice privilege can be withdrawn under certain circumstances, I do not think it will make for good morale. No honourable man objects to keeping his side of the bargain, no matter how inconvenient it may be for him. We should realize that when a man joins the service it is the most important contract in his whole life. It involves his complete career in most cases, in peacetime especially, and is much more important than his purchase of a house, a car or something of that nature. It is a very unsatisfactory situation in which to find himself, if he discovers that after he has entered into this contract the rules can be changed by the government if it suits its convenience.

In my opinion this is not justice. I believe that the individual as well as the government should have equal rights when it comes to terms of engagement. That is all I wish to say on this part of the clause. I will have more to say later on the first part.

The Chairman: Shall clause 3 carry?

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, I have a brief question to ask the minister. This matter was dealt with in part just before the luncheon adjournment. I wonder whether this information has been conveyed in a very tangible and real way to the people affected under the R.O.T.P. It is my understanding that this information has come to many of them as a brand new awareness and understanding of their position with regard to the plan.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, on April 17 a telegram went out to all commands giving them the policy and asking them to communicate it to the men in their commands.

Mr. Forrestall: May I ask the minister one further question? What has brought about the great delay in communicating this information to the men? Was it because of a breakdown in communication?

Mr. Hellyer: As I indicated, Mr. Chairman, the staff had been considering the possibility of applying the additional, obligatory service to R.O.T.P. graduates. This matter only reached my desk and that of the associate minister a few days ago. We dealt with it expeditiously once it was presented to us. In fact, we felt, and I think my hon. friend will agree, that if we changed that obligatory service it would have been the wrong approach. We did not feel that would be right under the circumstances and therefore it will apply only in so far as future graduates are concerned —those commencing their training this fall.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Mr. McIntosh: I am sorry I did not get back from lunch in time to hear the complete content of the minister's statement. Am I correct in assuming that the import of his statement was to the effect that this change only applies to R.O.T.P. personnel and that those who have served their three years, as suggested by the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings, wish to get out of the service and have made their applications will be allowed to do so? Is that the meaning of the minister's statement?

Mr. Hellyer: The requirement to serve five years applies to all air crew other than R.O.T.P., who abide by the terms of the obligatory service they agreed to when they joined the forces. That is the case up to this time. In so far as the future is concerned, no one will be given pilot training from the regular officers training plan unless they agree to serve five years following the completion of their pilot training.

Mr. McIntosh: In other words, this officially cancels the six month clause which the judge advocate general said was policy, not law?

Mr. Hellyer: No, Mr. Chairman. The six months' notice only applies in the case of aircrew after they have served their five years obligatory service and, in the case of

the R.O.T.P., men giving notice to leave the service after they have served their obligatory period. Perhaps this might be a good time to read into the record the exceptions in so far as the policy of permitting release after six months' notice is concerned.

Mr. McIntosh: Would the minister also refer to all services and tell us what happens to army commissioned officers and other ranks as well as navy commissioned officers and other ranks?

Mr. Hellyer: I understand the same policy applies to all the services. This statement is in response to an inquiry in respect of the voluntary release regulations and procedures. These are the exceptions to the six months' period of notice regulation for voluntary release. In these cases voluntary release will not normally be granted on six months' notice. I must again reiterate that this is policy, not something that is a matter of right or law.

The exceptions in respect of officers apply first to those obligated under Queens' regulations and orders 15.18, who have undertaken designed courses of over six months duration, R.O.T.P. medical and dental plan officers who are required to complete their period of obligation, and aircrew officers who are required to serve five years after completion of aircrew training, and R.O.T.P. aircrew officers required to fulfil the terms of their obligatory service.

The exceptions in respect of men apply first to men who are serving on a cycled ship, until the end of the cycle, men on fixed overseas unaccompanied tours such as in Cyprus with United Nations emergency force, and in Europe. These are six months or one year tours. Up to the present time, as far as can be determined, there have been no requests for release from officers who are serving on a cycled ship or who are on fixed overseas unaccompanied tours. If the problem arises the policy would presumably be the same as for men.

Second, I should add that compassionate or exceptional circumstances are accepted as reasons to release officers and men in the above categories. In other words, there may be circumstances so overwhelming that they would offset these exceptions. This would happen only in rare cases.

The current rules respecting release by purchase for all services are: (a) unless a man has urgent exceptional and compassionate reasons he is required to purchase his release if the request is made within three years of commencing his first engagement; (b) release is allowed without cost beyond three years service and on six months' notice; (c) men in second or subsequent engagements are released on six months' notice, and Q.R. and O table (1) is not invoked. I might add that except as modified by those exceptions, the Queen's regulations and orders, 15.33, apply.

I think that completes the balance of the policy. Hon. members will now know just what it is that is presently in operation in so far as policy on release is concerned.

Mr. McIntosh: I should like to ask the minister whether he has given any consideration to the requests of members on this side of the house to withdraw the word "indefinite". Let me refer to the minutes of proceedings and evidence, volume 32, March 14. The following question was asked by one member of the committee:

> Any fixed period; so that strictly speaking the "indefinite" is not really very important?

The judge advocate general then replied:

> No, it is not materially increasing the powers of the governor in council. It is just making it a little tidier, and easier to draft the regulations, and so on.

In view of the fact there is so much objection to the inclusion of this term, and possibly we are overly suspicious in this regard as to what it may mean, perhaps the minister would consider our request to drop the word "indefinite".

Mr. Hellyer: We discussed this matter at some length before the lunch break. At that time I indicated that the defence staff thought it would be advisable to have legislative authority for either fixed or indefinite periods for the enrolment of men. This would give the staff the same flexibility they now have in respect of officers.

The minister's manpower study on men, which made this recommendation in the first place, I am told and believe is the most comprehensive examination of the terms of enrolment and employment of other ranks in the armed services that has ever been undertaken in this country. It not only included a study by senior officers who formed part of the group but also involved consultations with many other ranks in all parts of the country and overseas. It was only after this exhaustive study that this recommendation was made. I believe they are only asking parliament to provide this flexibility. I cannot guarantee that this authority will ever be exercised. As the judge advocate general said or

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

committee on defence for examination, as I will propose for any regulations which may be made with regard to any amendment, and that these be examined. We have had this undertaking in the finance committee under the Bank Act where a sort of carte blanche is being given to the minister to flesh out a general authority given by parliament. I think that the more we develop the practice in this parliament that regulations made pursuant to these general authorities be referred back to the committee which is dealing with the legislation, the better off we are going to be. Far too great a practice has arisen in the years past to rely on this carte blanche authority, which is not reviewable by parliament. I would like to know what the minister—

At that point the hon. member for Edmonton West was interrupted by the chairman and then the hon. member continued:

I want the regulations as indicated in section 21 (2) as proposed be referred back and the minister can be given an invitation here. We respect that type of undertaking, as we have done in the finance committee with regard to the Bank Act, with what we have done with the Insurance Deposit Act and others. These regulations will be, as soon as they are prepared and if the house is sitting and this committee is sitting, brought in and referred back to the committee, not merely tabled as an order in council.

The minister, after some further interjections, replied:

If you mean regulations after enactment, I do not see why this could not be arranged.

I should like to ask the minister whether or not these regulations could be brought back to the committee for review prior to the bill being proclaimed.

Mr. Hellyer: I would not like to give that undertaking because it will mean a delay. However, my undertaking to have them referred once they are proclaimed is good. I am sure that at that time the committee or the house, if they want to, would be in a position to pass judgment on them in the normal manner. There are opportunities in the house on motions of non-confidence and that sort of thing to deal with the situation where regulations have been referred and they do not meet with the general approval of the house.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): Clause 3 reads in part as follows:

Subsections (1) and (2) of section 21 of the said act are repealed and the following substituted therefor:

21 (1) Commissions of officers in the Canadian Forces shall be granted by Her Majesty during pleasure.

Subsection 1 of section 21 provides for all commissions for all officers of the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force and says that those commissions shall be granted by Her Majesty during pleasure. When the bill we are now considering is proclaimed the section I have just quoted will no longer be part of the law. I assume, therefore, that all commissions now held by officers in our three services will cease to have any validity. I should like to know if my assumption is correct.

Mr. Hellyer: I think the situation is covered by subclause 2 of clause 6.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): We have here a situation which is the type of thing about which I was talking a little while ago except that in this case it applies to commissioned officers. Upon the proclamation of this bill, as I understand it, present commissions will no longer have any validity. They constitute the terms under which present serving officers engaged in the service. When Her Majesty's pleasure, as it is expressed, has ceased to exist, those commissions in the navy, air force and army will no longer exist. Apparently the minister takes the easy view—so what? These people are going to be commissioned into the new force. These are not the terms under which these officers undertook to serve in the first instance. They undertook to serve in one of the three services.

• (2:40 p.m.)

I am not just being difficult; I sincerely believe it would be recognized as a fact that the commissions of serving officers would no longer be valid. The terms under which they engaged will no longer be valid because they are being abrogated by parliament. Therefore there should be no compulsion on them to accept commissions in the new force. They should, of course, be given the first priority in accepting commissions in the new force if they so desire, but in fairness I do not think that there should be any obligation upon a serving officer to continue to serve in the new force unless he wishes to do so voluntarily.

What we have is a situation where men have embarked on a career on certain conditions which can be very binding upon them and difficult for them under certain circumstances. The conditions of the agreement entered into are enforced in many cases at great inconvenience to the individual. But when it is convenient to the government to do so the government take it upon themselves to abrogate the agreement and to substitute something else. It is like changing the rules half way through the game.

Therefore I do not think we should by act of parliament substitute a new arrangement for the agreement that was originally entered into by individual officers and make the substitution binding upon them unless they voluntarily agree to accept the situation. I should like the minister to say a few words on the question of the compulsion in regard to all serving officers in the present three services when this act is proclaimed.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether this is the proper place to ask the question, but as the minister mentioned men who leave the service to further their education I have a case in mind almost parallel to the one brought up by the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings concerning the officer who, after completing his three years, wished to leave the service and go into law. The case I have in mind is that of a young chap who was in the service and was permitted to buy his way out. I do not know whether policy, law or regulations govern this situation, but this man was not given a refund. The answer I received from the minister's department was that unless he left the service to enter university he must forfeit his $125, or whatever the sum was. In this case this young lad had not completed high school and he left the service intending to complete high school and, then go on to university. If proof is given the minister's department that after completion of high school the young lad has gone on to university, will the purchase price paid by the young lad to the department be refunded?

The Deputy Chairman: Shall clause 3 carry?

Mr. McIntosh: No, Mr. Chairman, I should like an answer to my question before allowing it to pass.

Mr. Hellyer: I am sorry, I do not know the answer to that question offhand.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall clause 3 carry?

Mr. Churchill: Call the yeas and nays.

The Deputy Chairman: Those in favour of the clause passing will please rise.

Mr. McIlraith: We should all rise.

Mr. Churchill: Call the nays.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. A request has been made that the yeas and nays be called.

[Mr. MacLean (Queens).]

Mr. Churchill: Only one person rose and you should have called the nays.

Clause agreed to: Yeas, 40; nays, 25.

The Deputy Chairman: I declare clause 3 carried.

On clause 4—*Ranks of officers and men.*

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Chairman, this clause deals with the ranks to be held by officers, N.C.O.'s and men in the services. When this bill was originally introduced clause 4 listed the new ranks in the single unified force which would be in effect after the bill became law. It also had a provision that the minister may make regulations prescribing other designations for the titles of rank set forth in the clause.

No evidence was brought before the committee to show what advantages would accrue from having a single rank structure for all three services. It was stated that this would make for administrative ease. However, all of the witnesses who came before the committee were asked their opinion about this and they gave evidence to the effect that the proposed single rank structure would have very serious effects upon the morale of the services and that in particular it would be damaging as far as naval personnel were concerned. It was said that when our naval personnel encountered personnel of other navies they would be held up to ridicule and suffer embarrassment. As a result, I believe, of the representations which were made, amendments were introduced in the committee, some of which we find in the bill now before us. Column I in schedule A of the bill shows the ranks which originally were listed in clause 4. The ranks shown in columns II, III and IV of schedule A are those now in effect in the navy, army and air force.

It was represented to the committee when this amendment was introduced by the minister that it would have the effect of making the ranks appearing in schedule A universal as far as documents, pay records and things of that nature were concerned. Apart from that, Mr. Chairman, it would be possible for officers and other ranks to use the rank designations which are in effect in the respective services at the present time if they were authorized by the governor general in council. The explanatory note says:

The amendment would result in the following changes in substance:

(a) ranks would be prescribed for the purposes of the Act only;

• (2:50 p.m.)

In spite of the judge advocate general's explanation in the committee and the minister's explanation, the meaning of those words is not clear. These should be a clear explanation of the meaning of the phrase, "ranks would be prescribed for the purposes of the Act only" and a clear explanation of its implications. The note continues:

(b) the other designations of rank that might be used would be limited to the ranks now held in the three services; and

(c) the governor in council, rather than the minister, would have the power to make regulations respecting other designations of rank.

Some contradictions seem to be inherent in the words of the last subparagraph. The governor in council so far as I am aware has always had power to make designations of rank, or to make other designations where that seems desirable for any purpose at any time. The committee ought to have an explanation of the legal effect of subparagraphs (b) and (c). Do they contradict one another? In view of the evidence before the committee and all the complaints, editorials, letters and so on about instituting a single rank system; and considering that the minister has seen the folly of his original idea to the extent that he has introduced the amendment now before us allowing in the naval environment naval ranks, in the land environment army ranks and in the air environment R.C.A.F. ranks, would he not be prepared to drop this whole clause? There is no demonstrable advantage in keeping it. As I understand it, the ranks will continue as they are at present. I hope that is so.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, I join with the hon. member for Calgary North in asking the minister to make clear the meaning of the phrase "purposes of the act". In addition, before the house confers on the governor in council the power contained in this clause, the minister ought to explain the circumstances under which it will be necessary for the governor in council to exercise its power. I understood, as I believe the hon. member for Calgary North also did, from the minister's explanation in the committee that the common rank structure in the three service environment has been introduced chiefly for accounting purposes and that the bill does not contemplate, for example, that persons in the navy will be required to adopt an army rank. It would help the committee if the minister could explain the meaning of the phrase, "for the purposes of the Act only, " and indicate what is contemplated in regard to what the governor in council may prescribe by regulation.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, where the bill says that the ranks shall be ranks for purposes of the act it means that they shall be ranks for legal purposes. Authority is given to the governor in council to permit different rank designations for other purposes.

The point I made clear in the committee is that it is not intended to introduce changes in rank designations at present beyond those that would be reasonably acceptable to the men and women of the armed forces. The great majority of the air force, I think, prefer the new rank designations, though the navy prefers not to use them. I understood that we would proceed with great caution in this area which is not important enough to exacerbate feelings. Over a period of time we think there will be an evolution toward single rank designations for some ranks. That may never happen in the senior seagoing ranks but much will depend, as I said before, on what other countries in the world do and how they change their rank designations. We do not in the future intend to rush the implementing of this proposal. We shall only do it in a way that is acceptable to the majority of men and women in the armed forces.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister a question. Clause 4 reads in part:

Section 22 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"22. (1) For the purposes of this Act, the ranks of the officers and men of the Canadian Forces shall be as set out in Column I of the Schedule.

I rise to ask the minister about the honorary colonels in the military establishment of Canada, some of whom are concerned about the effect of this bill on their future rank and dress. They wonder what their authorized dress will be once this bill is adopted. Will the minister inform the committee how this bill will affect honorary colonels with respect to the rank they will hold and what form of dress will be required when this bill becomes law? I might say in raising this point that I could not help thinking of that honorary colonel, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who I am sure wonders what his rank and dress will be once the bill is adopted.

Mr. Hellyer: No change is anticipated in the positions of honorary colonels and no change is provided for in the bill. There will be no requirement for them to change their regimental dress uniforms and they will be

able to turn out in all the brilliant finery they wear at the present time.

Mr. Herridge: Does that mean that the Secretary of State for External Affairs, as an honorary colonel, will be permitted to wear his kilt?

• (3:00 p.m.)

Mr. Hellyer: Most certainly he will be allowed to continue wearing his kilt. This is an opportunity to pass on a piece of information I picked up at the Vimy dinner the other night and which may be of interest to the hon. gentleman. Whereas we propose that kilts will still be worn for ceremonial purposes we do not intend to reinstate the practice of having people go into battle wearing kilts as was done in the first world war. One of the veterans of Vimy told me the other night that he saw men going into battle in kilts with mustard gas going up their legs. I am all for reform, he said.

Mr. Herridge: I thank the minister for that information.

Mr. Forrestall: I thank the minister for his reassurance with regard to traditional naval ranks, that they will not disappear in the near future and, indeed, quite possibly will never disappear. If I have paraphrased what he said, I think the minister has now understood the point we have been trying to make for some months. It is a little difficult to accommodate a colonel on the bridge of a ship or in the engine room.

I should like to ask the minister whether he has given further thought to the making of what might be called intermediate appointments—private first class, private second class and so on up to corporal. The point was well brought out by two or three members of the committee whose questions appear in the proceedings of evidence No. 36. As to modes of address, there is no difficulty when we get to chief warrant officer. We call him "Chief". I suppose one would call a warrant officer "Mister". I am not sure what we would call a master. Has consideration been given to the classification of recruits? When does a private become a private first class? Has this been settled yet?

Mr. Hellyer: I do not think it has been settled but in the present pay schedule there is a differentiation which relates to qualifications. This is already in force. As far as I know there is no differentiation expressed in rank insignia as between the different levels of privates. As I understand it there is nothing to prevent the armed forces making recommendations that some sign be worn which would indicate the difference in qualifications. Indeed, they might wish to continue appointments such as lance corporals. I think this is within the power set out in the bill. It would be strictly up to the military. They could recommend what they thought was the most workable procedure.

Mr. Forrestall: Am I correct in assuming that today pay is tied purely to trade structure as opposed to rank?

Mr. Hellyer: It applies to both. There are different pay fields for the same rank. One applies to rank and one applies to particular qualifications of persons holding that rank.

Mr. Forrestall: Could the minister extend the treatment he has promised senior naval officers to other ranks in the navy and express the hope that they will never become corporals?

Mr. Hellyer: I do not want to try to outguess the future. The associate minister has just been travelling in Europe and he has found great interest in this reorganization in the capitals he has visited. This leads me to believe it is much better to watch and see how the history of the world develops than to make decisions which might not take account of the situation five or ten years from now.

Mr. Churchill: The minister has spoken of the interest which may be developing in other parts of the world. This could be interpreted in two ways—interest in commendation of an enterprise or the fascinated interest of horror when something is being done which is wrong. I do not accept the minister's inference that other countries are anxious to follow the lead which has been set by him.

Mr. Hellyer: Some of this interest is accompanied by commendation. If the hon. gentleman would like me to do so I might give him an indication on third reading of the interest which is being shown in other parts of the world.

Mr. Churchill: Why would the minister want me to accept any statement of his on that account when he has said it so often in the past and we have been given contrary evidence presented by people in other countries of the world? The minister may say that everybody is following our lead but experienced people elsewhere in the world say, no; they say this is a shocking thing to have done. The minister has no support from the United States, Australia, New Zealand or

Great Britain. What is he talking about? Nonsense.

Mr. Hellyer: I doubt that opinions on this subject would be unanimous in other countries any more than they are here. There are bound to be people in all countries who think as the hon. gentleman does.

Mr. Churchill: I hope there are not many more people in the world like the minister, who is a self-centred egotist.

Mr. McIntosh: Does the minister remember the answers given by his former advisers when they were asked whether they had held discussions with their counterparts in other military forces of the world? Does he remember what these military officers in the service of other governments told his advisers when asked what they thought of this plan to decimate the Canadian forces? I recall specifically what General Simonds said with reference to a conversation he had had with his opposite number in the United Kingdom. He said: "Those people thought we were nuts". The minister should also remember that when he first introduced this bill in the house we on this side said that if he were not careful we would be the laughingstock of the world as far as our armed forces are concerned.

The minister tried to create the impression that he was bringing in a new idea which would revolutionize the military thinking of the world. In my opinion that was a ridiculous claim. The concept of a single service is not something new, and the minister knows it perfectly well. It has been discussed and discarded by practically every country in the world. The proof is on record. The minister has no basis for saying that unification will be successful.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Once the minister demolishes our services it will take years for us to put them back into shape after we come into power in the very near future. The minister is costing the country millions and millions of dollars. Everything he has said in regard to unification has not come to pass. He said it would save the country money but the last estimates which he introduced increased the defence budget by $115 million. Indeed, one might say that those people who are getting the contract for the new uniforms are possibly the only ones who will benefit from unification. For the minister to say that other countries will profit from this Canadian experiment is ridiculous.

Clause agreed to: Yeas, 57; nays, 17.

On clause 5—*Embodiment.*

Mr. Churchill: Clause 5, Mr. Chairman, is very much like clause 2. It reads as follows:

(1) The services known before the coming into force of this part as the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force are embodied in the Canadian Forces.

That is followed by subclause (2). In the original bill which was discussed by the defence committee it read as follows:

The Canadian Forces continue, as a single service, the services known before the coming into force of this part as the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force.

I drew attention to the fact that this implied no change in the services and that the three well known services would continue. As a result the judge advocate general, had a second look at it and accepted suggestions advanced by opposition members because, being non-partisan, he does not recognize political distinctions. The clause was therefore reworded.

This clause draws attention once again to the obliteration of the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force, and in their place we are to have the Canadian Forces or the Canadian Armed Forces. Away goes the tradition of the armed forces of Canada which have had distinctive names ever since their inception. No longer can we speak with pride of the Royal Canadian Navy. The word "royal" is anathema to the government party and they want it struck out.

The Royal Canadian Air Force, which like the navy established a magnificent record in wartime, is no longer to be spoken of as such. The men who are flying the transport planes and so on are only to be members of the Canadian Armed Forces. There is to be no special distinction. The pride that was felt by members of the Royal Canadian Air Force will disappear. It was a great distinction to belong to the Royal Canadian Air Force. Quite properly that force received attention during the second world war. It and the navy were active before the army units were employed. The Royal Canadian Air Force fought in the Battle of Britain, the battle that saved civilization in this country. Yet this minister, supported by his colleagues and the Prime Minister, who to my mind is the guilty one in the whole exercise, is wiping out that great tradition.

My hon. friends opposite laugh. They want nothing to do with the past. They want to

wipe it out. We are expected to look forward to an uncertain future and make fun of everything that happened in the past, make fun of the people in the services who have made such a contribution to Canadian life.

Mr. Groos: That is not so.

Mr. Churchill: Just to show how careless this government is with regard to tradition and recognition of the sacrifices of the past, I wish the Minister of Veterans Affairs were here this afternoon, the man who bungled the Vimy Ridge—

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Churchill: You can shout "shame" but let me tell you the story. He is the man who bungled the Vimy Ridge remembrance ceremony both in Europe and here in Canada, the man who did not give recognition to a representative of the Canadian Corps Association, who did not provide for a representative of the Canadian Corps Association to travel to Vimy Ridge with the regular party and who neglected the representative of the Canadian Corps Association here at the cenotaph ceremony. Yet the Canadian Corps Association was organized after the first world war and represents those divisions that fought at Vimy Ridge as well as other units. It has had a long and honourable history. But that is part of our tradition and therefore we are expected to forget it. The Minister of Veterans Affairs, like his colleagues, pays no attention to the past. He is not interested. He won't be bothered. This is the attention he gave to the ceremonies in remembrance of that famous battle.

• (3:20 p.m.)

I wish the derisive laughter could be recorded in *Hansard*. Members of the Liberal party laugh at such remarks about the Royal Canadian Navy and the Royal Canadian Air Force. They jeer at anyone who speaks of the history of this country and its traditions. All these things are to be wiped out.

The Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre has the floor and I would invite members to make a little less noise during the time he is making his remarks.

Mr. Churchill: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I do not object to the derisive attention I receive from the Liberal members. I will not be discouraged from speaking in this chamber. I often stand up here to defend freedom of speech. I will seize every opportunity to make my voice heard here in opposition to what the Liberal party is doing to this country. This is all part of a pattern which we meet day after day and week after week. Whether it has to do with the word "royal" or the coat of arms, everything in Canada's tradition is to be set to one side, laughed at and derided. I believe the Secretary of State has something to say and I should like to hear what it is.

Miss LaMarsh: What I should like to say is that the hon. gentleman has dishonoured the house several times. He has produced a phony letter and now, having sat in this house and having heard the explanation that the government of which he was a part was the only one which had anything to do with changing the coat of arms or its depictions, he tries to use what one of his own colleagues calls "the big lie" to change the record.

Mr. Churchill: We are doing well, Mr. Chairman. About ten days ago the Minister of Transport entered this debate. As I said, I thought his contribution was the silliest I had ever heard. It has been exceeded now by the contribution of the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State will now rise in her place and withdraw the accusation that I introduced into this house a phony letter. Mr. Chairman, I call upon you to protect the privileges of hon. members.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: The minister has to prove her case or withdraw her remarks. On a question of privilege, I ask that that be done.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: Order. I consider the remark made by the Secretary of State to be in fairly strong language, but I am not convinced that it is altogether unparliamentary.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, perhaps you did not hear the accusation. The Secretary of State said that I had introduced into the House of Commons a phony letter. I say that is an accusation to the effect that I did something dishonest or dishonourable. I say that the Secretary of State must withdraw that reflection or prove it. That is my point of privilege, sir. What phony letter did I introduce in this chamber? In what respect was it phony? That is the proof I want.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, on the question of privilege may I say that the question is not as to the hon. members' motives. The words suggested either that he introduced it and knew it was phony or did this not knowing any better. I think it is entirely plausible from what we know of the hon. member that he introduced it out of sheer stupidity with no motives at all.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: Well, of course—

An hon. Member: An arrogant bunch.

Mr. Churchill: Yes, they certainly are arrogant. I have asked the Secretary of State to withdraw her accusation and I have also asked the Chairman on a question of privilege that it be withdrawn. If you, sir, do not wish to rule that this is a valid question of privilege then I must, under the circumstances, accept your silence. I have asked the Secretary of State to withdraw her remark and she will not do it. She knows she cannot prove that the letter was phony. She was afraid after making that statement and every member of the Liberal party is afraid. They are afraid of that issue.

On the second point which she raised with regard to the coat of arms—

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Can the hon. member prove that the letter was genuine?

Mr. Nesbitt: What letter?

Mr. Churchill: Under what circumstances do I have to bring proof in this house with regard to what is introduced in this house? Will the hon. member prove to us that the things he introduces are genuine? I have grave doubts about that, but I have never bothered to attempt to insult the hon. member by asking him to prove his innocence. I doubt that he would be able to do so, but I am not making that suggestion.

The hon. lady has suggested, in respect of the references to the alleged coat of arms appearing on the medallion for our school children, that there is something wrong with that and that we were the ones who introduced it. This morning I happened to read the brochure published by the present government in 1964 describing the coat of arms. The Secretary of State, of course, has not read this document. She does not get around to some of these things. But in this document there is a definition of the coat of arms. It is defined as consisting of a shield, a helmet with a mantling and supporting arms on either side and the inscription below. The coat of arms consists of the whole picture, not solely the shield. So once again the Secretary of State is wrong. Perhaps she now would like to leave the house and continue her correspondence elsewhere, because her contribution to this debate is of the same low quality as that of the Minister of Transport. It has added nothing. I should like to return to where I started at clause 5.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Churchill: If there should be any other diversionary remarks I will be prepared to receive them and deal with them appropriately. This clause wipes out the famous names, "Royal Canadian Navy", "Canadian Army", and "Royal Canadian Air Force". They now become a part of our past which according to the Liberal party should be forgotten. This is what I object to—forgetting the past.

An hon. Member: You never learn from the past.

Mr. Churchill: I wish the Liberal party would learn from the past. They received a very severe lessons in 1956, 1957 and 1958. I hope the Canadian public will give them the same severe lesson again in the near future.

An hon. Member: It is coming.

Mr. Churchill: They are attempting to destroy our traditions. The other night I read into the record from the writings of Terence Robertson certain words concerning the change in our national defence policy. He showed very clearly what is in the minds of the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence, namely Canadianize everything in this country. If anything has a hint of origin other than in Canada it is to be obliterated.

The article by Terence Robertson and the speech I made in respect of it the other night have not been answered. Who on that side of the house is going to answer that speech and the remarks of Terence Robertson? Silence prevails. Of course, that address was made at 9.30 at night. When one speaks at 9.30 at night in this house the things he says do not get into the press and rarely reach radio or television. Therefore, his words go unnoticed.

An hon. Member: It all depends who says it.

National Defence Act Amendment

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Churchill: I may repeat the speech at a more appropriate time when I can catch the ear of those who are in the gallery. Perhaps I could get someone on the minister's staff to issue a release based on my speech. It is not very complimentary to the minister, and of course that is not the type of release that goes out to all the newspapers of the country. But it would be worth while if what the Liberal party is attempting to do to the country was made public knowledge right across Canada. It is trying to change so many of our habits, our traditions and so much of our valued history. That is exactly what this government is attempting to do, and clause 5 of the bill shows so clearly what is to be wiped out, ignored and forgotten.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, I shall take only one minute to salve the conscience of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) who, it seems to me, is overly concerned with the removal of the word "royal". I suggest he exaggerates when he says that the intention is to remove anything reminiscent of the British crown, just to Canadianize everything brutally.

I shall tell him, as the saying goes in my part of the country, that he is more catholic than the Pope, or that he is more royalist than the Queen. And I would like to prove it to him by quoting the words of Her Majesty the Queen of England, for whom, incidentally, I have much respect; those words are taken from the speech she made during her last visit to Canada. Here is the exact quotation from her speech:

The role of the constitutional monarchy is to represent the democratic state, to sanction lawful authority,

As far as I am concerned, the lawful authority is the elected government, the one in office.

—to ensure the legality of the methods—

That is what is voted by parliament.

—and to guarantee that the will of the people will be carried out. I strongly wish—

I am still quoting the Queen.

—that none of my people will know coercion. To be happy, the citizens of a country must live in a climate of confidence and affection.

And note what the Queen said:

But a dynamic state must not be afraid to rethink its political philosophy. There is nothing surprising in the fact that an agreement drafted a hundred years ago does not necessarily meet all the problems of this day.

The Queen herself said that.

[Mr. Churchill.]

[*English*]

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman, just before clause 5 passes I should like to draw the attention of the committee to a remark made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre about the Minister of Veterans Affairs, namely, that the Minister of Veterans Affairs does not care about the traditions of Canada's fighting men. I would remind the hon. gentleman, although I think he knows it, that the Minister of Veterans Affairs was an officer in the R.C.A.F. during world war II, was shot down in battle and was a prisoner of war. Like the hon. gentleman opposite, he was a gallant gentleman and served his country well in battle. I think it is stretching the imagination to select this minister out of all others and say that he does not care about the traditions and past of the gallant men with whom he served. I do not think the hon. gentleman opposite would want that remark to stand on the record or would want to select this man, of all people in the House of Commons, and say that kind of thing about him. I give the hon. gentleman the opportunity to withdraw that statement from the record.

Mr. Churchill: I know all about the record of the Minister of Veterans Affairs, so what the hon. member has said is not news to me at all. I said nothing about the military record of the minister. I said that he fumbled and bumbled with regard to the Vimy Ridge recognition ceremonies in Europe and here in Canada. I leave that on the record and I put it on again. I will put it on a third time if the hon. member wants me to do so.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to re-enter the debate when I came into the chamber but I was impressed by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre fighting a battle with respect to clause 5, and fighting it alone. I want the committee and the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre to know that he does not have to fight this battle alone. Another reason for my rising at this time was that in my humble contribution to this debate last Monday I made the statement, as reported at page 14987 of *Hansard* that this government, which is in a minority position in the house, was doing these things to our armed forces for no better reason than political expediency. I quote my words as they appear at page 14987 of *Hansard.*

One of these expedients is the removal of Anglo-Saxon traditions from our services.

That remark was followed by a one word interjection by the Minister of National Defence. I point out to the committee that the

word was "Nonsense." In other words, the Minister of National Defence implied that my remark was nonsense.

Mr. Hellyer: So it was.

Mr. Alkenbrack: The remarks I made at that time are substantiated by clause 5 of this bill. Is clause 5 nonsense? I claim that clause 5 is the most injurious clause ever introduced into military legislation in the history of this country.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Alkenbrack: Yes.

Mr. Hellyer: Does my hon. friend think that the introduction of airplane engines into ships is designed to do away with Anglo-Saxon traditions? Does he think that bridge control on our ships is designed to do away with Anglo-Saxon traditions? Does he think that the pursuit of excellence is designed to do away with Anglo-Saxon traditions? I ask the hon. member to apply his common sense to this matter. We are trying to develop a force for the second half of the 20th century and the years ahead, not for the 1930's and the 1940's.

Mr. Forrestall: Surely you don't mean that, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Hellyer: We are taking a forward-looking approach and showing some leadership in the field of military organization which I am sure will be emulated later not just by Anglo-Saxon countries or Scandinavian countries but ultimately by countries all over the world. Does the hon. member feel this is in any way a reflection on our heritage? I am sure he would not want to give that impression.

Mr. Alkenbrack: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the minister when he is going to ask me a question.

Mr. Hellyer: I just asked you a question.

Mr. Alkenbrack: I am not surprised at the interjection of the minister. He interjects by asking about material things, the use of engines, the use of bridge control, and so on. I am not surprised that my remarks brought the minister to his feet because he now realizes the enormity of his error, especially with regard to clause 5 of this bill. The minister talks about material things such as engines. Is he referring to British engines? What the minister says may be the case, but I am not debating the merits of material things. I am talking about our Canadian traditions, excellent traditions which have been handed down to us. We have many good traditions which have been handed down by both our mother countries. However, I am talking about the very valuable Anglo-Saxon traditions and practices, especially those of a military and defence nature, which have been our inheritance and which we have used so successfully in the past. In clause 5 of this bill the Liberal party betrays those Anglo-Saxon traditions and influences.

You will notice, Mr. Chairman, that on the page opposite clause 5 the legal advisers have attempted to give an explanation of this amendment. I draw your attention to the fact that clause 5 (1) of the original bill read as follows:

> The Canadian forces continue, as a single service, the services known before becoming into force of this part as the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Apparently that did not suit the minister, the cabinet, the Prime Minister or the Liberal party's electoral interests. God only knows what electoral roads that party will follow in future, but at this time they are playing this game for all it is worth. They decided there must be a change in this regard.

Clause 5 as it appeared in the original bill was apparently not strong enough or definite enough in its pronouncement as to the dissolution of the three separate services. The government had to come up with what now appears on page 3 of the bill. This is obviously the death knell of the separate services and the names they have carried down through the past, thanks to the Anglo-Saxon influence.

I listened with interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Three Rivers and I should like to remind him—

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Let me remind the hon. member that the name "Three Rivers" does not even exist as the name of my constituency. It is "Trois-Rivières".

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, may I remind the hon. member that my grandfather was born in Three Rivers, Quebec.

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, to our delight the son does not live there.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, let me remind the hon. member that the son is now 90 years

of age and is living on Somerset Street here in Ottawa.

Mr. Mongrain: Let me apologize by saying that perhaps he only looks like his son. I change my reference to grandson.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Mr. Chairman, I offer my apology to the hon. member for Trois-Rivières for my mistake in respect of the name of his riding. He is correct; its name is "Trois-Rivières". I have visited the area and have great admiration for it because of its culture, geographic location and history.

The hon. member did refer to the crown and its affect on this situation. Let me remind him that the crown has guaranteed and is the guarantee that his and my rights shall be preserved. To me there is nothing personal in the crown. It represents the power that lies within that hon. member and each of us individually and collectively as citizens of Canada. The crown means nothing more than that to me. If we allow these guarantees to be eroded we as Canadians may no longer enjoy our inherited rights. We do not know what might happen in this country as a result of Liberal erosion of our rights. It might become subject to dictatorial power which will not be to the benefit of the Canadian people as a whole.

Mr. Mongrain: I rise on a question of privilege.

My noble friend has attempted to insinuate that I advocate the disappearance of the crown. I have the greatest respect for the crown, as I have said, but there are conditions which arise on occasion which the Queen understands better than some of my friends on that side of the house. She in her own words has said that occasionally changes must be made and that she will accept such changes as long as they are suggested by a legal government, democratically elected.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Is not this type of discussion in respect of the crown and Her Majesty entirely out of place during this debate?

Mr. Alkenbrack: That is the exact and succinct reason I referred to the crown rather than Her Majesty. To me the bearer of the crown is not at issue. The crown itself is significant of the guarantees made to Canada in the past which exist today. I was referring to the erosion of Anglo-Saxon traditions in our forces and I think I have made my point clear. The hoots of derision by those who care nothing about these traditions mean nothing to me.

[Mr. Cowan.]

I submit that the Anglo-Saxon traditions which have been carried on by the armed forces down through the years and centuries ought not to be allowed to be eroded. For that reason I should like to move that clause 5, which stamps out the individual names of the three branches of our armed services, the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army, and the Royal Canadian Air Force, be struck from the bill.

The Deputy Chairman: Let me remind the hon. member that our procedure requires that he submit his proposed amendment to the Chair in writing in the proper form. In any event, I suggest to the hon. member that his intended purpose will be served in another way. He may obtain the same result by voting against the adoption of this clause.

Mr. Pickersgill: According to our traditions we should have a copy of this amendment.

Mr. Forrestall: Why do hon. members want a copy of the amendment? They have not been interested in this debate up till now?

Mr. Alkenbrack: I submit that clause 5 should not be included in this bill. I will write out my proposed amendment and submit it to the Chair forthwith.

The Deputy Chairman: May I suggest to hon. members that the proper course of action would be to vote in favour or against the clause.

Mr. Churchill: We want to speak in reference to this clause.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, while the amendment is being prepared in the proper form, perhaps I as one member for Halifax would be remiss if I did not remind hon. members and Canadians as a whole of the history of the Royal Canadian Navy. Let me remind hon. members of the great contribution the Royal Canadian Navy has made to the Canadian way of life.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I have in front of me some notes prepared on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the R.C.N. which occurred some seven years ago in 1960. The Royal Canadian Navy came into being in 1910 as a result of the promulgation of the Naval Service Act on May 4 of that year. It was a natural step in our evolution and progress from the wilderness to full nationhood and the acceptance of our responsibility not only in terms of our own nation but in terms of the common safety of man everywhere.

The year 1910 was a fairly meaningful one for the R.C.N. I am not going back into the past but am simply giving a young man's appreciation of the contribution made by our naval service over the last 57 years and what this contribution has meant to the world. I should like to recall some dates to hon. members, such as June 1, June 3, June 19 and August 4. They were all milestones. On August 4, H.M.C.S. *Rainbow* was commissioned at Portsmouth. It may be recalled that H.M.C.S. *Rainbow* was the first ship to enter the Royal Canadian Navy. H.M.C.S. *Niobe* followed on September 6. Again, I am sure all hon. members are very much aware, or at least they should be, of the very gallant record of the *Niobe*.

In so far as things historical are concerned, a few minutes ago the minister told us that what he was doing was laying before the Canadian people the role of our armed forces for the next 50 years. He knows better than that, and I think we all know better than that. We are all aware of the fact that no matter what we do with our armed forces today they will be obsolete in three years' time, so rapid are the technological changes which are taking place. We are all aware of this.

I remind the minister that on October 1, 1910, Atlantic command was established—in other words, maritime command. There is nothing new about it at all because 57 years ago we had a maritime command. On October 13 of that same year dockyard and Admiralty House in Halifax were transferred to Canadian ownership. This was a very meaningful event in terms of the economic and social life of Atlantic Canada. These are very real things and are not passed over easily.

On November 8, still in that year, *Rainbow* arrived in Vancouver. These things should not be treated lightly. On May 4 of that year dockyard at Esquimalt was formally transferred. On May 18, 1914, the Royal Canadian Naval Vounteer Reserve was established by order in council and on August 4 war was declared. His Majesty's Canadian ships were placed under admiralty operational control. On that date *Rainbow* sailed to seek S.M.S. *Leipzig*, and to protect H.M. ships *Algerine* and *Shearwater*, other great Canadian names.

On August 5 two submarines built at Seattle for Chile and purchased by the premier of British Columbia were delivered to the R.C.N. off Trial Island. H.M.C.S. *Niobe* sailed from Halifax in September of that year to complete her complement at St. John's, Newfoundland. Again, we find evidence of the expansion of this Canadian contribution to the world. On November 1 the first four Canadian casualties were suffered by our Canadian naval service. H.M.S. *Good Hope* took part in this battle and was carrying four Canadians in her crew.

There are other dates that are very significant in terms of the Royal Canadian Navy. There was the explosion in 1917 at Halifax. In connection with all of these things the Royal Canadian Navy has been geared to give comfort to man in an hour of crisis or disaster. After the war, in 1920, naval demobilization was completed. In 1921 we got some more submarines for training purposes and our fleet began to grow. On June 16 the Royal Naval College disappeared and became something a little bit more identifiable with our own Canadian needs. In 1923 the Royal Canadian Naval Reserve and the Royal Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve were established.

On July 1, 1923, H.M.C.S. *Stadacona* was commissioned in Halifax. This was one of the most significant events that happened in the 218 years of history the city of Halifax has enjoyed. Its role has been immeasurable in many respects, Mr. Chairman. On March 1, 1928, we added more ships, the *Champlain* and the *Vancouver* which were to replace the old *Patriot* and the *Patrician*. On February 27, 1939, we lost H.M.C.S. *Thiepval* in Barkley Sound, British Columbia. On May 22, 1931, H.M.C.S. *Saguenay* was commissioned, followed by H.M.C.S. *Skeena*. These two ships are very significant in terms of our Canadian navy. These were the first two ships to be commissioned in Canada on the basis of Canadian design, engineering and talent.

On July 1, 1934, Commodore P. W. Nelles became our chief of naval staff, the first Canadian trained officer to receive this appointment. We see here the evolution and development which has taken 57 years to bring about. On July 26, 1936—I was four years old at the time—a royal guard from H.M.C.S. *Saguenay* paraded at Vimy Ridge for the unveiling of the Canadian memorial by King Edward VIII. This was the first royal guard provided by the R.C.N. for the person of the monarch. These are milestones in our development.

I see one hon. member opposite paying some attention and that is the chairman of the defence committee who must be very familiar with these facts. He must indeed feel some sadness in his heart today at what is taking place. I am not old fashioned. I am in favour of progress. These things all happened

long before I became an adult. However, I am very proud of them.

• (4:00 p.m.)

On May 31, 1939, King George VI presented his colour to the R.C.N. in Beacon Hill Park, Victoria, B.C. The hon. member is probably familiar with that and in all likelihood was present. Perhaps I should repeat it for him. On May 31, 1939, King George VI presented his colour to the R.C.N. in Beacon Hill Park, Victoria, B.C. We started the building of our fleet and the *Fraser* and *St. Laurent* sailed in those early months before the war. On September 1 the R.C.N., the R.C.N.R. and the R.C.N.V.R. were placed on active service. On September 10 Canada entered the war by declaring war against Germany. On September 16 convoy HX-1 sailed from Halifax to the United Kingdom; the local escort were H.M.C.S. *St. Laurent* and *Saguenay*. Again we have these two very famous names of ships that made a very great contribution to the war effort. On December 10 the first Canadian troop convoy sailed for Britain, escorted out of Halifax by H.M.C.S. *Ottawa, Restigouche, Fraser* and *St. Laurent*. These are the things we are throwing away, that we are casually brushing aside because they are not right for the next 50 years.

On May 24, 1940 H.M.C.S. *St. Laurent, Restigouche* and *Skeena* sailed to reinforce the naval defences of the British Isles in repayment, in part, of our great debt to the past that some people would like to brush aside casually.

There are a lot of significant dates in 1940, such as June 25 and July 31 These are dates which remain in the memories of a lot of people, and they are not ashamed of that fact. On September 24 of that year the *Annapolis, Columbia, Niagara, St. Clair, St. Croix* and *St. Francis* ex--U.S.N. destroyers which were part of the 50 or 60 given to the British naval strength at that time, were taken over, if I remember correctly, by the British and handed over in turn to the Canadian authorities to man.

On October 22, H.M.C.S. *Margaree* was lost in collision with the *Port Fairy* in the north Atlantic. On October 25 H.M.C.S. *Bras D'or* foundered in the St. Lawrence. On December 4 the *Prince Henry* was commissioned as an armed merchant cruiser, followed by the *Prince David* on December 28, again extending our capability to contribute to the defence of the free world.

On March 25, 1941 the *Otter* burned and sank in the approaches to Halifax harbour.

[Mr. Forrestall.]

On May 25 the first Canadian corvettes arrived in St. John's to establish the Newfoundland escort force. On June 14, three weeks later, the first group of ships of this Newfoundland escort force sailed to protect a convoy of merchant ships along that treacherous trek from Halifax and St. John's to the United Kingdom and up to Murmansk.

The war is full of records of glorious dates. Those who want to brush them aside casually are the less enriched for it. It is records such as these that build some spirit of Canadianism. Certainly the loss of them is not going to build that spirit. We should be able to look back with pride at a distinguishable force, an identifiable element of our armed forces. Men should be able to say that they joined a particular force, that this is their heritage, that it is what they are interested in. This, Mr. Chairman, is what we are throwing away. It is what we are being chided about. What is wrong with having some feeling of deep seated pride in our history?

I could go on for an hour reciting dates such as these. If we keep on as we are we will not have enough ships left to constitute a Royal Canadian Navy even if the government wanted to retain that force.

I have one or two other remarks to make on this particular clause before it passes. I understand that the amendment has now been withdrawn so I will be brief. My remarks have essentially to do with the point made earlier, by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, at which time he likened what is happening here to clause 2 and to the intent and content of clause 6, namely the compulsory aspect of this bill.

I am sure that the decision to do this is the minister's alone and nobody else's. No recourse has been had to any of the arguments that we advanced, either in committee or in this chamber during the last 12 or 14 months. Indeed at times it has been so frustrating that we wondered whether there was any point in continuing to ask questions, because in most instances it was extremely difficult to get straightforward and clear-cut answers.

In this connection I would remind the minister that compulsory action of this sort will not result in any meaningful implementation of his plans or this bill. The men will accept it because it is compulsory and they are loyal. Every officer and serving man is loyal first of all to Canada. But they have had no part in this whatever. Their best advice has been brushed aside. It may have been considered but we have not been told it has been duly

considered, even though we have inquired. The minister has simply gone ahead arbitrarily and said that this will be their new role, their new look. I suggest to the minister that what he will wind up with is a lot of men and officers who will work from nine till five or from eight till four and then return home and do some gardening.

In the old days a job was a job and a task was a task, and they were performed by men who had some pride in what they were doing. One day next week those days will disappear. There will be a quiet transition. But in the implementation of the regulations and in the meaningful day by day detail that is implied in this bill, the minister and those responsible for the furtherance of this measure will find a lot of disinterest on the part of the middle ranking officers and men. He will find a lot of nine to five men who will return home at the end of the working day and forget about their work until the following day.

I suggest to the minister that there is an opportunity for him here. We should not have to ask him to withdraw a clause such as this. We should not have to ask him to relax the compulsory aspects of this measure at all. The minister should see the dangers of such a provision. I am sorry that the amendment will not be introduced, because I would have supported it vigorously.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Alkenbrack: Mr. Chairman, I had undertaken to move an amendment to clause 5, which seeks to abolish the word "Royal" from "Royal Canadian Navy" and "Royal Canadian Air Force." The three forces, the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force are to become known as the Canadian Forces. The point is that as my amendment was not procedurally sound, I beg leave to withdraw it. I shall be content to vote against the clause at the appropriate time.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman, I have a few remarks to make on this clause. Having served in the Royal Canadian Navy for over four years and being still in the reserve ranks, I feel on this unhappy occasion that a few remarks might be in order.

It has been said that a nation with no past has no future. The real meaning of that expression is that a nation does not live by bread and resources alone, but that it builds its history on its traditions, and the events which have taken place to build it. To forget all these traditions and events is to forget that we have a country.

The government has done a quite commendable job through its parks branch in commemorating historical events, and with the centennial celebrations. For that reason I am puzzled why there is this attempt to remove some of our background and traditions, and particularly those of our armed services. It is particularly necessary for the armed services to have traditions. Traditions are not tangible; yet they build something known as morale, which the psychologists have a difficult time explaining. Without morale—and I expect the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) knows what I mean—you can have all the ships, aircraft and tanks in the world and they will not be worth their metal. If the people in the forces have no will to fight or have no fighting spirit, they may as well have no weapons.

Factors other than tradition contribute to fighting morale, of course; but one of the most important factors in building morale is tradition. That is why the services emphasize the background of a regiment, or of a ship particularly if the ship has been in service for some time. The navy is proud of naval traditions and naval battles; and the same applies to the air force. Psychologists tell us that people joining a service associate themselves with the traditions of their service. Those traditions are not to be let down. That is why one of the most important elements of fighting spirit is morale.

I hope the minister and some of his bright eyed, bushy tailed flannel suited computer experts remember my words. The minister may acquire fine equipment; he may obtain his answers from computers, but he will not have a fighting service that is fit even for peace keeping operations for the United Nations. I hope he bears that in mind.

Does the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) wish to ask a question?

Mr. Groos: No thank you.

Mr. Nesbitt: I am always interested in the hon. member's remarks.

Removing the word "Royal" from "Royal Canadian Navy" and "Royal Canadian Air Force" will not save the taxpayers any money. That will not accomplish anything except to destroy the morale that is necessary for any fighting force. One wonders why the minister and his colleagues are so dead set on abolishing the word "Royal". It has been suggested by other members that this is part of the government's plan to destroy Anglo-Saxon traditions. I do not know whether that

suggestion is correct, but it looks as if it may be. I hope it is not, but future events will show whether it is or whether it is not.

In conclusion may I say this: The Royal Canadian Navy has had a long and great tradition. The hon. member for Halifax dealt with it and I will not repeat what he said. For some of us in this house who see the navy being obliterated this is a sad moment. I never thought, during the years I served in that force, that I should see the day when this parliament would destroy it, wiping out its traditions and record. I am sorry to have to be here at this time, and I can only hope that the future may bring some changes.

Mr. Winch: My remarks on clause 5 will be brief. I spoke on this clause during the debate on second reading, in the defence committee hearings, and subsequently when the bill was referred back to the committee of the whole house. Because of the implications contained in clause 5 I find it necessary to emphasize something to which the minister has not paid proper attention.

Let me say at the outset that I have no objection basically, after planning, testing and readjustment, to integration culminating, in unification of the three services. If we do amalgamate our three services into a single service, surely no one will argue that in that single service we shall not have an army, a navy and an air force. I cannot conceive of any form of Canadian armed service not containing an army, a navy and an air force.

• (4:20 p.m.)

With integration going forward toward a single service, can the minister explain to me why, without destroying the single service concept, it is not possible to retain the Royal Canadian Navy as a unit of the single service, the Royal Canadian Air Force as a unit or element of the single service, and the Army as a unit or element of the single service? I have used those terms "unit" and "element" because they appear in clause 5.

To my way of thinking, preservation of the names "Royal Canadian Navy", "Royal Canadian Air Force" and "Army" would in no way prevent a reasonable minister arriving at an efficient realization of the principle of integration or its culmination in a single service. It would not even interfere with his computers.

Because the maintenance of a name means so much and because the traditions and the honours and victories mean so much, why is it necessary to be so adamant in saying that

the name will have to go. It does not make sense. It certainly is not common sense for a minister who wishes to get so complex and far-reaching a bill as this through the House of Commons.

I have been a member of the defence committee ever since it was established. As far as possible I have attended every meeting of that committee. I think it would be reasonable, just and commendable for the minister of defence to consider the principle which I am trying to espouse and expand. You can have your principle of a single service—but without wiping out and destroying that which means so much to thousands of our people who have served and who are serving in the navy, in the air force and in the army.

If the minister can assure me that the meaning of the words in the third line of the first subclause of clause 5, namely, "are embodied in the Canadian Forces" is that we can have, as units or elements, the Royal Canadian Navy, the Royal Canadian Air Force and the Army, I shall vote for clause 5. But if I do not receive this assurance I shall have no hesitation about voting against clause 5 as it is now.

Mr. McIntosh: I hope the minister will pay some heed to the plea just made by the hon. member for Vancouver East. However, I doubt very much whether notice will be taken of any plea made by a member of the opposition. This was clearly demonstrated a few minutes ago when we asked for the deletion of a certain word, "indefinite", which the judge advocate general said was inconsequential and without great importance. The plea made by the hon. member will almost certainly fall upon deaf ears. Indeed I doubt very much whether the minister even heard it.

We in the opposition refer to clause 5 as the compulsory transfer clause. When members of the present armed forces joined that force, they joined either the navy, the army or the air force. That was the agreement they made. The hon. member for Queens has referred to the contract entered into by members of the present forces. They joined a particular service. By a stroke of the pen this government intends to wipe out that service. I am not a lawyer so I am not prepared to say whether this clause is ultra vires. The passing of the bill will mean that those who have entered into a contract to serve in the army, the navy or the air force are now compelled to serve in

the Canadian Forces. This is in any case a change in terminology, but it may also be a change of a much more substantial kind.

We suggest that the minister should consider the feelings of those who do not wish to continue to serve as members of a Canadian armed force. The contract into which they entered has been terminated by the abolition of the three services: There is no contract in existence. I do not object to those now in the services volunteering to enter the new force, but I plead on behalf of those who feel they will no longer be able to serve Canada as army, naval or air force men.

I should like to place on record some of the questions which were asked on this subject by a member of the defence committee and the replies given to him, because I am sure this evidence will strengthen the point I am making. The judge advocate general is the witness being questioned, and I am quoting from pages 2082 and 2083 of Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence, No. 32.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): If I, as a serviceman in any one of the three services decided, when this act was about to come into force, that I would dispute the legality of it, under what law could I be proven guilty?

Mr. Lawson: Well, I suppose you would desert and you would be tried as a deserter.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): A deserter from what?

Mr. Lawson: From the Canadian forces.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): On what basis would I be considered a deserter, if I had signed to serve in, say, the army?

Mr. Lawson: Because parliament has said—

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): The army no longer exists, according to the law. How can I desert something that has been wiped out?

Mr. Lawson: But parliament has said that you are now a member of the new force; so as a member of the new force you are a deserter.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): But I have not said that, and my attestation papers do not show it. How can the law actually pin me down as having deserted something that parliament has wiped out?

Mr. Lawson: But parliament has provided that you are to be a member of the new force; and therefore—

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Arbitrarily?

Mr. Lawson: You continue serving the term of service that you have agreed to serve.

I wish to point out that the term these men agreed to serve was not a term in the Canadian Forces but in the army, the navy or the air force. Yet by a stroke of the pen clause 5 (1) declares:

The services known before the coming into force of this part as the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force, are embodied in the Canadian Forces.

• (4:30 p.m.)

The three services are wiped out. The contracts made by the members of the present forces were contracts to join one particular arm of the services. Therefore I say there is a cancellation of those contracts, and those who do not want to stay in the forces should be given some consideration, whether by being pensioned off or by the provision of some settlement, plus honourable discharge.

The question went on further:

With the specific force, the army? I have signed my attestation papers. I have joined the army. The army is wiped out under the bill. What legal method can the government adopt to prosecute me for deserting something that they have done away with?

The answer was:

The law is there. Parliament has enacted the law. Parliament has said that this is the law and you are bound by that law.

Then there was another question:

Yes; but my question is: how are they going to apply that law? This is the essence of the whole question. How are they going to apply the law to something that is no longer in existence?

The answer was:

Simply by the fact that if you leave you are a deserter. You can be charged with desertion and tried for desertion. You can raise the issue at your trial.

Another question was asked:

How could he be charged with desertion of something that he has not joined?

The answer was:

Because parliament has said he is in it.

I am not too sure parliament can say he is in it. This is a case that should be tried by the courts of our land, to see if we have the power to pass this particular clause of the bill breaking a contract unilaterally. In view of what has transpired previously, all this is very odd to me.

We were talking about regulations that were going to be introduced after the bill had passed. The judge advocate general told the committee he had formulated some regulations, or suggested some regulations to the minister. I would like to read a portion of them because I do not believe they coincide with his remarks about joining the new service. These two paragraphs of the suggested regulations are very interesting:

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 Navy shall

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

a more subtle thing than the exercise of voting power. If a democracy is to work properly, surely there should be regard for the traditions, the feelings and the points of view of all segments which together make up a country, if that country is to hold together at all.

There are millions of people in this country—I know there are a great many in my constituency and I am sure there are many others like them—who feel so keenly about this erosion of things which they hold dear, that their ability to make the contribution they would like to make toward a united Canada is lessened. I believe this fact is very sad, especially if what is taking place is unnecessary. In much of what is being done here I see actions which appear to be based completely on prejudice. I think it is most unfortunate, because I believe prejudice is unnecessary and need not exist.

I have the highest respect for Canadians of all racial backgrounds, but the fact that they come from different racial backgrounds or from different parts of the country does not give them the right to force me to submerge any recognition I may have of my origin, or the traditions which I hold dear. This does not give them that right any more than it gives them the right to wipe out my religious thoughts.

In this connection I should like to quote briefly from Edmund Burke:

> A nation is not an idea only of local extent and individual momentary aggregation, but it is an idea of continuity which extends in time as well as in numbers and in space.
>
> People will not look forward to posterity, who never look backward to their ancestors.

In this particular clause we are whittling away at one of our traditions. I do not care what the minister thinks about "Royal" or whether the majority in this house think this word should be eliminated from the names of our services. If they think it should be removed, they at least should have the courtesy and the tolerance to realize there are millions of Canadians and, although I have no way of knowing what the percentage is, I believe there are many thousands of Canadians in the services, who are proud of this tradition.

The traditional appellation "Royal" was not given lightly to military units. It is something special. It is given in recognition of duties performed and standards achieved. The Royal Canadian Air Force was not always the Royal Canadian Air Force. It received this part of its appellation by achievement. Even if I were one who approved of this unification, which I am not, I see no reason that in the process, by the back door, the government should take this opportunity to wipe out the designation "Royal" from all of our armed services. This has nothing to do with the efficiency of engines or the kind of electronic equipment which might be used; that is obvious.

I should like to ask the government to come clean, to put their cards on the table, and tell us what they are up to. What is the purpose? Do they think these traditions are divisive and bad because they happen to be associated with one ethnic group in this country, namely the Anglo-Saxons? Is that the reason? I do not agree with that reason. I do not think we should allow our traditions to be eroded or destroyed, regardless of their origin.

I am of Scottish origin. My ancestors fought against the constitutional authority of Britain almost as recently as the French Canadians did. I might say that for their pains they were treated much less kindly than were the ancestors of French Canadians. That, however, is aside from the point. I do not believe we should fall into the trap of judging conditions in the 20th century by the codes or ethics which existed in the 18th century. This of course is a means to stir up prejudices in the minds of those who either do not understand, or would stoop to compare the two situations. They are not comparable. I do plead with my colleagues who represent other parts of Canada to have regard for these things.

Mr. Churchill: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): These things are held dear. What I am about to say, I say without any political implications, without any attempt to cast reflection on the government or anything of that sort; and although I am speaking only for myself, I know there are others in my constituency who feel the same way. I confess that in the last four years I have considered very seriously moving from Canada and becoming a citizen of another country because I believe, if this trend should continue, that this would be the best course to take, although a difficult one, in the best interests of my children and my children's children.

This is an indication of how deeply some of us feel about the things I have been speaking of. I am not surprised that people who come from other parts of the country and from other backgrounds perhaps do not appreciate this. All I ask that you do is look into it. I do not care what methods you employ in looking

into it so long as you do it objectively. I would like some of the hon. members who this afternoon, sneered at some on this side of the house who spoke from the heart, although perhaps a little heatedly, to go down to our constituencies, mix with the people there, and find out what these people think. Let them do that, before they come to the conclusion that because of some magic, since they happened to get elected with a minority government, in some way this gives them a divine power to be dictators for the next four years or for the life of this parliament.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Democracy, in its proper sense, is not that sort of thing. Democracy is the temporary placing in the hands of those who acquire the confidence of the Canadian people the responsibility of carrying on government for a limited period of time, not just in the interest of those who support them but in the interest of all Canadians, paying proper attention, in proper balance, to the rights and aspirations of all Canadians. A dictatorship of a majority as Burke said—and I do not quote him verbatim—is no more righteous than a dictatorship of princes.

I would commend to hon. members that they read citation 18 on page 16 of Beauchesne's fourth edition of parliamentary rules and forms and citation 67 commencing on page 54. I think they are both particularly applicable to this situation. I shall quote only part of citation 67:

> A minority party may question ministers, may criticize but cannot control in the ordinary case a government with a reasonably large majority. There can be no control of the executive where the supporters in parliament are prepared without question to obey the leaders of their party—through the whips. All that the minority party—the opposition—can do without support from members of the majority party is to question, inquire and criticize, but whilst this does not amount to control it is an important method of checking abuses of power.
>
> With the support of a majority of members it would be possible for a cabinet to suspend the sitting of parliament, have the minority members arrested, withdraw the safeguards of liberty such as habeas corpus and freedom of speech, and to establish virtually a dictatorship.

The point is that in our system of government there is no magic power that protects the electorate against the folly of a government if they wish to indulge in such folly. care must be taken by the electorate when they do the electing, because once they elect a majority in parliament, that majority is all-powerful until the next election.

[Mr. MacLean (Queens).]

The only thing that keeps our democracy alive is the intangible sense of decency, honour and respect for the rights of others and a sense of tolerance among those people who form the majority. This is why I have objected most strenuously to this bill. I have done it, not with any thought of political advantage. I feel aggrieved when we are accused by the minister of holding up the passage of this bill, when he himself has refused to pay any attention to the representations that have been made with the deepest sincerity by hon. members in this and other sections of the house. The minister has brushed aside the advice of loyal, conscientious Canadians who happen to be serving officers and who have given their lives to a military career and the service of their country.

I think that when the minister accuses us of holding up this legislation and messing up the program of the government, he is akin to Kaiser Wilhelm accusing the Belgians of being perverse because they loused up his program to be in Paris before Christmas of 1914. When it is a question of what you believe to be right, objectively defended, you must let the chips fall where they may. It is under those terms that I have taken part in this debate.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes left to me I should like to make a few remarks concerning the advantage or disadvantage of abolishing the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the R.C.A.F. If the government and the Minister of National Defence had decided that the present army, air force and naval services and units, particularly the traditional and long standing units, were to be wiped out and completely abolished, I would have thought it would have been suggested that new units should be established to take their place.

Competition is involved in this question. Hon. members have spoken about morale in the services. This involves the question of competition, not only in the military area but in every facet of the life of man. The spice of life is competition, to be just a little better than someone else. That is the reason for living of most people. If you take this competition away from the armed services, if you take away their right to compete in military as well as non-military activities, I think you take away the life and soul of the armed services. Nothing is being substituted for the units that are now in existence. We are going to have a faceless, grey—or green—group of

people serving Canada, without any incentive to do a good job for this country on behalf of their particular unit.

Mr. Chairman, I see it is five o'clock. I presume you will want to rise so that we may proceed to private members hour.

The Chairman: I think that under the terms of the standing order there will be no private members hour today. I would invite the hon. member to continue.

Mr. Aiken: As I read the rules, Mr. Chairman, it is fairly clear that there is no provision for the suspension of private members hour. If I may at this point, I should like to state my reason for suggesting that the Chairman should rise and report progress. Standing order 15A sets out the procedures to be followed during a debate on allocation of time. Paragraphs 7, 8 and 9 of that standing order indicate a special concern for the one-day allocation of time on third reading of a bill, but no special treatment for second reading of a bill, or committee stage, which we are now in.

• (5:00 p.m.)

I should like to point out particularly that the provision for one day on third reading has been given special consideration in section 7. The one day is allotted for third reading on three or four conditions. It states:

> No motion made by a minister under sections (5) and (6) of this standing order shall provide for the allocation of a period of time less than two days for the second reading, two days for the committee stage, and one day for the third reading of any bill.

The specific provisions for third reading provide that it shall be called as the first item of business under government orders on a Monday, Tuesday, Thursday of Friday. Presumably that is so we will not have a short day such as Wednesday. It also provides that third reading shall have precedence over all other business on one of those days until the normal hour of adjournment.

Section 9 of this standing order provides that Mr. Speaker shall have the authority to extend the one day for third reading for four hours. Here again the rule obviously expresses some concern about the final day for the debate under the time allocation. It gives Mr. Speaker the opportunity to extend the time, if necessary. For the purposes of such an extension it would be necessary on a Friday, such as today, to carry the debate on third reading through until six o'clock because of the one hour notice requirement. However, that is not the situation today. We are now at the committee stage. There may be some ambiguity in respect of section 7, although I do not see any. This section specifically states in the sixth line, "for the third reading of the bill".

The section then makes specific provision for the one day debate on third reading. In the present circumstances I would say that the words "it shall have precedence over all other business until the time of adjournment on that day" has reference to third reading. If there is any doubt in this regard let me remind hon. members that the private members hour is considered somewhat sacrosanct. It has never been set aside unless provided for by a specific rule. I do not think I need enlarge on that point, or stress it.

We as members have been very jealous of our private members hour. Under some provisions that hour can be set aside. Standing order 16 makes such a provision, but excepts debates for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, or for a debate on allocation of time. In that regard private members hour cannot be suspended. The reference there to the allocation of time has nothing to do with this debate, but a debate such as we had yesterday. I thought we were a little bit off base yesterday in having a private members hour.

In any event there are provisions such as those contained in standing order 15 (4) and (5) which provide for the suspension of private members hour under certain conditions. Standing order 38 (2) provides that the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne shall have precedence over private members hour. There is nothing in any standing order which says that private members hour shall be suspended without specific provision for such suspension. I submit there is no provision for the suspension of private members hour at this stage of the debate. For that reason I think you, Mr. Chairman, should rise and report progress, if you believe there has been any, allowing Mr. Speaker to assume the chair during the private members hour.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, there is a very important point which concerns us here in this regard. I was a little surprised that we did not immediately proceed to consideration of private members' business. I am not aware of any circumstances which would allow the government to encroach upon private members' time without a formal rule, or without a motion to suspend private members hours.

Sometimes this is done by agreement. Standing order 15 (3) specifically sets out the order of business for Friday. There is provision there that the hour from five to six o'clock shall be private members hour for the consideration of private bills and public bills.

Nothing has transpired in this house to indicate that private members hour shall be suspended, or that private members shall be deprived of their time.

Quite frequently during this session the government has made a request to abrogate the private members right in respect of this hour. Quite frequently that request has been granted. On several occasions I have protested because I think private members are being careless in the protection of their rights. I am afraid that if they yield too frequently the government will take over this time for the consideration of government business.

The order paper indicates there are 175 public bills standing in the names of private members. Some of those bills have not been reached during this lengthy session while others have been up for discussion and adjourned. Very frequently we talk about obtaining decisions in respect of these bills. If private members hour is to be discontinued in order to consider government business there will be an infringement on the rights of private members. This will prevent a decision in respect of important bills, important not only to the members who introduced them, but also to the country.

• (5:10 p.m.)

As pointed out very clearly by the hon. member who has just spoken, the order under which we have been operating up to five o'clock says nothing specifically about suspending private members hour. I doubt very much if any government would take away private members time without consent, in the one instance, or without specifically mentioning that fact in a motion. I know that from time to time when we have reached a point within days or weeks of concluding a session, we have had motions put forward to the effect that private members hours will be eliminated in order that government business may be considered. This, however, is done clearly and openly and the motion is subject to debate and vote.

In this particular instance, working under this new rule which the government devised, there is nothing to indicate that private members hour would be eliminated on any day. If the government had intended to eliminate private members hour when we were in this closure operation, that would have been so specified. It is not so specified here. The other point that was made by the hon. member who preceded me was that in the section which has been quoted, except for the first sentence, it applies to third reading proceedings. I do not see there that private members business is struck out. Perhaps this is the result of careless drafting, but in all other sections of this order, such as subsection 6, there is an indication that Mr. Speaker shall, at fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for government business, interrupt the proceedings and forthwith put the question.

I would think, by inference, that what is intended is that this is government time that is being used for this special purpose and not private members time. I am sure that the government never intended to encroach so seriously on private members hour. I do not want to encroach any longer on private members hour. I am here to defend the rights of private members. I hope that you will find it in your power, Mr. Chairman, to rule that we should now proceed immediately to private members business, which will be public bills.

Mr. Winch: I rise, Mr. Chairman, strictly in search of information. I find myself completely stumped. It is my understanding that under a decision which was reached by a majority vote in the House of Commons, for every five minutes we lose in a procedural discussion we are losing five minutes of the time permitted for discussion of the 65 clauses of a most important bill. We have already lost sixteen minutes of time allotted for the discussion of this bill. May I ask whether it would not be possible to proceed so that we spend time on this bill and not lose a second, because we require every second—I think this is the position of the Conservatives—so that we might discuss the 65 clauses.

Mr. Olson: I believe, Mr. Chairman, you will have to look at standing order 15A, paragraph 7. The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka has already drawn this to your attention. There is a sentence which commences:

> Such an order having been called on any Monday, Tuesday, Thursday or Friday, it shall have precedence over all other business until the time of adjournment on that day, unless it is disposed of earlier.

I think what you will have to do, Mr. Chairman, is decide whether that sentence relates to the first or last part of paragraph 7. I suggest to you that it relates only to

the second part because it says, "such an order". Prior to that only place the word "order" is used is the following:

> For the purposes of this section, third reading shall be deemed to have been considered for one day provided the order for third reading is called—

I believe, Mr. Chairman, this is the place to which that word is related. I have to agree therefore with the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka and, infrequently but at least on this occasion, with the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, when they suggest there is no provision here for dispensing with private members hour. I have to agree also with them when they point out that the motion moved by the Minister of Transport, as reported at page 15119 of *Hansard* for April 20, makes no provision for dispensing with private members hour. Of course, private members hour would be suspended anyway if we were on third reading, where the order is given as has been pointed out. I suggest therefore there is no provision in standing order 15A to dispense with private members hour on any day except the day third reading is being considered, which we presume will be next Tuesday.

The Chairman: I should like to point out to hon. members who have taken part in the discussion of this point of order that the Chairman is confused, too. On January 21, 1964, when these provisional standing orders were agreed to, standing order 15A was included. I do not believe members of the committee will be surprised if I say that some days ago, when there was some inclination that standing order 15A would be invoked, the Chair spent considerable time studying 15A and its subclauses to decide exactly what was meant in different situations.

Standing order 16, which deals with private members business, in my view is the standing order which governs the ordinary practice with regard to private members business. I suggest to the committee that at the moment we are under a special order. I must admit that I cannot quite agree with the interpretation given to paragraph 7 of standing order 15A by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre or the hon. member for Medicine Hat.

I read paragraph 7 in this way:

> No motion made by a minister under sections (5) and (6) of this standing order shall provide for the allocation of a period of time less than two days from the second reading, two days for the committee stage, and one day for the third reading of any bill.

Since second reading has been disposed of, that part of the rule does not apply. I continue:

> For the purposes of this section, third reading shall be deemed to have been considered for one day provided the order for third reading is called as the first item under government orders on a Monday, Tuesday, Thursday or Friday, and provided it is continued, if necessary, until the normal time of adjournment on any such day.

Now I come to the phrase "such order". I think it is the duty of the Chair to interpret what this phrase "such order" means. It is the contention of the Chair that this phrase "such order" applies to the first part of paragraph 7 and not the second part, which refers to third reading. If this were not so, then I do not know how you would interpret the last sentence in this paragraph which reads:

> Under any other circumstances, a total of five hours shall be deemed to be the eqiuvalent of one sitting day.

It is my view that the phrase "such order" applies to the whole operation of this particular order under which we are operating and would indeed apply to second reading, to the committee of the whole stage as well as to third reading. I suggest the order having been called on a Monday, Tuesday, Thursday or Friday, it would have precedence over all other business until the time of adjournment of that day, unless disposed of earlier. I say again to members of the committee, there is a great deal of confusion in the mind of the chairman, so I quite understand the possibility of there being some misunderstanding on the part of hon. members.

However, it is the duty of the Chair to make a ruling in this matter, and my ruling will have to be that this particular part of paragraph 7 applies to the operation of standing order 15A in the committee of the whole stage. It is therefore my view that private members hour for today will be suspended.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether I might ask your indulgence to rule also on standing order 16, which provides that the proceedings on private members business shall not be suspended by virtue of the operation of provisions of standing orders relating to the allocation of time to certain debates.

In the first instance I accepted the fact that this probably referred to the debate we had yesterday on allocation of time; but there again standing order 16 says that the proceedings on private members business shall not be suspended in relation to the allocation of time to certain debates. I raise this as a second

point and I think we might have the advantage of your ruling at the same time on another matter that is equally difficult.

• (5:20 p.m.)

The Chairman: I recognize the validity of the argument that the hon. member presents. I am sure that he too will recognize the difficult position in which the Chair happens to find itself. Standing order 16 applies to the general operations of the house and standing order 15A applies to a special case. My problem is to give the proper weight either to the provisions of standing order 16 or to the provisions of paragraph 7 of standing order 15A.

There is a conflict here; I do not think there is any doubt about that. I have recognized this conflict for three or four days now, but I have to make up my mind where I should place the weight. I place the weight on standing order 15A, paragraph 7, and it is my opinion that at this time I would have to decide that this standing order does suspend private members hour. I believe the debate on the committee stage of Bill No. C-243 should continue at this time.

Mr. Churchill: Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, because of the seriousness of this question and the apparent infringement, to my mind, on private members time, it is with regret that I will have to appeal your ruling.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair, and the chairman of the committee made the following report:

Mr. Speaker, the question is an appeal from a decision of the chairman of the committee of the whole. In the committee of the whole the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka raised a point of order to the effect that the hour for the consideration of private members' business must be proceeded with at 5 o'clock.

Using section 7 of standing order 15A, after having given due consideration to the conflict between the provisions in this section and those in standing order 16, the Chairman ruled that the committee of the whole on Bill C-243 should continue, whereupon the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre pursuant to standing order 59 (4) appealed to Mr. Speaker from the decision of the Chairman.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I make no apology for raising the point of order, despite the comment I hear from hon. members on the other side and to my left. We operate under rules, and when there is a conflict between rules we are entitled to raise the matter. I thought we were wrong yesterday; I was doubtful when debating the allocation of time motion, in view of the provisions of standing order 16, whether our procedure in going on with the private members hour yesterday was correct.

Today a similar question arose, but today it was felt that we should not go on with private members hour.

Briefly, it seems that there is a conflict between provisional standing order 15A and provisional standing order 16. In considering the point, the Chairman acknowledged that really there are two conflicts one being within provisional standing order 15A(7).

To clarify the matter perhaps I ought to say this. Sections 7, 8 and 9 of standing order 15A refer specifically to the third day of debate after an allocation of time has been made. That is, they refer to the day of the third reading. I emphasize that third reading is particularly dealt with in those three sections.

Section 7 makes specific statements. First, that the order for third reading shall only be called on a Monday, Tuesday, Thursday or Friday; second, that the order must be the first item of business; third, that the debate shall continue until the normal time of adjournment, and fourth, that such an order shall have precedence over all other items of business. The point at issue within section 7 arises from the words beginning at the seventh line from the bottom, which are:

Such an order having been called on any Monday, Tuesday, Thursday or Friday—

I submit it is clear that those words refer to an order for third reading, because third reading is dealt with after the first sentence of the standing order. I submit that everything appearing after the first seven lines, which constitute the first sentence, refers only to third reading. This contention is strengthened because closer to the beginning of the section we find that the language says that third reading shall be called as the first item of business on a Monday, Tuesday, Thursday or Friday, and farther on in that section the words are, "Such an order having been called on any Monday, Tuesday, Thursday or Friday," and so on.

Section 9 of the standing order says that Mr. Speaker shall have the authority to extend the sitting of the final day of debate for four hours. I presume that that is to make certain that the last day is as full and as complete as possible. There is no argument about any reference to the third day. Also it is clear that we are now in the committee

stage, and this brings up another point. The second point, or putting it more correctly, the second difficulty on which the Chairman ruled had to do with standing order 16 which says that private members' business shall continue. Quoting the relevant parts of standing order 16 we find these words:

> The proceedings on private members' business, . . . shall not be suspended by virtue of the operation of the provisions of standing orders relating to the adjournment of the house . . .
> or to the allocation of time to certain debates.

It is quite possible that that wording refers to the allocation of time to certain debates, or to the discussion about that allocation of time. That wording may also refer, and probably does refer, to all debates taking place during the allocation of time, and herein arises the uncertainty.

My final point is this. It is clear, I submit, that the private members hour should not be interrupted or dispensed with unless there are specific provisions to that effect in the standing orders. Nothing in the standing orders says that the private members hour under these circumstances shall be dispensed with, and there was nothing in the order of the house allocating time which said that the private members hour should be dispensed with. Under those circumstances we ought to proceed with private members' business.

I am not raising my argument to delay the house. Should Your Honour decide that private members' business is not to be proceeded with, I shall continue with my remarks that were interrupted at 5 p.m. Surely, however, if we have rules, then we ought to know what the effects of those rules are.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): It would never occur to Your Honour, because of your obvious fairness, that this discussion was designed to delay the debate on the unification bill. Remarks to that effect were made from the government side of the house, and they might leave the wrong impression in Your Honour's mind.

Mr. Hellyer: Do not smile when you say that.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Mr. Churchill: The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka in his closing remarks has shown that there is here an abrogation of private members' time. The submission made earlier to the Chairman was on that point. The government does not infringe on the time of private members unless specifically by motion or by taking other procedure in accordance with the rules. I recall that in a number of years when we were reaching the end of the session and attempting to conclude the business of the house we found it necessary to eliminate the private members hour. This was always done by a motion to that effect. The ambiguity which is contained in the rule under which we are operating led us to draw this matter to the attention of the Chairman and now to Your Honour's attention.

I have put in a plea earlier for the rights of private members who have frequently given up their time during the course of this session, and who should not be asked to do so again because there are 175 bills in the names of private members set down for the consideration of this house. This constitutes an additional contribution of mine to the very good argument presented by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say only a few words and I am afraid that what I say will not be of great assistance to Your Honour. It is obvious that you have a very difficult problem on your hands.

If I can recall our discussions about this rule, rule 15A, when we were adopting it a couple of years ago, the intention was that a day on third reading would be the same as a day on second reading or in committee of the whole house. But I am bound to say, as one reads carefully the exact words of that standing order as we have passed it and of the other standing orders, that the case presented by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka and by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) is quite strong.

I will go further and cite another point in their favour. In *Votes and Proceedings* of Monday, March 20, there appears the second report of the special committee on procedure. One of the recommendations made in that report is that standing order 15(4) be amended. The purpose of amending standing order 15(4) was to put together in one place the instances where the private members hour may be suspended.

The report is interesting to read in the present context and it suggests that even in the committee on procedure we are a bit confused on this point. On page 1552 of *Votes*

and Proceedings for March 20, 1967, we find this recommendation:

> That Standing Order 15(4) be consequentially amended on a provisional basis to read as follows:
> 15(4) On any Monday, Tuesday or Thursday, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of this Standing Order, the consideration of private members' business shall be suspended when an order for resuming the address debate or the budget debate, an order for a motion 'That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair' for the House to go into committee of supply, or an order to go into committee of the whole on a money resolution, pursuant to standing order 61A, is set down as the first item of government business in any such sitting.

I hope no one will accuse me of revealing what has gone on in the special committee on procedure if I say that in presenting this proposal we were not trying to present anything new; we were merely trying to put in one place the various orders relating to the suspension of the private members hour. I submit that this also is on the side of the position taken by the two members of the Conservative party who have spoken.

The statement made by the chairman of the committee of the whole house to the effect that the phrase about third reading in standing order 15A should be treated parenthetically also carries weight. The phrase at the end of that section, "such an order", does seem capable of being applied to the whole of that section of the standing order. We all sympathized with the chairman when he admitted that he was confused. I do not think he needed to apologize for that. I think the wording of this standing order leaves a good deal to be desired.

There are times when we call upon Your Honour to overrule a ruling made by the chairman of a committee of the whole house. You have demonstrated your impartiality and the chairman has demonstrated his largeness of soul by the fact that on one occasion this did happen and a chairman's decision was overruled. Obviously this should not happen very often. I wonder whether in these circumstances—because, after all, there is not much time left either for a private members hour or for the discussion of the defence bill, —whether it would not be better for Your Honour to rule that the special committee on procedure should redraft the whole of this standing order. It seems to me there is nothing to be gained by ruling either way at this time.

There are arguments on both sides but if one looks at the precise wording before us there is a great deal to be said for the position taken by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre and the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka. In any case I offer the suggestion that Your Honour reserve your decision until the special committee on procedure has had a proper chance to look at this matter more thoroughly.

[Mr. Knowles.]

Mr. L. M. Brand (Saskatoon): There are just one or two other points which I should like to bring to Your Honour's attention in view of the ruling made by the chairman of committees that private members hour should have preference over all other business until the time of adjournment.

I would refer Your Honour to page 2 of today's *Routine Proceedings* where the order of business for Friday is stated as follows: oral questions, government orders, questions, public bills and private bills. Today we have already considered questions, oral questions and government orders. So we have already carried on some of the order of business, and it would seem to me that if it is the ruling of the Chair that private members hour should not take precedence, then immediately upon our deliberations beginning this afternoon we should have gone on to the consideration of this particular bill in committee of the whole.

Since we have not done so, it would appear to me we should continue normally in accordance with the provisions of the standing order which is in effect, and consider that we should have proceeded at five o'clock to consideration of private members business.

• (5:50 p.m.)

I would point out, in view of the fact that Your Honour may decide to uphold the ruling of the chairman of committees, that we have already spent five hours on the consideration, according to this, and therefore suggest there is valid reason for not carrying it on into private members hour at five o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: I thank hon. members for their helpful comments. I think I should repeat the comments I have made previously when similar circumstances have arisen, that is, when the Speaker has been asked to review a decision reached by the chairman of committees. There is a fundamental difficulty about this in that the chairman of the committee is not only chairman of the committee but is also Deputy Speaker of the house and this, I submit to hon. members, complicates the situation when it comes before the person who occupies my position to review or reconsider a decision reached by the Chairman.

On a previous occasion I have suggested that that particular provisional standing order should be reviewed, and that an appeal or a questioning of the decision by the Chairman of the committee should come to the Speaker, not by way of appeal but perhaps by way of trial de novo, or by way of stated case; certainly not by way of appeal. This having been said, I have looked at the standing order which is the source of our difficulty and I am in full agreement with the suggestion made by the chairman of the committee, wholly supported by all members, that there is a confusion, and ambiguity and uncertainty in the interpretation of the relevant provisional standing order, No. 15A.

The question of course is to determine whether the third sentence of provisional standing order 15A (7) refers to the second sentence or refers to the first one, when we read:

> Such an order having been called on any Monday, Tuesday, Thursday or Friday—

The question is whether the order referred to there is the order on third reading. The main difficulty comes from the obvious conflict between this provisional standing order and standing order 16 which specifies the cases where private members hour may be suspended. Of course standing order 16 refers not at all to this particular circumstance. There is no reference to the case where an item of business is under consideration under a time allocation order.

Having been a member of the special committee of the house reviewing these standing orders a couple of years ago, I am willing to plead guilty, along with other members who were concerned with this review, to perhaps not having gone far enough. I cannot agree with the suggestion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) that perhaps this was intentional, because certainly if we accept that there would be a suspension of private members' business when we are considering the third reading stage of a bill, then if we are to follow the argument made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken), that exception would have been provided in standing order 16; but it was not.

And yet if we were considering the third reading stage of an item of business under a time allocation order, on a day when we have private members' business, I wonder if anyone should argue that we should not suspend the private members hour because it is not specified in standing order 16. Obviously there is a mistake either in the drafting of provisional standing order 15A or in the reconsideration that should have been made of standing order 16.

I have every possible sympathy with the suggestion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre that because of this uncertainty we should leave the matter in a state of suspended animation. There are four minutes left this afternoon and I can say very honestly to hon. members that if I were to make a ruling, in view of the uncertainty of the situation I would certainly rule to support the decision of the Chairman of the committee, because there is as much logic to support his view as there is logic to support the other view; and when in doubt I think the Chair should not overrule the decision of his colleague, the chairman of the committee of the whole.

For this reason, and in view of the fact that there are only three minutes left before we adjourn at six o'clock, I would suggest to hon. members that we either go back to private members business for a little while, for the next two minutes, or that we call it six o'clock. But of course we would have to resume in any event in committee of the whole, and this exercise will take a short while, which will take us to the time of adjournment. We will suggest in a formal way to the special committee on procedure that it review at the first opportunity the provisions of provisional standing order 15A in conjunction with the provisions of standing order 16.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

The house resumed consideration in committee of Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof—Mr. Hellyer—Mr. Batten in the chair.

On clause 5—*Embodiment.*

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might call it six o'clock. I am prepared to go ahead with my remarks if necessary. I had two minutes before five o'clock, and it is now one minute before six o'clock.

The Chairman: Is the committee agreed to call it six o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Progress reported.

Business of the House

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: I realize, Mr. Speaker, that we are working under an allocation of time order, but there is nothing in the rules which says that could not be changed or modified; so perhaps the leader of the house has some different business to announce for Monday.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, for Monday we propose submitting to the house for consideration item No. 107 on government orders on the order paper, and if it is concluded during the day, then item 134.

Mr. Churchill: What about unemployment insurance and the dairy industry?

Mr. Hellyer: On Wednesday and Friday.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, April 24, 1967

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

TABLING OF STATEMENT RESPECTING COMMONWEALTH WAR GRAVES COMMISSION

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the house I should like to table a statement I have issued on behalf of the government in connection with the fiftieth anniversary of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

YOUTH COMMISSION PERSONNEL, SAINT JOHN

Question No. 2,731—**Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert):**

What are the names of the personnel working in the greater Saint John area for the Canada youth commission and what are their specific duties?

Mr. John R. Matheson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): I am informed by the Company of Young Canadians as follows: Mr. and Mrs. G. Fatels and Miss S. Williamson are the Company of Young Canadians' volunteers working in Saint John, N.B. They were requested by the Saint John urban redevelopment office to assist in the development of the north end - west side urban renewal scheme, and have been working with the residents of that area in studying the redevelopment opportunities available in that program.

CENTENNIAL COMMEMORATION OF LOUIS RIEL

Question No. 2,739—**Mr. Schreyer:**

1. Has the government of Canada or the Canadian centennial commission any plans to arrange for the commemoration of Louis Riel during centennial year?

2. If so, what is the nature of these plans or arrangements?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the centennial commission as follows: The confederation train and caravans, in sections dealing with western Canada (1869) (1885) commemorate Mr. Louis Riel.

Under Festival Canada, a program of the centennial commission, an opera entitled "Riel" has been commissioned. The libretto is by Mr. Mavor Moore and the music by Mr. Harry Somers.

TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT TAKEOVER OF ROCKCLIFFE AIR STATION

Question No. 2,744—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Is it the intention of the Department of Transport to take over the airfield and all or part of its facilities at the Rockcliffe air station as of April 1, 1967?

2. If so, have the Canadian armed forces agreed to this turnover, and what facilities are to be included?

3. Are steps being taken to locate storage space for goods and material now stored in the two hangars located on the northern boundary of the air station so that these may be vacated and turned over without delay to the Department of Transport?

4. Is there existing storage space in the so-called ready hangars located at the extreme southeast section of the Uplands airport where such goods and material could be stored?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Departments of Transport and National Defence as follows: 1. It is the intention of the Department of Transport to take over the airport proper and one associated building at the Rockcliffe air station, to be operated on a temporary basis, day VFR conditions, and at minimal licenceable standards for the convenience of light local and itinerant aircraft. Further consideration will be given to its continued operation if the needs of the aviation industry warrant. The takeover is to be effective as soon after April 1, 1967, as these takeover arrangements can be completed.

2. The Department of National Defence proposed this takeover, which includes the land and runway complex comprising the airfield and one building.

3. Only one of the two hangars on the northern boundary is being vacated.

4. No.

Questions

CENTENNIAL COMMISSION GRANT FOR DINNER HONOURING GEORGE BROWN

Question No. 2,785—**Mr. Hales:**

1. Did the centennial commission make a grant towards the dinner recently held in Toronto in honour of George Brown, one of the Fathers of Confederation?

2. For what amount was the grant?

3. By whom was the grant requested?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the centennial commission as follows: 1. Yes.

2. $2,000.

3. Mr. Ralph Cowan, M.P., on behalf of the centennial dinner committee, which dinner was organized by a group of businessmen and editors from Toronto.

CONFEDERATION CENTRE, CHARLOTTETOWN —CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Question No. 2,816—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. What amounts have been paid by the government of Canada towards the operational and maintenance costs of the Confederation centre, Charlottetown?

2. What was the date of such payments?

3. Has an undertaking been given by the government to contribute an annual contribution for such purposes and, if so, what is the amount?

4. Is this amount the equivalent of the total operating and maintenance costs and, if not, what is the difference?

5. What contributions has the Canada Council made towards support of activities presented in the Confederation centre?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by my department and by the Canada Council as follows: 1 and 2.

Amount	Date of cheque
$ 45,000.00	April 3, 1967
25,000.00	December 5, 1966
100,000.00	November 2, 1966
25,000.00	September 1966
25,000.00	August 1966
25,000.00	May 1966
22,500.00	January 1966
87,500.00	July 1965
40,000.00	May 7, 1965
$395,000.00	

3. Yes, to the extent of one half of the total operating and maintenance cost but not to exceed $175,000 each year.

4. Answered by number 3.

5. Apart from some $36,500 provided toward the architectural competition for the design of the centre, the council has provided some $173,000 toward the support of activities at the centre, as follows: $10,000 in the year 1964-65, $62,937 in 1965-66 and $100,800 in 1966-67.

[Miss LaMarsh.]

ARDA PROJECT No. 7030

Question No. 2,838—**Mr. Schreyer:**

Regarding the answer on April 5 to question No. 2,789, what was the cost per major item that was involved in the $20,000 expenditure for ARDA project No. 7030?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry and Rural Development): The data provided by the province of Manitoba when the project was proposed were:

	Total cost	Federal share
1. Provincial staff analyst	$10,000	$ 5,000
2. Other staff consultant	6,000	3,000
3. Material and supplies	2,000	1,000
4. Report (The People of Manitoba)	2,000	1,000
Total cost	$20,000	$10,000

DELAY IN AIR CANADA FLIGHT, MONTREAL-WINNIPEG

Question No. 2,843—**Mr. Jorgenson:**

1. Was the three hour delay of the Air Canada DC-9 aircraft flight of March 18, 1967, from Montreal to Winnipeg via Ottawa, in any way related to insufficient facilities or staff at Dorval?

2. Was the aircraft out of service time in any way related to difficulties arising from the recent implementation of midnight shift requirements?

3. How many hours was the aircraft available at the overhaul base prior to its being released as airworthy on its regular service that morning?

4. What were the specific reasons for the three hour departure delay?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Air Canada advises as follows: 1. No.

2. No.

3 and 4. The aircraft which it had been planned to use for this flight remained overnight at the Montreal station. A fault existed in the electrical system. Component replacement did not rectify the problem. The plan was revised to call up an aircraft which was undergoing a schedule check at the maintenance base. This aircraft had arrived at the base at 2400 hours and was released as serviceable following the check at 0845. Following servicing the flight departed Montreal at 0945 operating two hours 45 minutes late.

*STAMP COMMEMORATING SIR CHARLES SAUNDERS

Question No. 2,847—**Mr. Irvine:**

Is it the intention of the government during this centennial year to introduce a special stamp or in some other way to recognize the great contributions made by Sir Charles Edward Saunders, the originator and founder of Marquis wheat, who was born in our confederation year in London, Ontario, and (a) if so, of what will the recognition consist (b) if not, for what reason?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Postmaster General): The answer is no, Mr. Speaker. As a result of the contribution the Canada Post Office is making in commemorating the centennial of confederation, the philatelic program for 1967 is one of the heaviest in Canada's history. Numerous outstanding subjects were suggested for portrayal on postage stamps, but it was necessary to defer many worthy suggestions even though they were of national and international significance.

PARK STEAMSHIP CO.

Question No. 2,895—**Mr. Grégoire:**

1. Is Park Steamship Company, Limited, still operating and, if so, will it be given a French name?

2. If it is no longer in operation, has the company returned its letters patent?

3. If it is still in operation (a) what are its activities (b) who are its directors (c) when will it stop its activities?

Hon. John N. Turner (Registrar General):

1. No. Surrendered its charter June 27, 1966.

2. Yes.

3. Not applicable.

RETURNING OFFICER, VILLENEUVE CONSTITUENCY

Question No. 2,896—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. Is Mr. Fontaine the returning officer for the constituency of Villeneuve?

2. Has he been replaced as the returning officer for the new constituency of Villeneuve and, if so, for what reason?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): 1. Yes, Mr. Fontaine is the present returning officer for the Villeneuve riding.

2. Yes.

According to the Canada Elections Act, a returning officer must be appointed by the governor in council for each electoral district, Now, as the boundaries of the present electoral district of Villeneuve were readjusted by virtue of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act (13 Elizabeth II, c. 31), a returning officer had to be appointed for this new electoral district—and this was done accordingly.

[*English*]

*GRANT FOR FERRY SERVICE, BAIE COMEAU-RIMOUSKI

Question No. 2,916—**Mr. Ricard:**

Has the federal government received a request for grants on behalf of the Compagnie Nord-Sud Limitée in relation to the ferry service between Baie Comeau and Rimouski?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GREECE—INQUIRY AS TO RECOGNITION OF NEW RÉGIME AND SAFETY OF CANADIANS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister regarding the new régime which has come to power in Greece by a military coup d'etat. In view of the fact that this government appears to be a military dictatorship which has suspended many of the democratic provisions of the constitution and imprisoned a number of political leaders, I want to ask the Prime Minister if Canada intends to recognize the new régime and continue diplomatic relations with that government.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the question of recognition of a new régime is an important one, and it will be considered by the government. Meanwhile I do not think I can say anything else about the change in the internal government of Greece.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Canadian government considered withholding recognition until such time as there is some indication of the restoration of democratic rights in that country and some assurance given with respect to the security of the political prisoners?

Mr. Pearson: Of course, Mr. Speaker, that is a hypothetical question. As far as the latter part of the question is concerned, we have no information which would lead us to believe

that the recognized standards of international law and justice will not be observed by the government now in power in Greece.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether any information has been received from our embassy in Athens as to the safety of Canadian citizens who may be in the country.

Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. A report has come in from our embassy indicating that to the best of their knowledge all Canadians are safe. I also noted in this morning's news reports that there has been no fighting or violence following last night's events in Greece.

UNITED NATIONS

SOUTH-WEST AFRICA—CANADIAN POSITION AT EMERGENCY SESSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister. Could the Prime Minister give any indication to this house of the course to be followed by Canada at the emergency session of the United Nations to deal with the question of South-West Africa, which opens in New York today.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the special assembly which has been called to consider this and one other question is, as my hon. friend knows, meeting today. The first item on the agenda is to the one mentioned by my hon. friend, consideration of a report from the committee that has been discussing this question in the light of the assembly resolution of last autumn.

I understand three resolutions were submitted to that committee, and the committee has not made a unanimous report. Two of the resolutions provided for the territory to be administered or supervised by the security council because of the alleged failure of the mandate and the mandatory country; the third was a resolution sponsored by Canada, and I think two other countries, providing for—I am just relying on memory now—an inspection of the situation by the United Nations Secretary General or a representative. That is the resolution which the Canadian delegate to the special assembly will be supporting.

[Mr. Pearson.]

AIR CANADA

INQUIRIES AS TO SERVICE TO REGINA AND WINNIPEG

On the orders of the day:

Mr. K. H. More (Regina City): Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. I regret that I could not give him notice; I have been away and have just returned. Last year when DC-9's were put into service I asked a question about DC-9 service by Air Canada to Saskatchewan. At the time the answer was that the target date for this service would be May 1. We are getting rather close to that date now, and I am wondering whether the minister can ascertain when Air Canada will indeed put DC-9's into service to Regina, and whether the target date remains as announced.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to make inquiries.

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. At the same time the minister is making his inquiry would he ascertain whether the direct flight between Ottawa and Winnipeg is to be discontinued on May 1 and, if so, why?

Mr. Pickersgill: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to do that too.

INDUSTRY

AUTOMOBILE AGREEMENT—POSSIBLE RELIEF OF CANADIAN MANUFACTURERS FROM COMMITMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry. May I preface it by welcoming the minister back to the house after his extensive trip.

Because of the decline in the production of motor vehicles in Canada, is it a fact that Canadian car manufacturers are asking to be relieved of certain commitments which they agreed to when the United States-Canada auto pact was signed?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I replied to a similar question before my departure. I thank the hon. member for welcoming me back, but at the moment I have nothing to add to the reply I made previously.

Mr. Hales: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister assure the house

that no relief from these commitments will be granted?

Mr. Drury: If at some time in the future it may be impossible to fulfil some commitments which have been made, I do not think the hon. member would wish to insist on impossibilities.

NATURAL GAS

DECISION ON PIPE LINE BY U.S. AUTHORITY—NEW APPLICATION BY TRANS-CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. David Lewis (York South): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Can he say when the United States authority may render a decision on the Great Lakes application; and can he say also when the National Energy Board of Canada will be considering a new application filed, as I understand, by Trans-Canada Pipe Lines?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The answer to the first question is that I wish I knew. The answer to the second question is, on May 23.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

CONSIDERATION OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RESPECTING ESTABLISHMENT OF BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): May I direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Mr. Speaker. Will the government act on the recommendation of the justice and legal affairs committee to set up a federal board charged with responsibility for all matters of motoring safety?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): I have not had an opportunity of studying this matter, but I shall do so at the earliest possible moment.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

INQUIRY AS TO COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF ANIMAL PROTECTION

On the orders of the day:

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the escalation of pressure on the members of this house for an investigation into the protection of animals, will the Prime Minister indicate when the government plans to assign this matter to a parliamentary committee?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I am afraid I cannot answer that question. I shall be glad to look into it.

STEVEN TRUSCOTT—INQUIRY AS TO FINDINGS OF SUPREME COURT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Solicitor General. Will the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada with respect to the Steven Truscott case be announced this week and, if so, does the minister know on what day the decision will be made known?

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): I can only say that I share the hon. member's hope that we will receive the judgment in this case very soon.

HAL BANKS—INQUIRY AS TO EXTRADITION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): I wish to ask the Minister of Justice a question. Has the minister any further information he can give the house with respect to the question I asked him on April 14 as to whether Harold Chamberlain Banks is to be charged under the Criminal Code with perjury?

Hon. P.-E. Trudeau (Minister of Justice): Yes, I have an answer to that question. It is also an answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce the other day. This matter has been placed in the hands of the local provincial crown attorney, Mr. John Cassels, who I expect in turn has been consulting with his superiors in the attorney general's department at Toronto. The investigating officers are receiving their advice from these sources. In my view, under the circumstances any statement relating to possible proceedings should come from the provincial authorities.

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR SUBSIDY ON SURPLUS FLUID MILK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): I wish to direct to the Minister of Agriculture the same question that I addressed to the acting minister last Wednesday. The acting minister said he would refer this matter to the minister on the minister's return to the house. My question is as follows. What was or what will be the government's response to the request that fluid milk be reinstated in the dairy subsidization program?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): The government's program as announced entails a basic distribution of functions as between federal and provincial responsibilities. Inasmuch as the provinces already exercise a responsibility for quotas and price levels of fluid milk the fluid milk producer and his support are clearly and primarily a provincial responsibility. I believe that the distribution of responsibilities, with the provinces assuming the responsibility for support of the fluid milk producer and the federal government assuming responsibility for the support of the manufacturing milk producer, will in the long run serve the best interests of the dairy farmers of Canada.

Mr. Olson: Could the minister tell the house what he has heard from those provinces which have no subsidy program for surplus fluid milk? Will the federal or provincial governments give relief in the near future to take care of this deficiency, now that the subsidy has been removed?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, of course I cannot speak for the provinces. I believe that all provinces or provincial agencies set the price of fluid milk, and that either the provincial government or one of its agencies sets the quota. If any province in its wisdom, as happened in Ontario this past year, feels that it wishes to subsidize fluid milk producers at figures over and above their production quotas, and basic prices, that of course is a decision that must be made by that province's government.

Mr. H. A. Moore (Wetaskiwin): Is the minister aware that this new policy is causing an increase in the price of bottled milk sold on the street?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is an argument and not a question.

[*Translation*]

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

REASON FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF ABOLITION LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Henri Latulippe (Compton-Frontenanc): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister.

Could he inform the house why he intends to have reconsidered the decision taken by the house on capital punishment?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think this question is in order.

[Mr. Olson.]

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS RESPECTING BAD CHEQUES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): My question is addressed to the Minister of Justice; I apologize for not having given him notice but perhaps he will take this as notice. Would the minister look into the relevant sections of the Criminal Code to see whether something could be done to tighten up the provisions relating to N.S.F. cheques?

Mr. Speaker: I think this is a question which might well be placed on the order paper.

GRAIN

PROTEST AGAINST SLOW MOVEMENT FROM LAKEHEAD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Ed. Schreyer (Springfield): I have a question for the Minister of Transport with regard to negotiations which were under way last week between the great lakes shipping companies and the Canadian Wheat Board. Can the minister say whether these negotiations have been successfully concluded, or whether grain is still not moving from the lakehead positions?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I am not sure whether the one situation would follow from the other. I regret to say that since this is not primarily my ministerial responsibility I did not make special inquiries this morning with regard to the matter. But I will.

NATIONAL PARKS

REQUEST FOR POLICY STATEMENT RESPECTING EXPANSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In view of recent remarks by the minister about the desirability of extending our national parks may I ask whether the hon. gentleman has any new legislation in mind which would give expression to these new ideas?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): I can assure the hon. member that we intend at the new session to introduce a measure with respect to parks, and we are in negotiation with a number of provinces looking toward additional parks in Canada.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Can the minister say whether his ideas include the expansion of the park in New Brunswick?

Mr. Laing: We are thinking in those terms, Mr. Speaker.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

BELL ISLAND, NFLD.—ASSISTANCE FOR UNEMPLOYED MINERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I wish to address a question to the Minister of Industry, and first say how glad we are to have him back in our midst. Last week the Prime Minister said that more than one department was looking into the problem facing the people on Bell Island, Newfoundland, and the Minister of Manpower and Immigration told us what his department was doing in this connection. I want to ask the Minister of Industry whether his department is conducting research, either on its own or through the National Research Council, into the possibility of upgrading the ore deposits on Bell Island or pelletizing the ore there in order to make use of the two billion tons of recoverable ore which are estimated to be on the island.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): I thank the hon. gentleman for his kind expression of welcome. As far as Bell Island is concerned, extensive investigations were carried out about two and a half years ago as to the possibility of chemical treatment of the ore to make it appropriate for use in Canadian furnaces. I regret to say that in spite of the intensive research work done we have not as yet produced an economic answer.

Mr. Douglas: As a supplementary question may I ask the minister by whom these tests were conducted, and is it possible to get copies of the report?

Mr. Drury: Basically, Mr. Speaker, by the National Research Council together with outside consultants, and I will see if it is possible to make a copy of the report available to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Joseph P. O'Keefe (St. John's East): May I ask the minister if those steps will be continued to investigate the problems of the ore at Bell Island.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the conclusions of those conducting these investigations were such as to warrant or justify continuing them any further.

Inquiries of the Ministry

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REQUEST FOR ANSWER TO QUESTION ON ORDER PAPER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. R. Keays (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Public Works and ask him if he is waiting until he can give me an affirmative reply in answer to question No. 2,728 which has been on the order paper since March 10. This has reference to the harbour development at Chandler, Quebec.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to look into the matter immediately.

[*Translation*]

TRANSPORT

QUEBEC—SALE OF BAIE COMEAU-RIMOUSKI FERRY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Transport.

Would the minister have any further information to give the house concerning the sale of the ferry *Père Nouvel*?

[*English*]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I could perhaps remind the hon. gentleman that certain arrangements were made by the federal government to assist in inaugurating this service, and the contractor undertook to carry on the service until December 31, 1966. Since that time there has been no obligation on the part of the contractor toward the federal government, and any relation he would have now I should think would be with the provincial authorities.

TRANSPORTATION

INQUIRY AS TO REPORT ON MARITIME STUDY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport and ask if he could be charitable to us in the maritimes and tell us whether it will be this fall, or perhaps hopefully this spring, when we will get the maritime transportation study report?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Hope springs eternal, Mr. Speaker, and I hope it will be in the spring.

Mr. Knowles: What year?

Inquiries of the Ministry

HIGHWAYS

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS TO RESOURCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In view of the fact many of the provinces have built roads under the roads to resources program and have not completed all their planned work, and apparently are not willing to continue without further federal assistance, may I ask the minister is the government considering further financial assistance in this regard?

Mr. Speaker: This question should be placed on the order paper.

[*Translation*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

INQUIRY AS TO APPLICATION OF BILINGUAL PREMIUM POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Henri Latulippe (Compton-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put another question to the right hon. Prime Minister.

Since we are now celebrating the national secretaries' week, could the Prime Minister take this opportunity to grant the 7 per cent raise, retroactive to October 1, 1966, to the secretaries of members of parliament and others who are recognized as being bilingual?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This question has already been asked.

[*English*]

REQUEST FOR ADJOURNMENT SO MEMBERS MAY ATTEND EXPO OPENING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Public Works in his capacity as government house leader. In view of the fact that all members of parliament have been invited to attend the opening of Expo on Thursday of this week would the minister say whether a decision has yet been reached as to whether or not the house will sit that day.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, it is planned that the house will not sit that day.

Mr. Churchill: What about Friday?

Mr. McIlraith: We are prepared to not sit on Thursday.

[Mr. Knowles.]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

USE OF CIVILIAN AIRCRAFT TO TRANSPORT RESERVE UNITS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of National Defence. Will the minister advise this house the reason for the leasing of Air Canada aircraft to move reserve units to training establishments? If our defence forces are fully equipped and competent to meet defence commitments, why is it necessary in Canada to move reserve forces by private fleets of aircraft?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that this question might be placed on the order paper.

Mr. Winch: The contract is being signed this week, Mr. Speaker.

WATER RESOURCES

FRASER RIVER—IMPLEMENTATION OF BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In view of the concern that is felt by many people in the lower mainland of British Columbia, could the minister indicate whether any conferences are going to be held with provincial authorities regarding the implementation of the recommendations in the Fraser river board report?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am going to meet on this particular subject next month, I believe on May 3, with the British Columbia minister responsible for water. With respect to possible flooding, I might say that all possible measures are now being taken, and I might also say we are having an interdepartmental meeting this afternoon to try to co-ordinate these measures as well as possible at the federal level.

Mr. Grant Deachman (Vancouver Quadra): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister tell us if the emergency measures apply to emergencies in the current year, or are they merely for future undertakings?

Mr. Pepin: In the current year, Mr. Speaker.

PARLIAMENT HILL

INQUIRY AS TO EXTINGUISHING OF PERPETUAL FLAME

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. E. Pascoe (Moose Jaw-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Public Works. Some visitors from the west came to parliament hill Saturday to see the national capital. Can the minister explain why the perpetual flame was extinguished at that time?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

ARDA—APPLICATION IN LOWER ST. LAWRENCE—GASPÉ AREA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. René Tremblay (Matapédia-Matane): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Forestry and Rural Development.

Following a week-end meeting at Cabano, in Quebec, where an important section of the territory of the Lower St. Lawrence Development Board decided not to join the area as a whole in the implementation of the Rural Development Plan, is the minister in a position to say whether this decision will somehow affect the implementation of the ARDA program in the lower St. Lawrence and Gaspé peninsula?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This question seems too general in character to be asked at this time.

Mr. Tremblay: At ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION

HALIFAX—DEPORTATION ORDER RESPECTING POLISH NATIONAL

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Friday I was asked, I think by the members for Halifax, concerning a deportation order against one Stanislaw Lubaszko. The minister concerned has received representations on behalf of this man. No action will be taken to remove him from Canada until the minister has had an opportunity to review all aspects of the case.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, may I thank the Prime Minister and the minister for their expediency in this matter. In the absence of the appropriate minister may I ask the Prime Minister whether he will look into the possibility of this man being permitted to attend church services; in other words, perhaps he might be taken out of the isolation in which he now finds himself.

Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker; I will be seeing the minister this evening and can mention this to him at that time.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Ralph Cowan (York-Humber): Mr. Speaker, I had a question which I wished to address to the Minister of Trade and Commerce in connection with Expo in Montreal. Since these cockatoos that are able to speak French and English are not paid in cash, will those which master both languages be given 7 per cent more food than the unilingual ones, or a 7 per cent higher perch in the pecking order at Expo?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

AMALGAMATION OF NAVY, ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The house resumed, from Friday, April 21, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof—Mr. Hellyer—Mr. Batten in the chair.

The Chairman: When the committee rose on Friday evening clause 5 was under consideration. Clause 2 had been allowed to stand. The proceedings in respect of this bill are subject to the time allocation order which was adopted Thursday, April 20, 1967.

On clause 5—*Embodiment.*

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, call the vote. We are ready to vote on this clause. Call the yeas and nays.

Clause agreed to: yeas, 77; nays, 43.

The Chairman: I declare clause 5 as amended carried.

Clause agreed to.

On clause 6—*Officers and men members of Canadian Forces.*

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a suggestion in respect of the procedure for this afternoon. Would the committee agree to stand clauses 6 and 7 and proceed with the

consequential items commencing with clause 8? The committee then could return to the substantive clauses once the consequential and general clauses had been dealt with. I realize that all clauses were examined in detail by the standing committee on national defence and it may be the opinion of this committee that it is not necessary to repeat in full the discussion here. It might be preferable, however, if hon. members would agree, to proceed to clause 8 at this time and consider the clauses which are not too controversial. This would allow us to spend all the remaining time on the substantive clauses in part I of the bill.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, this suggestion by the minister comes rather late in the day. If the minister had accepted the first reasonable proposal which I put forward about four times that we stand clauses 2 and 6 until next fall, this would have made some sense. I am surprised that he is not now prepared to do that. In fact when he got up to speak earlier that is what I thought he was going to say. In view of the unrest in the services and in view of the difference of opinion which exists across the country with regard to this bill the suggestion I put forward appears to be more and more reasonable each day. This would not interfere at all with the process of drafting the regulations.

I do not wish to impute motives to the minister, but the suggestion he has made this afternoon conceivably could prevent or curtail discussion of clauses 6 and 7 which are vital to the bill. We might find ourselves taking up time on the inconsequential clauses which are in part II. Our preference is to continue now with clause 6 which is one of the vital clauses in the bill. Much as I should like to agree with the Minister of National Defence, who never agrees with me, I have to reject his suggestion as unsound.

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Churchill: Oh, no. I have just said that this is one of the vital clauses in the bill and I propose to move an amendment to improve it.

• (3:10 p.m.)

The first part of clause 6 reads as follows:

> Officers and men who were members of the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army or the Royal Canadian Air Force immediately prior to the coming into force of this Part are, subject to the provisions of the National Defence Act, members of the Canadian Forces.

This is one of the compulsory features which have been introduced into this bill. As soon as it becomes law the members of the navy, army and air force will be shifted into forces to be known as the Canadian Forces. We discussed this during defence committee hearings, and I think it would be worth while to re-emphasize the subject of those discussions at this time, because there are many more members present to give it their attention.

During the committee hearings I moved two amendments to this clause, which were voted down in the normal fashion by Liberal members voting against any of our proposals. I intend to put those proposals before the committee of the whole house in order that it may decide whether or not they are valuable.

Clause 6 introduces a compulsory feature. Men who are now in the three services are all volunteers. When they enlisted, whether it was last year or five, 15 or 20 years ago, they made a definite choice. They had the opportunity, wishing to serve their country, to become members of the army, the navy or the air force. Each officer and man made a deliberate choice as to the service in which he wished to devote some part of his life. Some of them deliberately chose a service in which to make a lifetime career. The government through this bill now intends to shift those officers and men from these three services into the Canadian Forces. The names of the Royal Canadian Navy, the Royal Canadian Air Force and the Canadian Army will disappear.

These officers and men who chose to make a contribution to Canada as members of one of the three services will no longer have this choice. They will be shifted into the Canadian Forces and will no longer be able to take pride as members of the navy, army or air force. The government is now saying that they are now in the services and will remain as members of the renamed service without any choice in the matter.

I gave an example of what happened in the past during the committee hearings and I should like to repeat it on this occasion. It is drawn from the experience of September, 1939. On September 1, 1939 officers and men were attested, enlisted, and sworn into the Canadian field force. I speak from practical knowledge because I was acting as assistant to the adjutant of our regiment on that occasion. These officers and men became members of the Canadian field force. Within a short period of time the cabinet at Ottawa changed the name to the Canadian active service

force. The documents which had been prepared for the Canadian field force were destroyed.

All this has been recounted in the official history of the Canadian effort during wartime by Colonel Stacey. There was great wastage of time and money. New documents were issued in the name of the Canadian active service force and we were instructed throughout the army to re-enlist, reattest and swear in again the people who had been members of the Canadian field force. We went through all that reattestation.

The Canadian active service force provided only for service in Canada, so when the decision was reached that forces would be sent overseas—and it was reached very quickly—instructions came again from the cabinet through the Department of National Defence to the effect that everyone who had been sworn in to the Canadian active service force must be asked whether he wished to serve only in Canada or elsewhere in the world abroad. We had to go through the whole process once again. That happened in wartime when the officers and men were all volunteers.

In wartime it is conceivable that no one would object to a name being changed half a dozen times, from the Canadian field force to the Canadian active service force, the Canadian expeditionary force or anything of that nature. However, the government of that day took the stand that the officers and men, having specifically entered the Canadian field forces, should have the opportunity of saying whether they wanted to belong to a force of a different name.

That opportunity was given and the change was made. When it came to determining whether they would serve elsewhere than in Canada the government of the day decided the officers and men should have yet another opportunity to make a choice. When the several thousand who had been reattested into the Canadian active service force were asked whether they would serve outside Canada only a very small number declined to sign on for service abroad. The official history indicates that there were only about 500 all told who declined.

The point is that even in wartime the officers and men were given that choice. They were all volunteers and free citizens of this country. Our objection is that under clause 6 this opportunity is not to be given to the officers and men who are now in the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army, and the Royal Canadian Air Force. Without being reattested or sworn in, and without any choice whatsoever in this matter, once this bill is declared law these officers and men become members of the Canadian Forces.

I should like to move the following amendment to clear up this matter, and I am sure the Minister of National Defence, now that he has had time to think this over, will agree that this freedom of choice should be offered to the officers and men now in the services. Consequently I move:

That clause 6 be amended by adding thereto the following subclause:

(3) No officer or man who was a member of the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army, or the Royal Canadian Air Force immediately prior to the coming into force of this part shall be enrolled in the Canadian Forces without his consent registered by reattestation.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, the matter raised in this amendment is most serious, one which will have the most far reaching and the longest lasting consequences of any in this bill. Unlike the minister I am not one who believes that the bill before us will provide the answer to our defence posture over the next 40 or 50 years. Indeed, I will be quite surprised if we do not find ourselves in the position of having to make further changes within the next two or three years.

However, it is to the amendment to clause 6 that I would like to address my remarks. Perhaps I will start by analyzing it as I understand it. It is quite clear when it says that officers and men who were members of the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army or the Royal Canadian Air Force immediately prior to the coming into force of this part are, subject to the provisions of the National Defence Act, members of the Canadian Forces.

It says in effect, as the previous speaker pointed out, that this is compulsory. The word "conscription" has certain connotations, but I think it is an expression of the government's failure to recognize any moral responsibility whatsoever to serving officers and men in the three services.

The explanation of clause 6 is not very clear. The remarks of the minister concerning this clause leave much to be desired. All we know about clause 6 is that it is transitional. However, as I mentioned, a better explanation is needed. So strongly do I feel about this lack of information that in my opinion the government is open to the charge that its

failure to explain fully and properly the meaning of this clause is nothing more or less than a deliberate attempt to gloss over its very serious and far reaching implications.

I am not prepared simply to look at the word "transitional", to accept it and move on to the next clause. It is my hope that in the course of the remarks we may make on this clause the minister might give second thought to what is happening. As I read the clause and analyse it, I find the government is indeed saying to our 103,000 serving personnel "You are being transferred. You are fine, decent chaps; you know we have your best interests at heart, but just go along with our plan." In effect it says to them "Come along with us and we will look after you. The days of the identifiable services are gone, but have no particular fears about the new force. We will give you nothing at all to worry about. You will be there all right, but you will be there simply because we have decided. We will take care of you."

This is an abandonment of the very essence of the structure of our force, that is its voluntary nature. Every flag officer, every general, every air marshal and every commissioned officer is being told to burn his commission or toss it into the wastepaper basket. Since each was commissioned into only one of the three services, they are in effect being ordered to join the new force, and to accept something which is not part of the commission they originally accepted. Every officer and every man has been attested into the service of his choice, but he is now being attested into the service of the government's choice. Again I say this denies the voluntary nature and aspect of the structure of the Canadian armed forces.

First let us examine the voluntary aspects of their service. Each serving officer and man joined one and only one of the three services. He did so of his own free will after first having committed himself to a career for life in the Canadian forces and after having chosen which of the three services he wanted to join. He did this voluntarily. These men are in every sense of the word volunteers. Indeed, the officers volunteered to serve for life; that is for the length of time prescribed in the regulations for officers of the rank they would attain during their particular careers.

Each officer in any service on joining voluntarily had a different undertaking to the officers in the other services. This was the result of the free exercise of his choice. A naval officer decided to be different from an army officer. Under the existing regulations naval officers who reach the rank of lieutenant commander have a career which continues until they reach the age of 45. An army major, whose rank is equivalent to that of the lieutenant commander, has a career which continues until he reaches the age of 49. An air force squadron leader, whose rank is equivalent to that of a major or lieutenant commander, serves to the age of 47 if he is on the flying list. Commanders, lieutenant colonels and wing commanders have careers which last until they reach the ages of 50, 49 and 49 respectively. Captains of the navy, colonels and group captains have careers which continue until they reach respectively the ages of 55, 51 and 51.

[Mr. Forrestall.]

At one time the minister indicated that these careers were different. The fact is that each of the officers who joined voluntarily joined for a career which would last a certain length of time. I will repeat a word which I think is the key word in this context, namely "voluntary". They did so voluntarily. As far as I know no one as yet has been informed as to the length of the career which will apply to any particular rank in the new force.

The reason I introduce this problem is that serving officers and men are quite concerned about it. This legislation simply says to the whole of the officers' corps "Don't worry about it, old fellow. We will look after it. You no longer have anything to say about it."

• (3:30 p.m.)

I come back to another point, the use of the word "transitional" in the explanation concerning clause 6. The explanation of the intent of the clause covers up the matter quite successfully. A cursory reading of the clause would, I suppose, leave a person in the same state as members of the committee were left, quite confused. What is important today is whether or not we have the right to permit this confusion, this uncertainty, to continue. What does the government mean and what does the minister mean by the use of the word "transitional"? Matters such as this must be cleared up so that the men who are being arbitrarily transferred will understand what it is they are transferring to, for what period of time and under what conditions.

If we pass this legislation without the consent of the officers and men, the bargain made with respect to the length of their careers, to which I referred earlier, will be broken. Alternatively, differences will be created which will most certainly cause resentment in rank levels where the different lengths of career

apply. This is a natural consequence of the failure to clarify these matters before this clause receives the approval of this committee. This again, is the underlying reason for the suggestion by the official opposition that clauses 2 and 6 be allowed to stand until the fall. This procedure would permit the departmental people time to come up with adequate answers and detailed explanations so that these men would know where they are going and what is going to happen.

The fact that lieutenant commanders may have longer careers than hitherto and majors may have shorter ones means you are playing around with the careers of officers whose lives have been voluntarily dedicated to a particular aspect of the service of Canada. This is not morally right, whether or not it is legal. While members of parliament may have the legal and constitutional right to do as they desire, there is a greater moral order, and sometimes I believe it would be wise for us to keep this in mind. We are doing something serious here, and this clause should be substantially amended.

I suggest that the amendment before us is a good one. If it is not made then not only the government but the House of Commons will have broken faith with these 102,000 men whose careers are governed by the promotion regulations in each of the three services. These regulations differ, but that is immaterial to the issue. Whether one service has a faster or slower method of promotion is not a matter of dispute. We do not argue about that at all because that was so in the past and must be so in the future. Promotion is geared to the requirements of the fighting environment. When you get to be even as old as I am you find it is more difficult to run uphill, and I am still fairly young. These factors must govern and because of that this area is not in dispute.

The point at issue is the fact that each of the services has separate promotional regulations. This is a fundamental thing, and I come back again to the freedom of choice. Before any man should be invited to accept a modified or unified system, he should have the new system fully explained to him and then be asked whether he will go along with it. If you transfer him without his consent you are compelling him to accept a different structure from the one for which he volunteered in the first place.

I believe this is the burden of the argument in support of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. The National Defence Act has provided, I think quite properly and fairly, that no officer or man can be transferred from one service to another without his consent except when the forces are on active service. This would be during a period of emergency as determined by parliament. The National Defence Act uses these words:

> No officer or man shall without his consent be transferred from the regular forces to the reserve forces, or from the reserve forces to the regular forces, or from the service of the Canadian forces in which he has been enrolled to another service of the Canadian forces.

This is subject to the following exception:

> An officer or man on active service, may for the period of such service, be transferred from the component of the service of the Canadian forces in which he has been enrolled to the same component of another service of the Canadian forces or from the reserve forces to the regular forces.

If clause 6 passes without amendment we will have shown a total disregard for the undertaking given to the officers and men who volunteered to serve Canada in the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force. This view was clearly expressed to the committee by one witness, and the reference is found at page 1050 of minutes of proceedings No. 20 for February 15, 1967. Rear Admiral William Landymore spoke at great length on this point but I shall not read his evidence into the record. I commend it to any member of the committee who is interested. This is one senior officer's opinion of the effect of the moral obligation which is left as a result of the amendment of this section of the National Defence Act.

I have listened to all the evidence in the committee and I have reread it on a number of occasions during the last two or three weeks. I cannot find anywhere in the evidence given by any of the officers, either presently serving or recently released, any argument whatever which effectively counteracts the argument advanced in favour of the amendment moved by the hon. member. The minister has not attempted to prove that the government has neither legal nor moral obligations. I am sure he has accepted the fact there is a legal obligation, as the judge advocate general told the committee there was.

I believe that the minister recognizes the moral obligation whenever he is asked directly, but he has never done or said anything to counteract the meaningful amendment which is now before us. As I said earlier it has been

glossed over as though it was unworthy of debate. We do not have the right to gloss over something which so radically affects the lives of the officers and men who have volunteered to serve and, if necessary, to give their lives in defence of this country. The judge advocate general, Brigadier Lawson, in his evidence before the committee concerning this clause pointed out that in his opinion it is law. We accept that, and I am not talking about the legality of it at all.

• (3:40 p.m.)

It may be of some interest to some people to pursue this matter in the courts of our country, particularly from a civil rights point of view. There are two sections in the Canadian Bill of Rights which it is interesting to look at in connection with this clause, though other hon. members will deal with this aspect of the matter in more detail. The judge advocate general pointed out that he thought we had better be very careful about his advice. I should like to refer the committee to a question and answer exchange reported at page 2077 of minutes of proceedings and evidence No. 32 for March 14. The question put by the hon. member for Calgary North was as follows:

I do not think it was ever considered that a lawful duty would be to put an infantry battalion commander in the command of a ship.

Mr. Lawson: It certainly would have been a legal duty, Mr. Harkness, no matter how foolish it might have been.

Mr. Harkness: No, but I say, I do not think that to go and command a ship could even have been interpret as one of that infantry officer's lawful duties.

Mr. Lawson: Oh yes; I would say it would, sir.

Mr. Harkness: Under the naval provisions he is responsible for the safety of the ship, but he has no background, or training, or means of being responsible for the safety of that ship.

Mr. Lawson: Oh, I agree with you, it would be a very foolish—

Mr. Harkness: Well, that is why I do not think that it even would be legal.

Mr. Lawson: Well, no: I think in law, this would be a lawful duty.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, this comment speaks for itself. If I may extend this point, though I do not want to belabour it, there are international marine laws which have some bearing on the matter. I am referring to certain marine laws which exist under maritime law.

According to article 10.07 of Queen's Regulations the following regulations apply:

(a) No officer or man may be transferred from one list to another without his consent.

(b) No man can be transferred from one trade to another without his consent.

[Mr. Forrestall.]

This same article prescribes for each of the three services respectively. In each case consent is required. Therefore it follows that if consent of the individual for a transfer within a service is required, in view of the existence of section 26 of the National Defence Act there does exist a very reasonable doubt that when this bill is enacted it will be in fact be legal. As I mentioned, it is already in conflict with certain provisions under maritime law with regard to the lawful duties of a captain of a ship. It is in contradiction to section 26 of the present act. While the brigadier says that parliament is an end unto itself, and this may be so, I suggest that we are overlooking certain moral obligations. Indeed, we must accord respect to the laws of countries other than our own, and I make this point in connection with our obligations under maritime law.

I hope that some serving officer will have the courage, the determination and the guts to take this question to the Supreme Court of Canada under the Bill of Rights to find out whether the bill is legal. On the other hand, I hope all of them do not do so because I understand the Supreme Court is very busy at this time of year. However, it has been suggested that this might happen.

Whether the bill is legal or not, anybody who has read the evidence given at the committee hearings, has sat and listened to this debate and has bothered to inform himself—a tremendous amount has been written and said about this bill—must be driven to the firm conclusion that there is no doubt in light of the evidence that it is morally wrong to move members of the armed forces, arbitrarily without their consent and without their exercising an option, from the force in which they voluntarily elected to serve and perhaps die for their country to some other force. It is equally as immoral as giving a lieutenant in the army command of a ship or giving the command of a ship or an aircraft to any unqualified person.

I feel that the government has arbitrarily broken a very basic term of the contract entered into with these serving men. The minister should find in his heart some grounds for giving these men a choice. Let the men decide whether or not this is what they want to do. If he did so I think the minister would find that the vast majority of them would willingly serve in the new force because they would have the knowledge that they did so voluntarily. It is this business of having this rammed down their bloody

throats to which they object. Give the men an option. Give them a few months to make up their minds. If the men who joined the navy feel in their own minds there is a substantial loss of the marine and naval traditions of Canada, then give them the option of retiring voluntarily without any pension penalty. Give these men the full benefits to which they are entitled. Certainly the ones with whom I have spoken and corresponded seem to be sincere, loyal and dedicated. If the minister were to do this, he might find that his plans for the future of the Canadian forces would be implemented much more harmoniously.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, I think the members of this committee should realize that unless the amendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre carries we will be asked to pass a law which brings in for the first time peacetime conscription in Canada. We are discussing a peacetime voluntary force in a democratic country and the government is now proposing conscription. There have been a couple of occasions in this nation's history when a major upheaval occurred over the conscription issue. Yet on both occasions conscription was justified because this country's very life was at stake and we were then involved in a very serious conflict. However, there is no war in sight today and no reason has been advanced on the part of the government for resorting to conscription.

What makes it even more reprehensible is that this conscription does not apply to a particular class of people who might be suitable for the armed services or whose presence in the services might be necessary for the preservation of this country. We are going to limit this conscription to those who are now serving in our armed forces simply because these people agreed with the government of Canada to serve in one or other of our forces as they exist today. Certainly anybody who looks at the situation in this light, which I think is the only fair light in which to look at it, must demand compelling reasons from the government for resorting to peacetime conscription of the members of our armed forces.

• (3:50 p.m.)

How can the minister in all fairness conscript these men? Our men in the past have enlisted in the service of their choice as volunteers. If we take the navy as an example, they enlisted in the navy because they like naval traditions, naval life, the brotherhood of seafaring fighting men, and the kinds of trades they could learn in the naval environment. Reasons of this sort induced people to enlist voluntarily.

I say there can be no mistaking what the minister is doing. He—when I refer to the minister I refer to the government—is changing the agreement that was made with these volunteers. The government in effect is saying: You have no choice. Is that fair? Should that sort of thing be necessary if the men, as the minister alleges, are enthusiastic about serving in his new armed force? The minister and General Allard say that the men will be proud and anxious to serve in this force. If that is so, why is there this discrimination? What is the minister afraid of? If the men are so enthusiastic, why is he afraid of giving them a choice?

When men have served 15 or 20 years of a 20 or 25-year career it is difficult for them to give up their pension rights and to find a suitable job in civy street. Why does the minister need clause 7 to reassure the men that in the new force they will perform duties similar to those they performed in the old force? The answer seems obvious. The minister seeks to conscript in peacetime a small number of men. The government is changing the terms of the employment contract unilaterally. I can only conclude that the minister has less confidence in this measure than have the members of this house or of the armed forces.

Furthermore, I am not satisfied that parliament has the legal right to do what it seeks to do. In my view this clause deals with civil rights. It has nothing to do with matters pertaining to the armed forces. Brigadier Lawson says that the men who enlist in our armed forces have no contract. That argument has little weight because in my view this clause deals essentially with a matter of civil rights. I know that military affairs come within the ambit of the federal government, but I also know that civil rights do not. They come within the ambit of the provincial governments. By passing this clause parliament may be infringing on the exclusive right of the provinces to deal with civil matters, civil rights legislation being an exclusive prerogative of the provincial governments. Dominion-provincial relations are important matters. Do we, therefore, wish to go ahead blithely and pass this clause if there is any question about provincial rights being involved?

The government is seeking to change a contract that the men entered into voluntarily and it is seeking to do so in peactime when

no national emergency or disaster is upon us. I know that in wartime the government may abrogate civil rights, but we are not at war. Must the government, then, conscript a small group of people by saying to them, "Your contract with the government is to be changed?"

I cannot help feeling that somebody will take this clause before the courts and make a test case of it. What will happen if, as I expect may happen, the courts rule that this clause in sum and substance deals with civil rights and not with a defence matter and that the enacting of this clause was beyond the constitutional authority of parliament? Should the courts reach that decision this law would be null and void. The minister would find himself in a strange position because if he wanted to keep his armed force he would have to offer substantial monetary inducements. The situation the country would be confronted with would be that the members of the armed forces would not be subject to the provisions of this clause. Actually they would be governed by no effective law and the result would be chaos. I can imagine the pay raises that would be offered and the blandishments that would be held out to induce personnel to re-enlist. That is the picture as I see it, and that is what the minister risks by introducing the compulsory aspect of this clause.

• (4:00 p.m.)

I should like to study the law more closely. It may be I am wrong in my contention as to the law but I think there is a good chance I am right. If I am and the courts should throw out this clause, where will the minister be? He will have a force without a single body in it. Legally, there would be no one in it; there would be no troops, nobody subject to the old discipline. But the minister intends to take this risk. He wants compulsion. Why? He tells us that most of the men will want to stay, that only a small group will want to leave. He tells us that most of them would be constrained by concern for their careers, that many who did not welcome the proposals enthusiastically would probably stay in the force anyway. In any case, in light of the terms of clause 7 he says they would not have much to worry about.

This is the situation if the minister's words can be relied on. He would prefer to risk being left without troops than take the course we suggest. He would prefer to take the chance that he is possibly telling the truth and these people might re-enlist. This says a lot for the confidence he has in his own appraisal of the circumstances and in his own testimony.

We know there is one circumstance which might well dissuade troops from re-enlisting. Unification plans are still hazy. General Allard has told us that the plans are not yet complete, and we have the testimony of General Moncel that the government seems to be proceeding with the plan which was the worst of the four considered, the one which was so bad that he rejected it out of hand. We cannot doubt that there is uncertainty as to exactly the form unification will take. Contrary to the minister's testimony, I suppose there is a natural anxiety on the part of those in our armed forces concerning the reactions of members of the forces in other countries to those serving under this hybrid, unknown, untried scheme. They wonder what kind of beast they will be taken for.

Members of this house know very well how important the effect of these things is on morale and esprit de corps. If the minister were ready to admit this he would not be talking so blithely about wiping out the identity of the three forces. We can only take it that our view is the correct one and that there are good reasons why the men should hesitate to volunteer to re-enlist. Otherwise the minister is right, in which case there would be no reason to resort to conscription for the first time.

For some reason or other the minister always does things the hard way. We know he would prefer to ram something through parliament than seek co-operation. We know he would prefer to trample on parliament rather than have parliament help him. We know he would prefer to keep parliament in the dark as to the facts or mislead parliament as to the facts rather than explain things frankly. But in this instance, since there is obviously something so contrary to common sense about this proposal I cannot help feeling I have missed the point somehow and that there must be some argument to be advanced from the other side in connection with so serious a proposal and one which is so unfair to all who have volunteered.

It is important that what we do in this house should be fair to those who serve in our forces. Their views on whether or not parliament is behind them will certainly be a major factor in the future if we are to get the best out of these men. We must not even appear to do something which is unfair to them. But there has not been a single word

spoken on this subject yet either by the minister or by the associate minister. I hope one or the other will get up and explain why it is necessary to conscript people despite the assurance that most of them are enthusiastic about this plan.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, I do not share the legal and constitutional fears which have been expressed by the hon. member for Halifax and by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona. However, I am impressed by their statement that there is a moral obligation to give those who volunteered under certain conditions the chance of changing their minds if the law steps in to change the conditions under which they are to serve.

It is strange that in the discussion so far neither of the two hon. members who spoke so eloquently about moral obligations and peacetime conscription mentioned that in the defence committee the minister clearly and unequivocally stated that except in the case of national emergency an opportunity would be given to those who had enlisted in the services to opt out of their obligations. If such an option exists I suggest it is a travesty of the facts to talk about peacetime conscription. A conscript who can opt out is obviously not bound by a very dangerous form of conscription.

I am sympathetic toward the amendment but it does seem to me that administratively it might be far more satisfactory if those who are presently in the services were allowed to opt out rather than that they should be given the opportunity to re-enlist. I can see a number of reasons why it might be better to adopt the opting-out provision. The minister has stated clearly—and this is on record in the proceedings of the committee—that this option will be given.

I believe the minister should repeat this statement, as no doubt he is willing to do, in which case much of the difficulty which has been suggested would be removed. Not only should he make a statement along these lines but somehow, in the legislation itself, the right to opt out should be clearly conferred. After all, even though the minister has made a statement to this effect, he will not be minister for ever. He may be promoted upstairs or he may be demoted downstairs. I do not know. I think it would be much better if this option were clearly embodied in the law. It may be that the minister has some intention of making such a change. If he does so, the claim that he is conscripting people in peacetime will not be a very serious one. If he does not, I am afraid suspicion, however unjustified, will linger. I hope he will clarify the position while we are in committee.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Greenwood has just made an interesting observation with respect to compulsory service. He has suggested it would be much better to give serving personnel the opportunity to opt in rather than to opt out. I ask him this: just what would re-attestation be but an opportunity to do either of these things? Therefore in this amendment, which calls for the re-attestation of the forces, the hon. member's argument is met because on re-attestation nobody would re-attest only those people who want to opt into the unified force. The argument that it is better to give the men the opportunity to opt in rather than to opt out is exactly what this amendment meets. No man signing re-attestation papers would be doing anything other than opting into the unified force.

• (4:10 p.m.)

The whole question of compulsory service or conscription, as it is better known, is all wrapped up with the minister's confidence in his own bill. He maintains that the service people are behind it and that a majority of the senior officers are behind it. How can he say there is a majority? Has he taken a poll and will he give us the result of that poll? Despite what the Minister of Transport thinks about the evidence given before the defence committee and despite the opinion of the Minister of National Defence on expert evidence, although I think he should recall what he himself said about experts, the fact remains that Air Chief Marshal Miller, the recently retired chief of staff, told the committee that each individual who had signed with a particular service had an agreement with that service and before going into the unified force it would be necessary to tear up his old agreement and let him sign a new one.

During the discussion on clause 2 I asked the Minister of National Defence several times to make the tape recordings of the committee hearings available to us. I made that request for the simple reason that I want to compare what is on the tapes with the printed version of the defence committee hearings. For instance, on two or three occasions the minister referred to the contract which each and every serviceman has. He used the words "the contract." If there was such a contract then each individual must be given an opportunity to sign a new one. I

have failed to turn up those words in the printed record of the defence committee hearings and that is why I want the tapes produced. I asked for them previously. Again I request that the tapes of the defence committee hearings be made available to us. If we get the tapes we shall have the minister's own words in reference to a contract which each and every serviceman has. If there is such a contract then it is legal and binding, and in order to put a man into the unified force the contract must be rewritten.

To return to the minister's confidence in his bill, here is a pure and simple test of that confidence. Let him allow each and every serviceman to re-attest. But no, the minister will not permit that. I dare say he may be struggling with some kind of amendment to cover something that is already available, at least according to the instructions I have received from the Department of National Defence, namely, that anybody can get out of the service on six months' notice. If the minister is thinking of such an amendment I can tell him there is no reason for it because that is the instruction I received from the department in the fall.

An hon. Member: Instruction?

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Exactly, instruction. The minister said that to reattest the men would bring about chaos. What kind of chaos would it bring about? If the minister's confidence is well placed, everybody is going to rush to sign up again. This is peacetime. In referring once again to the arguments of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre I should like to read from page 43 of the Official History of the Canadian Army where it is stated:

> Government decided to place militia on active service in Canada (mobile force). Although all submissions to Council were ready and all plans made, we were horrified to hear the cabinet decided at the last minute to change the name of the mobile force from "Canadian Field Force" to "Canadian Active Service Force." The result being many changes, torn up stencils, and $65,000 worth of mobilization forms almost useless. Very hectic day—but we managed to get the general order 135/1939 issued and in the mail to all districts.

It goes on to elaborate on the fact that during wartime each and every serviceman, with the change of name of the force, was given the opportunity to reattest. I quote this because a request was made in the defence committee for a legal opinion from the Department of Justice on whether or not this could be done. It was reported to the committee that a legal opinion was given. If need be, I apologize to the brigadier, but so far as I am concerned the legal opinion was only hearsay. We saw nothing in writing from the Department of Justice. We do not know who in the Department of Justice gave that opinion and until that information is provided it still remains a very pertinent question whether or not this move by the Department of National Defence is legal.

Again I call the minister's attention to what happened in wartime in respect of the decision to send a force overseas. It involved changing the basis upon which men had enlisted in the active service force. These men had enlisted as volunteers. I quote from page 63 of the Official History of the Canadian Army:

> The Minister of National Defence had explained to the House of Commons on 11 September that under the Militia Act (section 68) no man could be required to serve in the field continuously for a longer period than one year, unless he had volunteered to serve for a longer period or "for the war." He suggested that if a decision were made to use part of the active service force overseas the men might be "re-enlisted for overseas service." The statement issued on 19 September confirmed that this would be done, the men of both divisions being re-attested on a basis of volunteering for service in Canada or elsewhere for the duration of the war. Orders were shortly sent out that the whole of the active service force was to be re-attested in this way.

Again I draw the minister's attention to the fact that this re-attestation took place during wartime. I quote further:

> During the afternoon parade at Picton the terms of the "Supplementary Declaration," Form M.F.M.2 (x) were read and explained to Picton Coys., and they were told that they might have a short time in which to discuss these terms and deliberate over them. However one strong voice called out: "I don't need any time on mine! Bring on the declaration! I'm all set to sign!" This was the signal for quite an outburst of enthusiasm, and there was a period of shouting and cheering. The upshot was that when the Coys. were called upon to sign for overseas service "D" Coy. turned out to a man, but five members of 'C" Coy. refused to sign and were heartily booed as a result.
>
> In all, only five officers and 532 other ranks of the C.A.S.F. declined to re-attest and were struck off the strength, "services no longer required."

The minister says that to re-attest the service personnel into the unified force in peacetime would bring about chaos. This is another indication that he has absolutely no confidence whatsoever in his bill, and I would especially draw his attention to this little incident. Could I have the minister's attention, please?

Mr. Hellyer: You have it.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Is he aware of the fact that one of his colleagues—when I say one of his colleagues I am talking about one of his cabinet colleagues—saw fit to invite me into his office to discuss this very clause and having discussed it, having made references to the examples I have just quoted, this minister, who nevertheless stands up and votes against what we are trying to do on this side, agreed and himself provided a few precedents to back up what we are now arguing, that men in the peacetime forces certainly should be given the opportunity to reattest, especially since the government saw fit to reattest the men during wartime.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Forrestall: Will the real minister stand up?

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I might also draw to the attention of the minister some other official records. I am referring to the period following the war in Europe and the activities which were still going on in the Pacific. On April 4 the Prime Minister made a statement in the House of Commons on the Pacific program. This included the information that the men to be employed against Japan would be chosen from those who elected to serve in the Pacific theatre. In other words, there would be no compulsion.

I do not mind competing with members present in the house, Mr. Chairman, but I am having a rough time competing with the noise coming from behind the curtains on the other side.

An hon. Member: Just keep on reading.

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): The hon. member for Russell could not carry water for a serviceman let alone carry anything else around here. I think the hon. member should be ashamed of himself for being here in this house and allowing Canadian men to be put into the new service compulsorily. The hon. member sits in his seat day in and day out and never makes a worthwhile contribution of any kind other than interjections. If the hon. member for Russell, who is a very prominent member in the snake pit, thinks he can bother me by his interjections—

Mr. Tardif: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman; the hon. member is quite right when he says I sit here regularly, but when he says I make no contribution I should like to say to him that he is making no contribution when he says nothing but foolish things and wastes our time.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I am waiting for your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I should amend what I said and say that the hon. member sits here on occasions.

The Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Cape Breton South has the floor.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Chairman, did I hear a ruling on the question of privilege?

The Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Russell, having been mentioned by the hon. member for Cape Breton South, wished to state his point and has done so. The hon. member for Cape Breton South has the floor.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): When are we going to get the truth from the Minister of National Defence? When are we going to get the truth concerning what happened in the defence committee? When are we to get the tapes so that we will be able to check them against the printed testimony? When will we hear the minister deny that there is a contract which has been signed by all members in the services? Is the minister now going to get up and deny that he said there was a contract? Is the minister going to deny what the chairman of the defence committee said in the house? I defy the minister to get up and deny these things.

The minister has sat here and listened to the arguments from this side of the house. Now they are bringing in the guillotine. We will have to stop discussing unification and the welfare of the armed services. Why? I will tell you why. They want to go down to Expo on Thursday. They want to take Thursday off. That is the reason we have to stop discussing unification. We have to go down to Expo; we have to wine and dine at the expense of the servicemen. That is what they are doing. How many members on that side can get up and say that the serviceman is receiving the privileges to which he is entitled? How many can stand up and say that this is not compulsory service? Let us hear from the member for Russell now. I have to raise my voice to make myself heard. If anyone has the guts, let him get up, raise his voice and say that what I am saying is wrong and that there is no compulsion about this bill. Let the minister who invited me into his

office and agreed with my arguments in respect of clause 6 get up and say he does not agree with me.

What do we get from the Liberal party? The same old attitude. Imagine the nerve this government has when it says we must stop the debate on this bill so that we can go down to Expo. This is what the government is trying to put across to the country—stop this talk about unification so that we can go down and be wined and dined while the Canadian serviceman not only is being compulsorily put into the service but is being put into a service which from now on will not have the distinction of being voluntary. We are now to follow the policy of those countries which have conscription. This is what the minister is bringing about. If he is now going to bring in an amendment to soften this blow, let me remind him that a serviceman today can obtain his release from the service on six months' notice. If that is not so, then may I say that a minister of this government has written a letter to that effect. I have that letter.

Let the Liberal members get up and recall what went on in the committee on national defence. Let everybody remember that the Minister of Transport said that there are no experts on unification because it has never been tried before. He has cast a reflection on every man who has served his country and served it well. The Minister of Transport is laughing. It is surprising that the minister is laughing because whether he likes it or not a number of members of his own party have contradicted his argument. The Minister of National Defence has contradicted him. Members of his party have stood up and read speeches which were probably prepared by officials of the Department of National Defence.

How many people in this country are aware of what the opposition was up against when they were fighting this matter in the committee? The other evening an hon. member referred to the fact that I was appointed to the committee very late in the hearings. He spoke about my contribution. He went so far as to say that I had fallaciously represented that unification could lead to conscription. I should like to have the hon. member refute my arguments. I maintain that what I say in this regard is the truth.

In so far as what went on in the committee is concerned, how many people in this country are aware of the fact that the minister sat behind his committee members along with members of his staff, including his deputy minister, who were there for the express purpose of feeding to the Liberal members on the committee questions which they themselves did not have sufficient knowledge to ask? How many people in this country know about that situation? How many people in this country will believe the Minister of Transport who said that these serving officers or old hats, or whatever he referred to them as, know nothing about this situation, that what was wanted was fresh minds with imagination and that experience and knowledge did not mean anything? That reference includes not only those officers who have recently retired but must also include those now serving in a senior capacity. The Minister of Transport said: "They do not mean a thing". He says there are no experts on unification. He says that it has never been tried before. If it has never been tried before, why did so many members of his party say that unification is a good thing and that the United States marines have it?

• (4:30 p.m.)

There is a contradiction between what the Minister of Transport and the Minister of National Defence have said. One can go through the discussion and find these ministers contradicting each other day after day, but in the final analysis the Minister of National Defence has used that lie to advance his argument. Perhaps someone will suggest that this is unparliamentary language, but a spade is a spade no matter how you look at it. So far as the original use of the word "lie" during this debate is concerned and whether or not it is parliamentary, it was introduced by the minister when he suggested that members on this side were repeating lies. I ask the minister now who originated the lies we supposedly have been repeating.

Mr. Hellyer: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman. I wish the hon. member would not pluralize that word. I used it in the singular.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): That still does not get you off the hook. Who originally used the word or told the lie that we have been accused of repeating? Let the minister rise on a question of privilege and tell us who originated that lie.

An hon. Member: Order. Stick to the point.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): You have a lot of helpers down at this end, Mr. Chairman, but I do not suppose you will recognize any of them. Who originated that

lie? Was it originated by a serving officer who testified before the committee? Was it originated by the Minister of Justice who was quoted, or was it originated by a member of the press? The minister has never answered the question. Yet he is the one who made the suggestion first and he has continually allowed his position to be advanced by that big lie. I am not referring to the big lie technique, and I will repeat this outside the house. I am referring to the big, deliberate lie of which he spoke and took advantage.

The minister now suggests that we should put our service personnel into one unified force without giving them the opportunity of volunteering honourably to be servicemen. Apparently there must now be an element of compulsion even though on several occasions during wartime a choice was given to the men. Let me remind the minister that one of his own colleagues in the cabinet has agreed with this suggestion, although I am sure he will vote against the amendment.

The actions on the part of ministers have been very strange indeed. The former minister of finance—I have not been able to keep up with his promotions—saw fit to sit back and laugh at certain suggestions from this side. I wonder whether he laughed when the Minister of Transport said he should resign. The suggestion was made that no minister who gives the government bad advice should remain in this house. He gives all kinds of advice outside this house on economics and the actions of other parties such as the New Democrats or the Conservatives. He has often given advice to the Liberal party, but I notice that his stature in that regard has decreased considerably.

Only a week or so ago the Minister of Transport when expressing his opinion about unification suggested that anyone who gives bad advice should resign. Surely one might infer from that statement that the Prime Minister should no longer be here because he accepted bad advice. The former minister of finance, as he is best known in the house, makes all kinds of statements regarding issues in this country. Yet he apparently does not see fit to express his opinion in the house on the unification issue. Why does he not express an opinion? Why does he not get up and support the lies upon which the minister of defence has been relying?

The Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence assured us that every opportunity would be given to hon. members to hear evidence and examine this bill. One can find by considering the evidence before the committee that the Minister of National Defence was sorry that an opportunity was not given to other people to appear before the committee. In spite of that fact he and his colleagues have now decided to use the guillotine to cut off consideration. Presumably they find that necessary in order that we may visit Expo on Thursday.

What this minister and the Prime Minister are doing in respect of unification of our armed forces is shameful. On a number of occasions during wartime the serving personnel of this country were given the opportunity to reattest. The Minister of National Defence professes confidence in the provisions of this bill. Yet he says if we were to allow the personnel to make a choice it would bring about chaos. How could that be so? The hon. member for Greenwood referred to the suggestion that our service personnel should be given the opportunity to opt into the unified force. Apparently the Liberals were willing to accept that suggestion. All they need to do to show their acceptance is vote for this amendment. Of course, they realize that if an opportunity is given to the serving personnel to opt in they will also be given the opportunity to opt out. I suggest that if the minister does have the confidence in this measure which he professes he should accept this amendment.

Surely we should continue our Canadian forces on a voluntary basis. We should remove any stigma that may be attached to a compulsory service requirement. Although some ministers have expressed a different feeling, I believe the Minister of National Defence could meet a great many of the objections of hon. members on this side by accepting this simple amendment. He should give the serving personnel of this country the same opportunity provided on several occasions during wartime, the opportunity to choose to re-attest. The legality could be considered later, but I think this principle should be accepted by the government at this time.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, for clarification in respect of this clause I should like to ask the minister whether or not he can shed some light on the current status of the armed forces pension fund. It is my understanding that it stands at something over $2 billion and that during the fiscal year 1965-66 $37 million was paid out in pensions. Can the minister advise the committee whether it would not be possible for the government to give consideration to those who choose to take the existing avenue of recourse to resignation rather than

whatever may come afterwards? Can the minister tell us whether or not there is sufficient money in the fund to justify the suggestion put forward by Admiral Landymore at page 1052 of the proceedings of the defence committee on February 15 where he pointed out the following:

• (4:40 p.m.)

In order to treat everyone fairly, each officer and man must be given a full pension. By this I mean, a pension equal to 2 per cent of his pay and allowances (averaged over the last six years of service) for each year of service, for all those who have served ten or more years. For those who have served less than ten years—they should have their pension contributions returned to them—

In addition I agree fully they should be given some kind of a settling-out grant, if that is indeed what it is. I raise this question simply because of the illustration given by Admiral Landymore in his testimony. He gave the case history of two officers of the same age who joined the R.C.N. on the same day. Both were still serving at the age of 44 and both had completed 25 years of service. One had been more successful than the other and had reached the rank of naval captain while his term mate was still a lieutenant commander. I suppose that actuarially speaking they are the same age and would have the same life expectancy and therefore the captain who paid in slightly more, because the system is contributory, might be expected to draw slightly more out of the fund. But indeed, as Admiral Landymore pointed out in his evidence, this was not the case. He said:

But this doesn't happen. The captain's pension is subject to a 55 per cent reduction. The lieutenant commander's pension is reduced by 5 per cent. The captain will receive a pension of less than $3,000 a year, while the lieutenant commander receives a pension of about $5,000 a year. The captain has been penalized—he has paid more for his pension, he has taken greater responsibility, and, for his success he receives a much smaller pension.

Before we get to the point of determination on this clause I wonder whether the minister could give us some information on this matter? I would like to move a further amendment after we have dealt with this one, and I believe this is the appropriate place for it.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, this is a most important clause and one which deserves the careful consideration of the committee.

First of all I should like to assure hon. members that these matters were given thoughtful consideration in the department and by the law officers of the crown. It has been suggested that the relationship between officers and men and the crown is contractual in nature. It has long been held, both in the United Kingdom and Canada, that there is no bilateral contract between the Crown and an officer or man serving in the forces of the crown. Thus in 1896 it was said in a case in the United Kingdom:

—it has been laid down over and over again ... that all engagements between those in the military service of the crown and the crown are voluntary only on the part of the crown and give no occasion for an action in respect of any alleged contract.

This case was applied in a Canadian judgment in 1921 where it was said that for both officers and men of the Canadian forces the engagements "are voluntary only on the part of the crown". The same decision was reached in 1940 when the Exchequer Court examined some nine previous cases.

In 1959, in an action for the recovery of pay and allowances, the Exchequer Court was called upon to determine whether anything in the National Defence Act had altered the previous non-contractual relationship between the crown and officers and men. In delivering judgment it was said:

—I think, that in construing the provisions of the National Defence Act I must apply the presumption that parliament, when enacting that act, did not intend to alter such a well established principle unless there be found therein language which in express terms or by clear implication leads to the conclusion that such an alteration was intended. An examination of the act satisfies me that it contains no such express terms or any language which clearly implies that such an alteration was intended.

It has also been suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite that this clause is not within the jurisdiction of parliament and that it comes into conflict with the constitution.

It has long been held that legislation by the government of Canada which properly relates to one of the heads of Section 91 of the B.N.A. Act is intra vires although it may affect the property and civil rights of individuals. Heading 7 of Section 91 is "Militia, Military and Naval Service, and Defence."

In 1958 the Supreme Court of Canada quoted with approval a judgment of the Privy Council in which it was said:

Most of the specific subjects in Section 91 do affect property and civil rights but, so far as the legislation of parliament in pith and substance is operating within the enumerated powers, there is constitutional authority to interfere with such rights.

A decision by the Supreme Court of Canada in 1962 is directly in point. In that case the Supreme Court was called upon to

decide whether a provision of the Exchequer Court Act, which provided that an officer or man of the armed forces was deemed to be a servant of the crown for purposes of establishing liability, was ultra vires as affecting property and civil rights. Part of the judgment reads as follows:

In my opinion, to declare the nature of the relationship existing between the crown and members of the armed forces for any or all purposes is legislation within the exclusive jurisdiction of parliament under head 7 and accordingly, intra vires. This does not depend, in my view, upon any such ground as that to do this is necessarily incidental to the powers of parliament under head 7: it is a direct dealing with the matter within such powers.

In considering this bill it must be presumed that officers and men join the service to serve their country, Canada. I do not think it is too unreasonable to assume that they will want to continue to serve Canada in the unified service. Nevertheless I think it can be argued that in view of the fundamental nature of the change proposed in merging three services into one, the officers and men should not, except in an emergency, be required to continue to serve against their will.

It was for this reason that I gave the standing committee on defence the assurance that the present policy in respect of releases would continue. I must admit that I have been impressed by the argument that it would be preferable to write the provision into the law rather than to rely on a statement of policy. I propose therefore, after we have disposed of the amendment now before us, to ask one of my colleagues to move the following as an amendment.

That clause 6 be amended by adding thereto subclauses three and four as follows:

6. (3) Notwithstanding anything in this act or in the National Defence Act and subject to subsection 4, where an officer or man was a member of the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army or the Royal Canadian Air Force immediately prior to the day on which this act is proclaimed and, within two months after that day, makes application in writing to his commanding officer for his release, he is entitled, except in an emergency, to be released within six months after that day.

(4) Where a person while an officer or man has received university, advanced technical or aircrew training or education at public expense, his right to release under subsection 3 is subject to such conditions as may be prescribed in regulations made by the Governor in Council.

• (4:50 p.m.)

I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that there is some question of the amendment now before us being in order because, as I understand it, it is in exactly the same wording as an amendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre in the committee, as recorded at pages 2371 and 2372. It is my understanding that a decision of the committee is binding on the house. Nevertheless, if you find that this amendment is in order I would ask the committee to defeat it and then I will ask one of my colleagues to introduce the amendment to which I have just referred and which I hope will be found generally acceptable.

Before I resume my seat, Mr. Chairman, I should like to deal briefly with the question of pensions which was raised by the hon. member for Halifax. First of all, there is no more money in the fund than is required to meet its obligations. As a matter of fact, hon. members will recall that in the estimates recently presented to the House of Commons the largest single increase, I think something in the order of $75 million for the fiscal year, was required to meet an actuarial deficit—I think only one fifth of the actuarial deficit —caused by increases in pay awarded to members of the armed forces last year.

It is true to say, therefore, that notwithstanding the size of the fund, the fund is committed to meet obligations on the basis of undertakings presently in force. It is a very generous pension fund, and I think quite rightly so because service in the armed forces is unlike service in many other fields of endeavour in that it requires the best of an officer or man during his most productive years. It is not unreasonable, therefore, that he should be treated accordingly by the people of this country. It was designed in order to keep officers and men in the forces once they had served for a reasonable period of time, and by and large it has been successful in doing this.

It is one of the provisions, I think, of most industrial and public pension plans, that after a certain period of service there is a definite advantage to the individual to remain in the organization or service in which he is employed. I believe one could raise a general question about the desirability of this kind of pension plan and the regidity that it introduces into our system, and perhaps the desirability of having much more portability than presently exists between different pension plans. However, at the moment we are looking at the problem strictly in the context of the legislation now before us, and in that context I think we must admit this bill does not change the circumstances under which the pension law was written in so far as its general application is concerned.

Servicemen leaving the service now are subjected to an actuarial reduction. They receive a smaller pension over a longer period of time, and this has been taken into account in determining the payments required to the fund from time to time, including the actuarial deficit to which I referred a moment ago. A suggestion was made to the effect that the actuarial reduction not apply. The result would be that a special benefit would be provided for people leaving the service. I think this would not be acceptable for one reason, according to my discussions with the officers and men of the forces, and that is that the people who would be most likely to take advantage of it are the pilots, engineers, lawyers and professional people whose training would be in the greatest demand in the civilian economy.

This problem has been freely discussed internally. We have come to the conclusion that the result of this kind of special treatment would not reflect directly our appreciation of the bill now before us but would reflect much more closely the opportunity available to individuals in the civilian economy. We have gone into this question very carefully over a long period of time to see whether or not there might be some relaxation in the present reduction at some senior levels. At the present time we have not been able to devise a policy which meets satisfactorily all the cases. We are still looking into it. I have not seen as yet a proposal which was not subject to very serious technical reservations.

Mr. Forrestall: Surely the minister will accept the fact that there is a tremendous disparity between captains and lieutenant commanders?

Mr. Hellyer: I freely admit, as I did in the other committee, that there are basic anomalies in the law. It is under general review to see if we cannot design a more equitable law. In the meantime there are anomalies which are known by my hon. friend and others.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the fund is fully committed to meet present obligations, any bonuses or extra considerations given to those who desired to leave the service as a result of this bill would be a considerable additional charge on the public account. We have decided this would not be in the best interests of the service or the country at the present time.

The Chairman: May I make a reference to the point of order raised by the Minister of National Defence with regard to the amendment before the committee. I should point out that in the opinion of the Chair a decision made in the committee on national defence with reference to an amendment does not bind this house. If that were so, then all the amendments made in the standing committee and recorded in this bill would also be binding on the committee of the whole.

May I refer hon. members to page 523 of May, seventeenth edition, the second paragraph under the heading, "Synopsis of Stages of a bill"? This paragraph reads:

> Upon this principle, it is laid down by Hatsell, and is constantly exemplified, "that in every stage of a bill, every part of the bill is open to amendment, either for insertion or omission, whether the same amendment has been, in a former stage, accepted or rejected".

Mr. Forrestall: I have one or two questions for the minister concerning pensions. Are my figures correct, that approximately $37 million was paid out in the fiscal year 1965-66 while some $55 million was taken in?

Mr. Hellyer: I do not have the figures before me, Mr. Chairman, but they sound reasonable. I would be willing to accept them until otherwise advised.

Mr. Forrestall: My other question must be, what has happened to the pension fund? Has it gone back into general revenues? Is it not kept separate? This is a contributory plan and the money belongs to these men, no matter how they get it back.

Mr. Hellyer: I am afraid the question being asked is well outside of my jurisdiction. If I had to give a reply merely from my own vague knowledge of the subject, it would be that these are largely bookkeeping entries in government accounts and the money has already been used for other governmental purposes but the interest is credited to the account each year.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Forrestall: That is what I am afraid of.

Mr. Hellyer: Then the total amount outstanding in the account is available to meet the liabilities of the fund. If I understand the system correctly, it is merely that the funds have been used on government account and the interest accrues on that basis.

Mr. Groos: Mr. Chairman, just before we vote on this amendment I should like to say that I agree with some of the things said by the hon. member for Halifax just prior to the

minister's remarks, particularly in respect of the case to which he referred of the captain and the lieutenant commander and the disparity in their pensions. Bilateral contract or not, Mr. Chairman, as the minister has explained this is undoubtedly legal. However, I was glad to hear the minister make the point that this anomaly is being studied at the moment.

Although this is an inequity I know it is unintentional. Certainly it is not intentional under the arrangements proposed by this bill. I hope the minister and the department will continue to give the matter special attention because I believe it wrong in every way—I deem this inequity in effect to be a penalty—to penalize any man or officer who has the intelligence or distinction to be promoted, as is the situation in this case. Therefore I hope that the minister can find some way to resolve this question in the near future.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, I should like to comment on a couple of matters raised by the minister in connection with whether or not a contract exists between the serviceman and the government. Although the argument he used that the government is not bound by the contract and that the courts have held that what the government gives the serviceman under what we regard as an agreement is a voluntary payment may perhaps be technically correct, I would point out that while the serviceman is bound he is only bound to the extent to which he signs.

The minister told us that a serviceman joins the services to serve Canada, and then he used this in the same context when talking about a contract. That is completely misleading. The serviceman is not bound to serve Canada in this context. He is bound to serve in the armed force that he joined, and that is all he is bound to do. I want to make sure that we are not misled by what the minister says and that there is no suggestion that when a man joins the armed services he is bound to serve Canada and therefore automatically bound to serve this new force. That argument does not hold water when subjected to legal interpretation. I do not think I would have too much difficulty in distinguishing the other cases in light of the pith and substance of this legislation, but that question can be argued before the courts.

The minister has suggested that a man can be released from the forces by giving notice within two months after the coming into force of this legislation and be released after the expiration of six months. As far as I am concerned this puts the matter on the wrong basis. This legislation provides that a man is voluntarily transferred to the new force unless he takes the opportunity to release himself from the forces within a certain length of time. This does not alter the fact that this amounts to peacetime conscription. This release is only available to certain people who disagree with unification, and I can see that the six months' period is going to be made plain hell for anybody who waits for his release under those conditions.

We all know, what the minister has done to senior officers who disagreed with him, and I have some idea what would happen to members of the forces, who today are unable to voice their feelings and live in fear and trembling down through the ranks, if they said something which was not in accordance with the minister's policy. I think that the minister's explanation is most unsatisfactory.

Amendment (Mr. Churchill) negatived: Yeas, 25; nays, 74.

The Deputy Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. Hellyer: I wonder whether my colleague the Minister of Transport would be good enough to move this amendment for me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could move the amendment and the Chair could read it without my doing so, if that is agreeable.

The Deputy Chairman: It is moved by the Minister of Transport:

That clause 6 be amended by adding thereto subclauses (3) and (4) as follows:

(3) Notwithstanding anything in this act or in the National Defence Act and subject to subsection (4), where an officer or man was a member of the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army or the Royal Canadian Air Force immediately prior to the day on which this act is proclaimed and, within two months after that day, makes application in writing to his commanding officer for his release, he is entitled, except in an emergency, to be released within six months after that day.

(4) Where a person while an officer or man has received university, advanced technical or aircrew training or education at public expense, his right to release under subsection (3) is subject to such conditions as may be prescribed in regulations made by the governor in council.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, the minister would like us to think that he has made quite a concession here. But all he is doing of course is writing into the bill something that he has already said in committee and this

merely clarifies it. The minister is still retaining the objectionable factor that my amendment was intended to cure, namely, compulsory transfer from the present services into the new service.

I am even wondering whether there is a catch in the amendment. It contains the words, "except in an emergency". Section 31 of the present act, which is not being amended, deals with the problem of securing a release from the forces. That section provides:

• (5:10 p.m.)

Except during an emergency or when he is on active service, an officer or man is entitled to be released at the expiration of the term of service for which he is enrolled or re-engaged.

That applies to the end of a man's service. An exception is made in case of an emergency or when the man is on active service. We were told by the Judge Advocate General in the committee hearings that since the Korean war officers and men in the services have been on active service. Is the minister taking shelter behind the phrase "on active service"? If an officer or man applies for release, under the proposed amendment, will the department's reply be that he is on active service and must complete his full term? What is the minister's answer?

Mr. Hellyer: The answer would be in the negative, that matter being covered in proposed subsection 3 by the words "except in an emergency". This proposed subsection would not be effected by the fact the armed services are on active service.

Mr. Churchill: I have another question about pensions. Where a man or officer wishes to withdraw, does the minister contemplate any penalty with respect to his pension? Will that penalty be any different from any penalty the man might incur now if he were to withdraw voluntarily?

Mr. Hellyer: If I understood the hon. member's question, the present regulations would apply and there would be no penalty. In all fairness I must differentiate between how the word "penalty" is used and what a penalty is. We must be careful of our language here. What is normally called a penalty is an actuarial reduction. There would be no other penalty beyond the actuarial reduction and the regulations presently in force would continue to apply.

Mr. Churchill: I intend to vote against the amendment because it retains that compulsion to which I have been objecting. I regret

[Mr. Churchill.]

that the minister has not sufficient confidence in our armed forces personnel to permit them to reattest. For some time now he has been telling us that everybody in the services wants to go along with his plan. Yet he will not risk his ideas by putting an attestation paper in front of armed forces personnel to prove his point. I doubt very much that conditions in the services are as happy and pleasant as the minister says they are. I think there is unrest in the services. Were the minister absolutely sure of his men he would do as we did in September, 1939, when we reattested the volunteers twice in a row without trouble. The official history shows that only 500 men out of several thousand failed to reattest. Perhaps a small number only would fail to reattest again, were they granted the privilege of attesting with respect to enrolment in the service. I am afraid that the minister does not have the courage of his convictions.

Mr. Forrestall: May I ask the minister a question? It is obvious that the amendment will carry. I agree with the position adopted by previous speakers. Will the minister undertake to communicate the intent of the amendment to our armed services without delay so that its meaning may be clear to them and they need not resort to news media or other unofficial means of communication to obtain information about the amendment?

Mr. Hellyer: Yes, I shall be pleased to give that undertaking. A lengthy telegram is being prepared to be sent to members of the armed forces when the bill is passed by this house and the other place setting out a number of provisions, including this one, and informing our armed forces personnel what they can expect in the months ahead and when the regulations will be made available to them for perusal.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the minister a question similar to one I asked before. I do not expect a reply from the minister but I ask it hoping for a reply. My question involves those men who, two months after this bill is proclaimed and becomes law, say they do not wish to re-enlist. It is well known that in our forces there may be ambitious sergeants eager to prove to their superiors that they are worthy to be promoted. Ambitious sergeants can make life intolerable for men who have to wait six months before being released. In view of the hardship that some men may suffer at the hands of ambitious sergeants would the minister not consider shortening the waiting period to two or

three months? Is there any reason why that cannot be done?

Mr. Hellyer: Six months is the maximum period, Mr. Chairman. That time period is included in the bill out of deference to those who will be posted to replace people seeking release. Some notice must be given so that another serviceman may be posted to replace the man wishing to go. This time period is necessary for the administrative machine to function in some sort of reasonable fashion and to give fair notice to the replacement officer or man and to his family.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I ask the mover of the amendment to define "emergency" as set out in the amendment.

Mr. Hellyer: Perhaps I could tell the hon. member. It means war, invasion—

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I asked the mover of the amendment to say what is meant by emergency. This again shows the slipshod way in which the government handles the affairs of our armed forces.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman has been in this house and in the committee long enough to know that when a minister is piloting a bill through the house and asks one of his colleagues to move an amendment that is merely a matter of formality and that the minister who is dealing with a bill is in the best position to explain precisely what the meaning of the amendment is. It does not seem to me that there is any particular reason on this occasion for the hon. gentleman to extend that usual courtesy for which he is so famous.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): As I may have said before, when it comes to courtesy and rudeness between the Minister of Transport and myself I may he ahead on courtesy and the minister may be ahead on rudeness. I ask the Minister of National Defence whether he will not strengthen his amendment by using the words "national emergency" to make clear that by national emergency a war or something of that kind is contemplated.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. Hellyer: I think the conditions I have described are considered to be national emergencies.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Well, would you mind writing in the word "national" then?

Mr. Hellyer: I do not think that would alter the effect of the law at all.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): It certainly qualifies the term. If the minister thinks it would make no difference, there should be no objection to writing the word in. A national emergency would be one affecting the whole of Canada. The department could dream up any number of emergencies so far as the armed forces are concerned.

What the minister has said about administrative difficulties is another indication that the Department of National Defence is not operating as efficiently as it should or as it did during wartime. During the war the department was able to reattest the men on very short notice indeed. In fact, within one day they went ahead with a decision to do it. Now the minister says at least two months are needed. This is a reflection on the administration of the department and it implies a lack of competence on the part of the minister. He tells us now that the addition of the word "national" would not result in any change. In that case, why not write it into the bill?

Amendment (Mr. Pickersgill) agreed to: Yeas 66; nays, 28.

The Deputy Chairman: I declare the amendment carried. Shall the clause as amended in the standing committee and further amended in committee of the whole carry?

Mr. Churchill: On division.

Clause agreed to.

On clause 7—*Restriction on employment.*

The Deputy Chairman: Shall clause 7 carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Churchill: Let us not be in such haste. There are groans from the other side, as usual. I do not intend to make a long speech. I did put forward a proposal the other day which would have shortened our consideration of this bill but it was not accepted. We discussed the bill on Tuesday and Wednesday when we should have been doing other business. Had my proposal been accepted we would not have had this debate on Thursday or Friday or today. This is where the time has been taken up.

While I am speaking of time I think it is going too far for people to announce to the public in one way or another that the time of the House of Commons spent on this bill has

been as great as they say. It is hardly fair to give the impression to the public, as some people have done, that this bill has been under discussion for 55 days or, according to others, for 29 days. It is quite untrue. The bill came under discussion on December 7 when the minister made his speech on second reading. Only then was it before the house for debate. That was on a Wednesday. The reply on December 7 by my hon. friend from Edmonton West was limited in time to about 20 minutes. Then the bill came up again on second reading earlier this year and we spent —what was it?—two days on second reading. In committee of the whole house we have now spent several days on it.

An hon. Member: Sixteen.

Mr. Churchill: That is all the time which has been spent on this bill and I wish that those who make announcements over the air or in the papers would be fair to the House of Commons and give the people of Canada the correct impression. We have not spent an excessive amount of time on this bill which is of major importance.

Clause 7 of the bill reads:

> Except in an emergency, no officer or man who was a member of the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army or the Royal Canadian Air Force immediately prior to the coming into force of this part shall, without his consent, be required to perform any duty in the Canadian Forces that he could not have been required to perform as a member of such service.

This clause recognizes something which we think should continue to be recognized, namely, that men have made a definite choice in entering one of the three services and should be given an opportunity to continue in the service of their choice. It is intended to protect people who are now in the three services from being required to perform duties outside those they might have been expected to perform in their present services. Obviously some such clause was necessary or the hierarchy of the department might transfer officers and men from navy to army or from army to air force who had no wish to serve in an altered capacity.

The very fact that this clause appears in the bill indicates that people who enter the defence forces after the passage of this measure will be subject to transfer among the branches of the service. Otherwise, why is it here? There will be two types of people in this service after this bill is passed, those who have already entered the army, the navy or the air force and those who enter the defence force later. Though the minister has told us they will not be required to do certain things, they will obviously be subject to transfer with or without their consent. This may have a bad effect on morale or it may lead to unsatisfactory conditions.

• (5:30 p.m.)

We had an example offered us which, frankly, I consider to be somewhat ridiculous. A pilot exercise was carried out in which two members of the army served on board a destroyer. The purpose was to see whether it would be satisfactory for somebody from the army to serve at sea. It all depends on the individual. Some people could serve as readily on land as at sea or in the air, but I do not think this pilot project proved anything at all. Nevertheless it is an indication that what is intended is that men who enlist in the future are going to be shifted, without any leave on their part, from one branch of the service to another or from one area to another. Even those whose enlistment earlier was in a special force—navy, army or air force—in an emergency will be moved about under the provisions of this clause.

The whole point of clause 7 is that it indicates the complete obliteration of the three distinct services. Yet in wartime there will still be activity at sea, separate and apart from land and air, there will still be activity in the air, separate and apart from land and sea, and there will still be activity on land, separate and apart from sea and air. This is taking place in Viet Nam at the present time. In the Vietnamese war there have been fights between fighter aircraft, and we had an example involving Israel and Syria just two weeks ago. But the minister has told us, "Oh no, all of this is in the past. All of this is old-fashioned. That is the way people used to do it in the olden days but now it is all different. No longer will there be clashes between air forces or clashes between fleets."

The strange thing is that other countries are still maintaining their fleets. They are building up their submarine fleets. For example, I do not know how an army is going to deal with a submarine 400 miles off the coast of Canada. It would appear to me you would have to have ships and airplanes to undertake that task, but the minister tells us that all of this is to be altered and nothing is to be done as it was done in the past.

I point out that under clause 7 the intention is quite obvious in an emergency to move the people presently in the services from one force to another, and it is also the intention

that when new people enlist in the future they will not have the privilege of those now in the separate services to select what they are going to do. They will be liable to be shifted back and forth. It is an undesirable clause.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, I find this clause a little confusing. If we are to take the speech of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra as correct, that all this bill does is change the name of the forces, then obviously it contains no provision to change the duties of serving personnel, and so I shall expect the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra to vote against this clause as being useless and redundant.

Mr. Deachman: You had better reread my speech.

Mr. Nugent: I got sick listening to it once, and heaven forbid I should have to reread it. The argument made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre applies. I imagine that when this act comes into force there is going to be a clear distinction so long as there remains in the new force anyone who is carried over from the old forces. There will be two classes of citizens, so to speak, in the armed forces, and this clause is going to make sure that it will be a permanent distinction. One class of citizen will be the new members who are subject to any duty at all in the combined forces and the other class will consist of those carried over from the old forces who, when ordered to change duties, can say, "Just a minute; here are my duties." In other words, whether in the country generally or in the armed forces we have always tried to avoid making a distinction between the working or serving conditions of one citizen and another, but this is going to be perpetuated by this bill and perpetuated not just for the six months during which anybody now serving can get out of the services after the coming into force of the bill.

I have an idea why the minister included this provision. It is to reassure people that their conditions of service will not change that drastically, that it will be the same old job. It is to tell them that, just as the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra said, "Maybe you will have a new uniform but there will be no drastic changes and you had better stay on." This reveals the depths of the minister's fear of how shocking members of the present forces find unification, his fear of the amount of demoralization that has set in and his fear of the degree to which serving personnel are going to abandon the unified force when they get a chance. So this provision is thrown out as a crumb to try to stem the tide of revulsion sweeping the forces against this bill.

It also points up very drastically some of the speeches which the minister and his supporters have made respecting the duties of the new force and the advantages of interchangeability even under integration, such as those claimed for the common training command. We have had some indications that training command is not working all that well. It has been discovered that there is not that much training in common among the three services, that specialization sets in so quickly that already, according to the evidence, there is real doubt that having one amalgamated training command has accomplished anything. Some testimony has been given that it is a waste of time and more expensive than an individual training command for each of the services. However, if the claimed great advantages of unification are going to be brought out, are going to be sold, then I suppose the minister had to sell the idea of interchangeability and training command was an illustration of it. All I can say is that this certainly makes a mockery out of his argument of interchangeability because if they have been trained in one service they cannot be required to perform in another. If we are going to get any advantages out of interchangeability, and we doubt there will be any in a realistic sense, then under the new set up only the new men who enter the force can be interchanged, according to the provisions of this clause.

However, I think this will not be the hindrance that it appears to be because the facts of military life are going to take effect, especially with reference to the phrase "without his consent." The classic army situation of asking for three volunteers, you, you and you, is not really so far removed from the truth. Volunteers in most instances are just picked at random or the sergeant may say to them, "You are going to do this, won't you?" That will be the extent of it and I think this is a beautiful illustration of the fallacy of some of the arguments used by the minister. It is a perfect illustration of the never-never-land in which the Minister of National Defence seems to live, in that it shows what he will do to try to sell this bill, what he will do to try to take the stink out of what he is doing to the armed forces and the extent to which he will go to make us believe everything is fine. But all this accomplishes is really nothing. The only worth of this provision will be shown if life

in the armed services is not realistic and if the phrase "without his consent" means something, but that is a pretty nebulous sort of thing because consent is too easily obtained.

• (5:40 p.m.)

If I am wrong in that regard then, of course, the only effect of this clause will be to make a very distinct cleavage between the two classes of people who will be in the services from the time this legislation comes into effect and for all time. Since the new boys will have joined freely and will be willing to serve anywhere they may regard the old boys as second class citizens. This situation might accelerate the attempt of the old boys to get out or it might accentuate the differences which will exist between the two groups and lead to misunderstanding. I do not particularly care whether or not this clause passes. No doubt it is necessary for those who will have the will to stand up and take advantage of it. I believe it will create a good deal of confusion, but perhaps that is what the minister deserves for having brought in a bill of this kind.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall clause 7 carry?

Mr. Churchill: Call the yeas and nays.

Clause agreed to: Yeas 51; nays 24.

The Chairman: Clause 8.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, we have pretty well completed part I, which is the essential part of the bill. I wonder whether we might revert now to clause 2. I think we would be prepared to deal with that clause without further discussion. If we then proceeded with part II we might make rapid progress in respect ot those clauses.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, I think that is an agreeable suggestion if it meets the wishes of the committee.

The Chairman: Is it the wish of members of the committee that we revert to clause 2?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

On clause 2—*Canadian Forces, Canadian Armed Forces.*

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, will you call the yeas and nays.

Clause agreed to: yeas 58; nays 22.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Although my point of order will have no effect on the outcome of the vote, I should like to say it is a well known rule that once a vote has been called, whether in committee or otherwise, members are not permitted to enter the chamber to record their votes. During the last two votes members on the Liberal side have rushed in in quite large numbers. At the time they were coming in this fact was drawn to the attention of the Chair, I believe, by shouts of order from this side of the house. It was most evident that quite a number of members on that side rushed in although the rules do not permit this. I realize my point of order is just that and has no effect on the vote. I believe, however, that the Chair recognizes the fact that these members did walk in after the vote was called.

The Chairman: I think the point of order raised by the hon. member for Cape Breton South is well taken. At this point I might read standing order No. 12 which is applicable in this regard. The standing order reads as follows:

(2) When Mr. Speaker is putting a question, no member shall enter, walk out of or across the House, or make any noise or disturbance.

I would ask members of the committee to adhere to that standing order.

Clauses 8 to 25 inclusive agreed to on division.

On clause 26—*Drunkenness.*

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, may I say a few words in respect of this clause. I should like to apologize to the brigadier but I am still concerned about clause 26. I realize the seriousness and consequences of the act of being drunk while on duty. However, the clause reads:

Drunkenness is an offence and every person convicted thereof is liable to imprisonment for less than two years—

I wonder whether the minister, with the assistance of his law officers represented by the minister's very able assistant, would indicate whether this could be more closely tied in with the civil law or made a little clearer in relation to that law.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to compare military and civil situations, although I suppose in some instances they are comparable. In the armed forces certain tasks have to be performed for the general safety of the organization as a whole. If a man were drunk on duty and failed to perform that task, that failure might result in a very serious loss of life of other members of the

forces. Such a failure could result in consequences of a very far-reaching nature.

Naturally the penalty provided in this regard relates to an extreme case. In most cases, as a matter of fact, the penalties applied are much less than the maximum, but one might envisage a situation where the magnitude of a crime and its consequences might be so great that a penalty of this order of magnitude would be justified, particularly as a deterrent to that kind of failure to perform.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, this is a permissive clause which gives the authority to a tribunal to send a man on active service to jail for up to two years on conviction. Let me give an example. Suppose it is 6.30 at night and four fellows are in the mess having a beer or two. One of them may not have had any lunch and is a little bit under the weather. That man is subject to a sentence of 90 days in jail. This seems absurd to me because most individuals who are thrown in jail in Canada for being drunk usually are sentenced to 24 hours and a fine of $5 and costs. That is the end of the matter. In any event I will leave the matter with those comments.

Clause 26 agreed to on division.

Clauses 27 to 65 inclusive agreed to on division.

Schedules A and B agreed to on division.

On clause 1—

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to make a lengthy speech at this stage but I should like to make this comment. At this stage and subsequently on third reading we could delay the passage of this bill by a discussion on this point of importance. The defence of the realm is one of the prerogatives of the Crown which must be considered seriously. Just recently we witnessed a ceremony at which a representative of the crown was sworn in. During the course of that swearing-in ceremony it was obvious that the Queen's representative became the commander in chief of the military forces of Canada, the Canadian defence forces. In view of the grave responsibility which rests upon the representative of the crown in this regard it is essential that a minister at some stage—this would have to be done before third reading—indicate to the House of Commons that the consent of the Governor General has been obtained in respect of this fundamental change in this area of his responsibility.

I suggest to the minister that considerable argument could be developed regarding this point which relates to a matter some people may feel inconsequential, archaic, old-fashioned or out of date. On the other hand, under our system of a constitutional monarchy with a parliament consisting of the crown, the House of Commons and the Senate, anything that infringes upon the prerogatives of the crown should be considered carefully. The House of Commons should not assume powers that have not been given.

I have read some debates on this subject. While I understand that practice and custom over the years have limited the prerogatives of the crown to a considerable extent, I realize what is happening in this country regarding the wiping out of so much of our tradition. Let me suggest to the minister that if he will give us an assurance now, or when he proceeds with the bill tomorrow, that he will make the customary statement indicating that the Governor General has been apprised of the nature of this bill and consents to this fundamental change in our armed forces, I will not prolong the debate on the issue of these prerogatives. Let me remind the committee that it is open to us at this stage and on third reading to put forward an argument which would effectively block the passage of this bill for some time. Is the minister now prepared to give that assurance?

• (6:00 p.m.)

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, I will take that under consideration. I think it raises a rather fundamental constitutional issue. Certainly under our constitution parliament consists of three parts: the House of Commons, the Senate, and the crown as represented in our country by the Governor General. Therefore the bill cannot become law before it receives the consent of the Governor General who is the commander in chief of the armed forces. I do not wish to go beyond that at the moment but would want to take a look at some of the constitutional authorities.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Transport is fully aware of all this. We quite agree that there has to be the consent of the Governor General after the bill has been passed by both houses. What I am speaking about is approval prior to the removal of one of the prerogatives of the crown.

Mr. Hellyer: I will certainly be willing to look into the matter because I am just as intrigued by the point as my hon. friend is.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, if the minister is going to look into it I hope he will consider very seriously the view that in a constitutional monarchy control over legislation would appear to rest with this house in accordance with modern practice. I would be very surprised indeed if the Governor General's view on this matter would either be expressed by him or should even be sought from him. I would have thought the Governor General would carefully avoid injecting himself into a political matter of this nature which has been fully considered by parliament because the matter is so sweeping and so interesting. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre said the view he is propounding might be regarded as archaic and old-fashioned. I did not catch the third adjective but if I may I might possibly add "antediluvian". However, whatever it may be it is of sufficient interest that I hope the minister will not treat it lightly but will look into it seriously. My feeling certainly is that any intervention by the Governor General or any request for his intervention would, in this day and age, be a constitutional anomaly and one probably to be avoided.

Mr. Churchill: I hope the hon. member for Greenwood is not attempting to muddy the waters. I was not asking for an intervention by the Governor General. The hon. member for Greenwood has intervention so much on his mind in connection with the peace restoring force, intervention of which he approves, that he is getting a bit confused. All I am suggesting is that the Governor General, being commander in chief of the forces of Canada, should be apprised in advance when something is going to be done with regard to the forces for which he is responsible. Has that been done? If it has not been done, will the minister do it? Will he inform the house that it has been done and that the Governor General has graciously consented that the government go ahead with this measure, after which it will receive royal assent?

Mr. Knowles: Is that not an intervention?

Mr. Churchill: I am surprised the hon. member has not given us the reference. He debated the issue with regard to the petition of right in 1951. At that time five members of the House of Commons participated, namely hon. Mr. Garson who was then minister of justice; the hon. member for Prince Albert; the former member for Greenwood, Mr. Macdonnell; the former member for Eglinton, Mr. Fleming, and Mr. Coldwell. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre also participated. The then minister of justice accepted their point of view. It was an interesting legal debate. He came back to the house before third reading and brought the message that the Governor General of that day consented to the house dealing with one of the prerogatives of the crown. This was done before third reading.

We have only taken about seven minutes on this point. I do not want to detain the house with this very interesting and potentially lengthy argument. Everyone can see that the hon. member for Greenwood and, on my invitation, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre would love to get into such a lengthy, difficult and abstruse debate and would not add much light to it. I would ask the minister to look up the reference and to give us the assurance tomorrow.

Mr. Knowles: I was taught to yield not to temptation.

Clause agreed to on division.

Title agreed to on division.

Bill reported.

The Deputy Speaker: When shall the said bill be read the third time, at the next sitting of the house?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at ten o'clock this day are as follows: The hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. Muir), Veterans Affairs—Camp Hill, N.S.—report of lack of hospital accommodation; the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge), Water Resources—participation by Canada in "Water for Peace" Conference: the hon. member for Matapédia-Matane (Mr. Tremblay), ARDA—application of ARDA in the lower St. Lawrence and Gaspé region.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, in view of the progress we have made today I wonder whether it would not be the desire of the house to take a little longer for dinner than we might otherwise have done.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, I was just going to do two things. First I wish to thank hon. members for their co-operation in committee of the whole house in respect of the bill to amend the National Defence Act and to say how much we appreciate the co-operation of hon. members on all sides of the house. I think there was a very thoughtful and careful examination of the bill in committee. The second thing I would like to do is to concur in the suggestion that in view of the progress we have made perhaps the house by mutual agreement might rise until eight o'clock this day.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is an order of the house made on Thursday, April 6, that the house suspend its sittings from seven to eight o'clock. If it is the wish of the house to suspend now until eight o'clock it will require unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Knowles: Before we rise could the house leader tell us what item of business will be called at eight o'clock?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to talk with the party leaders in the next five minutes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The sitting is suspended until eight o'clock.

SITTING SUSPENDED

SITTING RESUMED

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING

PROVISION FOR PAYMENT OF COSTS, AGREEMENTS WITH PROVINCES, ETC.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-278, respecting the occupational training of adults.

Mr. J. C. Munro (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I wish to deliver a few remarks on the second reading of this bill on behalf of the minister, who was on his way to fulfil a speaking engagement prior to our being advised that the bill would be coming up for consideration this evening. The absence of the minister is entirely unavoidable, and I should like to make these remarks on his behalf. I do not believe anyone expected the unification bill would be disposed of this afternoon, after such a lengthy debate.

Mr. Speaker, the bill we are to discuss this evening is not new in principle, to members of this house. The policy on which it is based was made clear by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) last October. Essentially, what the bill does is to give the government of Canada power to buy various kinds of training for Canadian workers. Hitherto, we have not done this. We have reimbursed the provinces for a part of the costs that they incurred in providing training. The change puts us in a more positive role. It makes us responsible for seeing that training responds to the needs of the economy. But I want immediately to make it very clear that, in doing this, we are not violating provincial jurisdictions. We represent the consumers of training. We are enabling the demand for training to be effective.

To serve its purpose, training must be provided in the occupation in which the individual will be able to find employment suited to him. We propose to pay for that training. There is no thought of our doing the training. The bill of course does not provide for that. It simply makes us the financial agents of all the hundreds of thousands of Canadian workers whose future earnings are dependent on more training, but who do not have the resources to invest in the training at the time they need it.

There is no doubt about the economic need for the program. Canada's demands for skilled workers must very largely be met by tapping the reservoir of able but untrained people in our labour force. That is the principal way to meet the skilled manpower shortages which hold back our industrial growth. The bill is directed toward those goals. It is not designed to compete with provincial education and training systems. It is not to provide cultural betterment, or to help people go to university. Those are vital matters, but they are not what this program is about.

Every day technological change robs old skills of their value. Men and women who were once adequately trained find that they cannot compete in our increasingly technical world. Since 1949, for instance, over half a million farmers have left Canadian agriculture. Very few of them left with the skills that other industries needed. In our new economy the number of people who will have only one occupation during their lives is very

small. But retraining people whose jobs are disappearing is only part of the task; we must also train the adults who earlier could not get the training that people need today. Even compared with ten years ago, school systems have been greatly expanded and diversified. They provide today's secondary school graduates with much more of the knowledge needed to earn one's way in the world.

But that has been no help to the great majority of people who are now working. The opportunities were not there during their youth. The training that will be financed under this legislation must meet the practical needs of a wide range of mature adults and it must frequently utilize techniques different from those normally employed in the training of youth. We cannot realistically ask a mature adult to return to school for an extended period of time; we must have accelerated courses which will do the job as quickly as possible. Adults want to work at a job; training is a route to that goal, not a goal itself.

The core of a successful adult training program is the ten months skill course. The provinces run a wide range of such courses, and we can expect that this range will widen further as the program expands. But workers all too often have forgotten—or never received—their basic training in arithmetic, scientific and linguistic skills. When this background is necessary for a skill course that a worker wants to take, we will pay for it. But the intent of the program is not extended educational training. The basic upgrading is simply a means to the objective, which is occupational training.

The individual courses that will be financed for adults will extend from a week to a year, depending on what they want and need. A man may need, and will be able to get, a one year upgrading course followed by a one year skill course. But this will not be a lifetime limit. A basic premise of the program is that our manpower needs shift over time. A man who must pursue several occupations during his working life may need training for each one.

It is not, of course, enough to make the proper kind of training available. Adults who have economic responsibilities need income during training. Those people who have been members of the labour force—for the past three years, or for one year if they have dependants—will be eligible for allowances to let them take training.

Eligibility for payment of training costs will require only that a person be one year above the school leaving age and have been

[Mr. Munro.]

out of school for one year. Even the last condition will be waived for apprentices. But it would not be fair to give people who lack adult responsibilities the allowances designed to let people discharge those responsibilities. We would not wish, by offering these allowances, to induce young people to drop out of school and take short term adult training when more high school training or a technological institute course is what they most need.

There will be no means test for allowances and a person need not be unemployed to qualify. These allowances are an income substitute to let people take training. They are not a form of relief. The allowances will initially be between a minimum of $35 and a maximum of $90 a week, varying with the number of dependants a man has and the general level of earnings in his province or region. The maximum scale will be $35 for a person who supports only himself, $55 for a person with one dependant, $65 if there are two dependants, and $75 if he has three or more dependants. In addition, a person who must leave his home town to take training will get up to $15 weekly to compensate for the extra expense. This is a total of $90 per week, or approximately $390 monthly.

• (8:10 p.m.)

We will seek provincial advice and agreement on the appropriate level of the allowance we use in each province. If a province wishes, we will be willing to use different scales in different parts of a province to better reflect variations in the level of earnings.

The bill provides that, starting on July 1, 1968, the allowance limits will be escalated each year in line with the increase in average hourly earnings in manufacturing. Over the last available five-year period this index has gone up by an average of 3½ per cent each year. The scales used in each province and the amount for each dependant will be adjusted at the same time as the national limits.

An essential aspect of allowances for adults is prompt and regular payment. I should therefore mention one detail that is provided for in the regulations. Canada Manpower Centres will be able to advance $25 to those who need it to help tide them over during their first week of training. Most adult training courses will be provided by provincial or municipal authorities. Of course, we will deal only with the province, which will make its arrangements with the municipalities.

The bill means that, when we enrol a adult in a publicly operated training course,

we will pay the cost of putting on the course and we will pay an amount to compensate the province for the capital and interest charges on the buildings and equipment that are used. We will pay a fair share of the provincial overheads involved in providing general administration for the courses. We will have an interim payment system to ensure that the provinces get a steady flow of cash to meet their expenses. The financial settlement at the end of the year will be based on the actual costs of training.

The bill lays it down that we will purchase training from the province when it is available. But if the province agrees that it does not have the course a man needs near where he lives, we will be able to pay for training in a privately operated course. In this case we will negotiate a fee, not above the usual level, with a private training school.

The bill also provides for the purchase of training in industry. A man who is employed should not be forced to quit his job in order to get training. In most firms, workers accumulate seniority and pension rights. To sacrifice these rights to take training would frequently mean to abandon the only security a man has.

The training we will pay for in industry is the same kind that is available in public institutions. It would be easy to record a vast increase in training if we offered to pay for the kind of on-the-job training that new employees get in most firms. But that would not be an economic use of public funds.

What we will pay industry to do is the type of training that it now does all too infrequently. That is the classroom type of training that the provinces provide to people who are not employed. But in industry "classroom" becomes a rather elastic term. One of the great advantages of industry as a training ground is that it already has the modern equipment that people must use in their jobs. A "classroom" in industry can be a part of a factory floor. It is the equivalence of the training given in public institutions that counts, not whether people sit at desks.

Although nearly all firms routinely provide on-the-job practice to new workers, only one manufacturer in four gives even one day's formal training to any of his workers. This is not because firms fail to recognize the need. It is because general training is often uneconomic for the individual firm. The workers who would benefit frequently leave for jobs with other firms, so that the company that does classroom training may help its competitors as much as itself.

Accordingly the bill recognizes a public obligation to pay for classroom training in industry. We must see that training is good business for the individual firm as well as for the individual worker. But we will not pay all of the firm's costs of training. The company will derive real benefit from the trained workers who do stay with it. Therefore it is sufficient to pay for the direct costs a firm incurs in training its workers; the firm will need to contribute the use of its facilities and equipment.

The biggest of the direct costs is the wages the firm pays workers while they are in training. We will reimburse the firm for most of these wages. We will calculate the proportion of the normal working week that is devoted to training. That proportion will be applied to the maximum training allowance or to the normal weekly wage, whichever is the lower.

There is one situation in which the bill provides payment for training in industry of a kind that is not provided in public institutions. When a technological change is going to displace established long-term employees at the same time as the company needs new people to run the automated equipment, we will be able to pay for on-the-job training in order to encourage the firm to retrain its older employees for the new jobs rather than hire outsiders.

Not all the training by industry will be done in factories. Sometimes it is more efficient for workers to take time off to go to nearby provincial institutions, and the bill provides for payment in such cases. Training need not be full time.

Thus the bill makes it possible for training to be provided in various ways to meet different situations. The training can be in courses operated by provincial or municipal authorities, private training schools, or employers. The courses can be full time, part time, evening, correspondence, or even by T.V. We hope that the provinces, which are improving adult training methods, will continue their experimentation.

For the individual Canadian this bill means that federal services will be available to help him decide what training course will benefit him most, to pay for the course; and to pay him an allowance to maintain an income while training.

The vast majority of these adults will be referred to provincial courses by a Canada Manpower Centre. The manpower counsellor will help people to find out what they can best do. Many people already have solid and

marketable skills, and the need is to find the right job for them. Sometimes a man has an adequate skill but there is no market for it locally; if so, the counsellor will be able to offer a mobility grant for a permanent or exploratory move to another town where the skill can be utilized. Frequently, however, the need is for training. When this is what the man wants and needs, we will be able to pay for it.

A rather different arrangement will be made for apprenticeship training. Thousands of apprentices, engaged in three or four year programs, take a six or eight week provincial course every year. These apprentices are not in need of counselling; they are already in a program which will give them a solid trade. They will be able to proceed directly to training.

Similarly, we will not ask people being trained in industry to march en masse into a manpower centre. If they wish it we will, of course, provide individual counselling before or after training. But in the main our officers will determine simply that the prospective trainees are qualified and that there is a healthy market for the skills to be taught; there is no need for us to duplicate the work which is carried on by company personnel directors.

I am afraid that we must face the fact that there are today more adults who need training than the system can handle this year. We cannot expect to provide training immediately to all who could benefit from it. At first we will have to select the people who need the training most. Obviously an unemployed man should get priority if he is able to benefit. The general criteria will be the size of the income increase that the training will give the man, his ability to absorb the training, and his determination and ability to put it to use afterwards. In all cases we must look to see that there will be a long run demand for the skills; there is no point to training a man for unemployment.

• (8:20 p.m.)

I do not mean that every trainee will always get a job right away after training. We must face the fact that training helps to fill demands for skilled people; it does not itself create that demand. Training can shift people from occupations generally in low demand to occupations generally in high demand, but it does not create a particular job.

In recent years all our labour markets have grown tighter. I am confident that properly managed policies can keep the economy running at a high pace. But even if there is a temporary decline in demand, our training efforts should not falter; they are the way to save the individual from being a permanent victim of recession.

There are a few other features of the bill that I should mention at this stage. When we pay for provincial courses, we will be including an amount to cover the costs of capital and interest involved. The bill recognizes that not all provinces can readily borrow the money they need to construct training facilities. We will be able to make loans to construct and equip adult training centres. Interest on these loans will be only fractionally above the long term interest rate that the federal government must pay, and it will be below the rate at which the provinces could normally borrow on the market. Our fees to the provinces for training adults will be the source of interest and capital payments on these loans.

Also, of course, the phase-out of the old T.V.T. capital payments may be used by the provinces for increasing their capacity to train adults.

Approximately $550 millions in grants will be available to cover 50 per cent or 75 per cent of the costs of construction of many projects, and a province can borrow the rest of the money for an adult centre from us if it wishes.

Another need is teachers. Indeed, one of the skills which is most in demand today is the skill possessed by an experienced tradesman or technician who has also learned how to teach adults. So long as technical and vocational teachers continue to be in short supply, our counsellors will be able to refer men and women who possess the necessary technical skills to courses which will train them in the art of passing on those skills. Thus the program will pay to train the trainers.

If the provinces are to experiment with new ways of teaching adults, and if we are to develop better ways of matching training with our emerging manpower needs, we must have research.

We propose therefore to co-operate with the provinces in paying for research which is concerned with developing new ways to teach adults and with designing courses to fit adult needs. The research which is done to better the training of adults will also contribute toward improving the training provided in secondary and post-secondary schools.

I might add that we have already taken some highly significant steps to foster development of more suitable methods for adult

training. Our pilot adult training projects will shortly be getting under way. These projects are frankly experimental. They are 100 per cent financed by the federal government but they will be run by independent boards appointed jointly with the provinces. The boards will be given complete freedom, within their budgets, to experiment in the development of advanced and accelerated methods of adult training.

Hon. members will recall previously when there was some discussion that they asked for an indication of the magnitude of the expenditures which we anticipate and the number of adults we expect in training. It is very difficult to estimate our expenditures this year, partly because of the transitional arrangements with the provinces. Capital phase-out payments will probably be about $120 millions. We expect that training costs, including other transitional payments, will come to about $110 million.

Future expansion must depend on the needs and on the resources available. At present there are 288 publicly operated centres which train adults. The adult enrolment at the beginning of the year was 65,716. We expect that in this fiscal year a total of about 120,000 people will receive adult occupational training in public institutions. The number will increase considerably in subsequent years. Until we have had more experience, I would not wish to predict the pace of the increase. But I would expect that in the foreseeable future the number of people trained in a year should rise to about 5 per cent of the labour force—which at present would mean over 350,000 persons.

I believe that we are moving into economic circumstances that make adult training on this large scale essential. It is the way to make our economy fully productive. It is the way to make the door to the affluent society open for the individual Canadian.

This bill creates the machinery to respond to the urgency of the need for adult training. I believe that the benefits, to our economy and to our people, will be very great indeed.

This bill has been waiting for some time to be considered; it has been waiting while hon. members discussed the unification bill. In order that the government should not be deprived of the opportunity to provide training, it has been necessary, since April 1, to supplement the program by regulations under the authority of interim supply.

During this period certain criticism has been made in press reports which may be causing some confusion as to the facts. I would like, therefore, to end by repeating this statement on the essential facts that the minister made yesterday:

> Many more Canadians now have the opportunity for retraining for a better job. This is the effect of the program. It means that every person in Canada who has been out of school for more than a year can benefit from retraining. The federal government will pay the whole cost of occupational training for anyone who will be able as a result to do a better job. This includes immigrants equally with long-term residents and citizens.
>
> The new program replaces previous arrangements under which retraining was available only to workers who were unemployed or who fitted various special categories.
>
> In order to take training most adults must be provided with an income while training. This is fully covered in the federal program by means of training allowances. These allowances are a minimum of $35 a week and considerably more, up to $90 a week, for workers with dependants to support.
>
> The only restriction on these allowances is that they are not to be used to compete with the school system. They are designed for retraining, not to make training a substitute for school. Therefore, to qualify for allowances as well as free training, a trainee must either have dependants or have been working or seeking work for the past three years.
>
> These facts were made public in October at the last federal-provincial conference. It was made clear that there was nothing to prevent any province from offering allowances to younger people without dependants, if it so wishes.
>
> From the start, the new program will train at least as many workers as the former program did. The federal government is providing larger funds, and as the provinces provide more facilities, an increasing number of people will benefit.

I believe I have nothing further to add at this time.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, before the parliamentary secretary sits down may I ask him a question about the regulations to which he referred once or twice in the body of his speech, and to which he made a more lengthy reference at the end. As the bill before us provides in clause 12 for regulations to be passed after the bill has been enacted, under what authority have the regulations been enacted prior to the passage of the bill?

• (8:30 p.m.)

Mr. Munro: My information, and I believe it is accurate, is that the details embodied in this legislation were sufficiently set out in the main estimates in such detail as to give the government authority to embody its program in regulations, in order that we might get it under way.

Mr. Knowles: I should like to ask the parliamentary secretary a further question. Is he referring to vote No. 5 of the estimates of the Department of Manpower and Immigration for the current year? If he is, does he think there is any kind of detail there which would give authority for these regulations?

Mr. Munro: I believe that is what I am referring to. The point has been checked and we have been advised that there is sufficient authority for the regulations we have made. However, I will be happy to check this further.

Mr. Knowles: It looks slippery to me.

Mr. R.-E. Régimbal (Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes): May I say at the outset that we endorse what the parliamentary secretary has said as to the importance and urgency of this bill. As a matter of fact I think the record of the last two or three weeks will show that on several occasions we in the opposition tried in vain to get this item moved to the head of the order of business because we felt it was certainly much more urgent than the question of unification.

As we move into a new area of business, in the light of past experience with the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) who has shown he can accept suggestions and advice even from the opposition benches, I am sure we can proceed with much more efficiency and make much better progress than was evident in connection with the unification bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) introduced the resolution preceding this Bill No. C-278 on March 3 last, I had the opportunity to congratulate him and the government on this step forward.

On behalf of my colleagues, I have no hesitation in renewing my encouragement and I trust that the minister will take into due consideration our few remarks during this debate.

Any discussion concerning the occupational training of adults affords us the welcome opportunity to look fully into this problem of prime importance for the development and progress of society with regard to future opportunities, challenges and needs.

[Mr. Munro.]

[*English*]

In the course of his remarks on March 3, the minister stated:

> This new program is an integral part of a national manpower policy whose basic purpose is to bring economic opportunity within the reach of Canadian workers.

This all sounds very good. It seems to imply that the government is ahead of the game and reaching forward with benevolent policies. I believe, though, that we must consider this as being the government's side of the story only. It was surely not the good heartedness of the government, its deep concern for the well-being of Canadian workers, which inspired the minister of manpower to prepare and introduce this bill. I believe that hon. gentlemen on the front benches opposite, as the government, and we, as members of parliament, are forced to consider this action as a matter of cold, economic necessity.

Our best economists and social scientists have long been urging all institutions responsible for this country's social development as well as for its educational policies to face the fact that as Canada emerges as a modern industrial society our old occupational structures must change, and change fast, if we are to remain competitive in the international market and retain the benefits of an affluent society.

Mr. Speaker, a technological society cannot come into its own or even develop satisfactorily unless opportunities are provided for all segments of the society to obtain higher and modern education. I will not attempt, for the time being, to invade the sacred area of formal education—I should like to remain in politics for a little while longer—but I am concerned by a forecast made by one scientist that in a highly industrialized society, one constantly in an atmosphere of progress and change, a man must anticipate four or five occupational changes in the course of a lifetime. Four or five such changes implies as many periods of readjustment or retraining.

It is difficult to deny or to ignore such a forecast, and this makes our responsibility as a parliament for finding forceful answers to these questions even greater than it would normally be. That is why we are anxious to see the present measure come forth for consideration in spite of weaknesses which it contains, weaknesses which can possibly be ironed out later.

In his introductory speech of March 3, the minister referred to the training allowances

act which provided greatly needed opportunities for training unemployed workers, together with a measure of financial assistance. This was, and remains a progressive piece of legislation and parliament had no hesitation in seeing it through, because it was timely. However, this should not prevent our calling attention to certain weaknesses which have shown up since its inception—weaknesses which might be avoided in the present case. I refer specifically to the fact that approximately one third of the budgeted amounts were not used. The people for whom the bill was enacted did not respond. Why?

I believe the simple answer is that the government and the department of manpower just did not bother to do the necessary research and prepare the groundwork so as to make sure that the measures they brought forward were those best suited to answer the needs. The same considerations apply to the measures proposed in Bill C-278. I believe no program of this magnitude and consequence should be put forward for enactment unless it has been preceded by an extensive and expert research program. No act which will affect millions of people in the days ahead and which will cost millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money can be accepted by this house unless the minister can explain on a basis of facts—dry facts and figures—that an effective adult education program is under way. The public must be made aware of its advantages. The interest of the people involved must be awakened so that they appreciate the value and necessity of further education, as well as the economic advantages of retraining to meet the requirements of an industrialized society.

When I mention the need for a research program I do not mean political research to find out what sounds best for the purpose of catching votes, but scientific research into ways and means of accomplishing specific ends.

Nowhere in his introductory remarks did the minister indicate, much less prove, that such a research program into adult education had been carried out. Yet without it we are heading for possibly failure. We have been given no indication that the minister or his department have done their homework before sitting the exam. The example is appropriate at this time of the year when our children are preparing for the year-end tests. We constantly remind them that if they do not do their homework they cannot expect promotion. By the same token, if we do not tell our children just how important a good education is, the number of drop-outs will inevitably increase. How can we expect to build a great society or, in the words of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), "a good society", on the basis of an increasing number of drop-outs or, in the present case, of adults who do not respond to these training opportunities. The government must have learned from its experience in connection with the training allowance act that human desires and needs cannot be met, nor human interest be awakened, by money or financial assistance alone. Yet most of the parliamentary secretary's remarks tonight centred around the idea of paying and paying for services.

• (8:40 p.m.)

We will influence and interest people if we first convince them of the values and needs of education and training, through proper methods of communication between those who direct the economy, the planners, and those who execute, the workers. We know for instance that quite a number of federal departments are involved and have spent millions of dollars on research programs on social development. Just to mention a few, they are the Department of Forestry and the ARDA program, the Department of Industry, the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and presumably, at least I hope so, the Department of Manpower and Immigration.

Has there been any co-ordination between these various programs? Have they gone their separate ways? Has one department relayed its information to the other? Has manpower sought out relevant information from the other departments? Have interested groups been consulted systematically to investigate real employment opportunities? Is there a follow-up program already prepared to shore up possible weaknesses or shortcomings if something goes wrong or if, once again, there is no public response?

I think, Mr. Speaker, we all agree that we must have the answers to these questions before we can be expected to support the bill. More questions come to mind. How many jobs must be filled? Some figures were given tonight. How were they arrived at? Are they guesswork, or scientific in their content? How many candidates are expected in the first, second and third years? Where are the jobs located? Are they concentrated in urban areas, or will people be directed to new areas where new opportunities are needed? Are the

people involved willing to go where the opportunities are before they undertake retraining? Have these people said so, or is the department guessing again?

Have the provinces shown any response to the federal government's offer to lend money over a period of 30 years for building training facilities? What happens to those loans if facilities are put to other use after five or ten years? What is meant by the phrase "private training facilities" contained in the minister's speech of March 3? It is hoped, indeed it is essential that this information be given to members of the house before we are asked to approve Bill 278.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that the minister is particularly concerned with any form of discrimination, no matter where or how it is expressed. I would sincerely hope that training opportunities as implemented or developed through the Canada manpower centres will not be taxed with or accused of such discrimination because of poorly defined policies.

Another consideration which must occupy our minds in studying this bill is the very evident misunderstanding which already seems to exist between the provincial and federal governments as to the effects of discontinuing existing programs in favour of the present provisions in this bill. The case has been very clearly spelled out in an editorial feature in the *Globe and Mail* of Saturday, April 22, under the title "The Retraining Row," with appropriate subtitles such as, "Queens Park Points a Finger at Ottawa," and "Ottawa Points a Finger Right Back." I imagine, Mr. Speaker, other hon. members will draw your attention to this article so I shall not put it into the record, although it would be well worth the while and the time.

Basically, the problem that this controversy underlines is the fact that the manpower department could easily lose sight of the fact that, independently of this or that argument, the basic concerns here are manpower, the national economy and the industrial society. All of these are federal concerns which must be met. No exchange of letters will settle that, and I urge the minister to get into these discussions, personally and immediately, with the provincial authorities. Let his successful experiences of the past as a hard but sensible negotiator come to the rescue, because one thing is certain: If this plan does not work, whatever the reason, he will have to answer for it not only to himself and to his government but also to the population as a whole.

[Mr. Régimbal.]

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Listening to the parliamentary secretary this evening I was dismayed that I could detect no consideration on the part of the government for the objections to the basic principles contained in this bill which were enumerated when the bill was debated last March. I was one of the members of the joint committee dealing with the white paper on immigration which heard representations about the shortcomings in the white paper, pointed out by individual members in the committee and by organizations from one end of Canada to the other in hearings which lasted for many weeks. Members of the committee were happy, and complimented the minister on the fact that he was broadminded enough to listen to the representations that were made and to study them. Many of those representations pointed out defects in the white paper, and last week the minister came to the committee with a statement which in effect rewrote major provisions in the white paper, substituting for them much more sensible and humane provisions.

I too complimented the minister. That is why I find it hard to understand why he, who was able to be realistic and specific in reassessing the principles he had enunciated in the white paper, and who was able to change his mind and, in effect, propose a modified policy, should now tonight, through the parliamentary secretary, make a speech in which not one principle enunciated by him last March 3 has been changed, and in which not one of the detailed objections have been met. More important, Mr. Speaker, I find it hard to understand why none of the objections by the various provincial governments, which have had a great deal of experience with manpower training programs, has been dealt with by the parliamentary secretary. It is as though nothing has happened in the last few months; as though none of the objections had any weight. It is as though nobody knows anything but the minister and a few of his top officials and, as a result, the suggestion is that we are to go ahead and accept all the provisions of this bill whether we like them or not, or whether the provinces and the educators like them or not. Apparently the minister and a few other key officials have all the answers.

I want to reiterate what we said on March 3, that in our opinion this division which the government makes between education, as the government calls it, and manpower training, is a completely fictitious one. It is a division which will lead to untold and incalculable difficulties. I can only assume, Mr. Speaker,

that what we have here is the working out to the Nth degree of the principle which seems to have been adopted by the government, I suppose at the suggestion of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Trudeau), that Ottawa must not infringe on fields which are the responsibility of the provinces; and if one province objects, then Ottawa cannot make any arrangements with the other provinces.

This is a completely fallacious position and one which will lead from one difficulty to another. After all, Mr. Speaker, if the provinces are in the field of technical and vocational training today—and I think it is good that they are—it is because the former Conservative government brought in a technical vocational training act in 1961 under which more than $600 million was given in capital grants to the provinces by the federal government.

• (8:50 p.m.)

As a result of this program there are in virtually every province in Canada effective technical and vocational training programs. Having co-operated with the federal government in a program which was urged on them by the federal government it is not surprising that the provinces not only have gone into these programs but have made plans to expand and continue them. The fact is, and I do not think there can be any question about it, that the provinces were met at the last federal-provincial conference by a unilateral decision on the part of the federal government to get out of the technical vocational program field. I should like to read a few lines from the statement at that conference by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand), where he said:

> We are determined to get out of shared cost programs in education ... For us to be involved in the school system in the name of technical and vocational training inevitably introduces distortions ... Increasingly your decisions—

Meaning the decisions of the provinces.

> —as to what to do are influenced by a natural desire to get as much as possible out of the programs of which we will pay 50 per cent.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the federal government which encouraged the provinces to get into the technical vocational training field should be criticized for having framed that program. Indeed the federal government should be commended for this, because I think it is a very great advance in educating the young people of this country in ways which they will find useful. Later in the same statement the minister said:

> So, unless you are prepared to argue that we should have the permanent influence on your programs that shared-cost arrangements give us, I suggest that you must accept the principle of our withdrawal.

On March 3 I said, and I now say again, that this withdrawal is a disaster for the people of Canada, for the young people who wish to leave school, and for those who will need to be retrained. I believe that rather than get out of the shared program in the field of technical and vocational training the federal government should expand its role. We have this unilateral decision to get out and as a result of that we have the draft of a program, the regulations for which most of us until recently and some of us until today have not had an opportunity to look at. I am informed that it is true not only in respect of the province of Ontario but also the province of Manitoba that the entire decision to get out—not only the principle, but the details of the program which is now before us and which will be carried on as a result of the implementation of this bill—was worked out unilaterally by the federal government and by the department of manpower. I am informed there were no consultations with the provinces. Because of the fact that the province of Ontario is the largest and most industrially oriented province, and I am quite sure has the most successful technical and vocational training program in the country, it is not surprising, as reported in the Toronto *Globe and Mail*, that the minister of education of the province of Ontario asked to see the Minister of Manpower and Immigration to discuss the new program, the details in respect of it, and some of the problems which will arise and which are arising as a result of the change in the program.

The Minister of Manpower and Immigration, however, could not find the time to meet with the minister of education of the province of Ontario. Well, I do not suppose it is my function to tell the minister what his job is, but I think that had he spoken at a few less Liberal party meetings and had met with the minister, we might have been a little further ahead. I understand that the Canadian Association for Adult Education asked the minister for a meeting so that they could discuss this matter with him. I believe they have a technical and vocational committee which is interested. They could not arrange a meeting with him. He was too busy.

The result of this is that in every province questions are being asked. Rather than expose us to the dry, dull dreary statement which the parliamentary secretary gave us tonight, it would have been better had the minister dealt with the suggestions which are listed in an article which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of Saturday, which was referred to by the previous speaker from the official opposition. It may be that those objections are not correct, but the article in the *Globe and Mail* of last Saturday and its article of last Thursday quoted officials of the federal department, who are supposed to implement the program, as saying completely contradictory things in respect of how this program will work.

I should like to quote from the *Globe and Mail* of April 20:

> L.F.D. Coulson, Ontario assistant director, Canada Department of Manpower and Immigration, admitted the regulations were a "semi-fait accompli" and that there was confusion over them.
>
> He said the manpower department would give an extremely broad interpretation to what constituted three years continuous work experience.
>
> He said it would include a housewife of three years.

In other words, a woman who had not worked but who had been a housewife for three years, in the opinion of Mr. Coulson, would be able to participate in the retraining grant. The article goes on to say, however:

> An Ottawa spokesman for the department said a housewife's duties would not likely be considered labour force experience.

If the officials in the department do not know what the program is and how the regulations will be implemented, is it any wonder that there is consternation, and indeed that there is a panic among the provincial authorities who have been operating the manpower training programs since 1961. What are some of the difficulties? I shall deal with a few of the many difficulties which I am sure will face us when we are dealing with the bill clause by clause, and even more so when we study the regulations which have been implemented and which, as stated by my colleague the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), were brought about in a pretty slippery way.

What do we find in the new regulations? The key point is that they exclude from the allowances any person under age 17 and any single person over 17 with fewer than three years working experience. I suggest that this is complete nonsense. We might take the example of a person who leaves high school. I am not too concerned about whether he finishes high school and receives a diploma, whether the existing curriculum in the high school does not fit his needs, or that he leaves for reasons of his own. Surely it does not make sense that we should say to such a youngster who is 17, 18 or 19 years of age that he cannot attend one of these manpower retraining centres now, that he cannot receive a living allowance now, and that he must go out and find work such as sweeping floors, or do anything—even be unemployed.

• (9:00 p.m.)

According to the provisions of this bill one must be unemployed for a substantial period of time before being eligible. During this time of unemployment these young individuals may become married and start to raise families. At that time, when they are living on their own with their families, we then all of a sudden become happy to allow them to attend our retraining centres. Then we must not only pay for the retraining, we must pay a living allowance. What earthly sense can there be in that kind of artificial approach?

Surely what we must do is encourage everyone who wants to increase his ability to perform a job which requires a skill to do so as quickly as possible. By imposing this kind of penalty we are being unfair to the young people concerned. As a result of this attitude we will suffer a great economic loss in this country.

This bill is discriminatory against women. The present government has appointed a royal commission to study the status of women. Many women who married early have children and have not been part of the working force for many years. At the age of 35 or 40 their children have become more or less independent and they may wish to go back to work. Under the provisions of this bill women who have not been in the working force will not qualify for admission to our retraining centres. That is not only a disadvantage to the country, because of a waste of potentially productive capacity, it is discriminatory against those individuals.

When we reach our clause by clause study of this bill we must consider carefully that portion relating to training programs in industry. I do not criticize industrial training programs, indeed I suggest they are not now numerous enough. Industry should be encouraged to participate in those schemes which will upgrade their employees' skills. Nothing in these provisions spells out the type of program in respect of which grants will be made by the federal government, nor do they

indicate the amount of money envisaged by the government to be allocated toward the cost of these industrial programs. It is conceivable that several large companies, and I think specifically of the railway companies, Air Canada and Bell Telephone, may devise programs which could use up the total amount of federal government money allocated under the provisions of this bill for the coming year. I am not suggesting that would be wrong in principle, but nothing is set out in the bill, and nothing has been said by the parliamentary secretary, which would indicate the relationship between the amount of money available and the number of programs involved for this type of program, and the total for all programs.

I was surprised that the parliamentary secretary, who represents a constituency in the city of Hamilton, with a large number of immigrants did not deal with the subject matter of concern expressed by the province of Ontario, the city of Toronto and other provinces. This matter was referred to by the Toronto chairman of the metropolitan board of education in an article which appeared in today's Toronto *Globe and Mail*. He took very strong exception to what he considers to be a clear indication in this bill, that the immigrants that have come to Canada in large numbers, and who will be coming to Canada during the next year or two, will be very sharply curtailed so far as their right to attend these training centres is concerned. This is true because of the requirement that individuals must have been available for employment for a period of three years prior to their qualification for inclusion in this program.

The board of education in Toronto is spending $1,500,000 this year to teach immigrant adults and children to speak English. In light of that effort by the city of Toronto and similar efforts on the part of cities such as Winnipeg, which I happen to represent, it seems very strange that the federal government should embark on a program which will not be available to those individuals who require training. Obviously that is the case, unless there are regulations in respect of this bill which members of this house and officials of the provinces have not seen or understood.

Mr. Munro: Would the hon. member permit a question in respect of the article which appeared in the paper this morning? Did he also read the minister's statement in the same issue, in which it was stated that it has been known for months that the provision regarding three years in the working force would not be prejudicial to immigrants, in that the years they had worked prior to coming here would also count?

Mr. Orlikow: I wonder why the parliamentary secretary finds it necessary to get up at 10 minutes after 9 p.m. on Monday, April 24, to tell a backbencher from the city of Winnipeg that this has been known for months, in light of the fact that provincial officials have been trying for some time to discuss this matter with the federal Minister of Manpower and Immigration. If this fact has been known for months, why is it that the Ontario provincial minister of education has not known about it? Why is it that the chairman of the Toronto metropolitan board of education has not known about it, and why did the minister have to issue a press statement yesterday apprising interested parties of this fact? Why were these things not discussed in detail with provincial officials?

Some people have suggested that the New Democratic party developed the expression "co-operative federalism". In any event the government has adopted this phrase as an expression of its policy. In spite of that fact this federal government states that this is what it intends to do and the provinces must accept it or leave it. To my way of thinking co-operative federalism in this field suggests that the federal government should say that this is what it thinks ought to be done, and then ask the provinces to discuss the situation. Surely this is true when we are dealing with a program such as this initiated by the federal government.

• (9:10 p.m.)

It is not surprising to me that provincial governments are looking with a good deal of scepticism and a good deal of concern at shared cost programs, because it is pretty easy for the federal government to say to the provinces: We are prepared to pay half of the costs if you will come into this with us. Very often the provinces think it is a good idea, particularly when the federal government is going to help pay for the costs. However, if at some time in the future, one, two or five years later, the federal government decides suddenly and on its own that it is going to get out and let the provinces carry the burden, a burden which may well run into hundreds of millions of dollars, it is not surprising to me that some provincial governments might say: Under the circumstances and in the light

of past experience we are not going to go ahead with this. At present this does not seem likely but it would not surprise me very much if in view of the way this problem has been handled the provinces said to the federal government: We are afraid to go into the medicare plan because although you might agree now to pay 50 per cent of the costs, three or five years from now you might say that health is a provincial matter and leave it to us to handle on our own. I am not saying the federal government has done this, and I for one would certainly have been sorry if they had done it. I am glad that nearly every province has indicated it is going into the medicare plan. However, as regards this decision on technical-vocational training made, as I said and I know I am right, without any consultation with the provinces, both with regard to the principle and to the details, it is not surprising that, to say the least, the provinces are very unhappy with the present situation. I urge the Minister of Manpower and Immigration—who is not here today, and I will not be too critical because I know that none of us expected this debate to begin tonight—to follow the example he set in the white paper on immigration. It is not too late. I do not think anyone will quarrel with the expansion of the program, although as I said earlier I think the division between education and manpower training is an artificial one which does not really exist.

Nevertheless, it is not too late for the federal government and for the department to sit down with the provinces, to go over the objections which they might have, to try to meet these objections, and to work out a program which will not only be accepted by the provinces, because they have no choice —after all the provinces are interested in getting as much financial assistance from the federal government as they can in this program as in every other program—but to work out a program which will meet the legitimate doubts, fears and objections of the provinces because, with all due respect to the officials in the federal department—and I know there are some very competent people there—they are not the ones who have had the experience in the field of educating young people or retraining older people for jobs. Who has had the most experience in this field? It is the provincial departments of education, the boards of education and the schoolboards in larger cities such as Toronto, Hamilton, Vancouver, Winnipeg, Calgary and Edmonton.

It seems to me that the experience of these agencies and bodies, their know-how regarding what mistakes we should not and need not make, has been completely ignored, according to information which I have. Not only has it been ignored but apparently it has been rejected by the federal department.

I will say again in closing that it is not too late for the minister and for his department to take the time to discuss the details of the program and how it is to work with the provinces and with the people who are working in the field. Right here in Ottawa there are people who have had a great deal of experience in adult retraining. They have not been consulted. The same is true in Toronto and other places. I suggest to the minister, before we get much further with the bill, that he and his officials take the time to sit down with the interested agencies and get advice from them, so that the program can be improved.

Mr. Munro: I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question before he concludes his speech. I do not think he would want to leave a misleading impression. I think he indicated the bill discriminates against women. It certainly does not; they are treated the same way as Canadian men. If they are over 17, they can get training. Of course they have no income while they are training if they are supported by their husbands, but if they have dependent children, they get allowances. This applies to immigrants. All of them are treated exactly alike under the bill. I think this should be made clear.

Mr. Orlikow: I do not think this was a question, but I will not make another speech. If these things which the parliamentary secretary mentioned are true, then I say what I said a little earlier, that it is amazing that the provinces and the cities which have worked in this field simply do not know it is so. Women who have not been working and are thinking about working are concerned about whether they will qualify.

Mr. Munro: Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): I think the parliamentary secretary should act in accordance with the rules of procedure. He has not asked a question. I think any further observations on the bill should be made in the committee.

• (9.20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on Bill No. C-278, although I have not yet had time to read it and our leader would have been far more able than I to comment on it generally. Still, it is obvious at first glance, that this bill will certainly give rise to several questions, will lead to discussions, not only while under study but even more so when it is implemented.

A while ago, I heard the previous speaker who, naturally enough, spoke as a socialist. He probably would have like the federal government to take over the whole field and manage it as it sees fit. But we, who are not of that opinion at all, and who are here first of all to protect the interests of the provinces in their fields of jurisdiction, ask whether the minister first consulted the provinces when he considered introducing this bill. I wonder whether this bill is not again the work of federal bureaucracy coming to the provinces and telling them: Here is a bill we have drafted; you may either accept it or reject it. If you accept it, you will derive some benefits; if you reject it, you will get nothing at all.

I believe that if the minister had been consistent before bringing in such a bill, he would have invited the representatives of the different provinces, during federal-provincial conferences, to give serious consideration to the legislation, in view of the fact that this is another one of those shared costs fields, in which provinces are as much interested as, if not more so, than the federal government. It seems to me that it would have been highly logical for the minister to consult the provincial representatives before starting out to draft such a bill.

Personally, we are wondering if Quebec will accept once again the conditions laid down by the federal government under this bill.

As usual, though, the federal government comes in through the back door. It reminds me somewhat of that man who under the pretext of bringing a box of matches to the woman of the house who needs them, puts the whole house on fire once inside.

I feel that if the federal government truly recognizes that education comes under provincial jurisdiction, it should leave it to the provinces. It should give back to them the means to administer those fields; it should first of all withdraw from their taxation field because it is another excuse for levying another tax. It should withdraw from provincial taxation fields and give back to the provinces in all fairness what belongs to them. Then, Mr. Speaker, it will be seen that the provinces are just as able as the federal government to give the required and appropriate education to their people.

Here, it is said that the provinces will be consulted in due course on such projects; but when the government for instance, is dealing with the employers on their relations with their employees, I wonder whether the provinces will have a word to say or whether the federal government will deal directly with the employers, with the large companies anxious to have their manpower trained in certain skills.

In this regard, if during consideration of this clause, we realize that the provincial governments will not be consulted when the question dealing with the employers arises, we shall certainly be opposed. We will not be in a position to accept such a clause and we will object to the federal government dealing directly with an employer, whatever his importance may be.

As far as assistance is concerned, it seems to me that, according to the bill, this will consist in paying for the training. But there all kinds of additional expenses, for instance, rental of premises, school construction, as mentioned further in the bill, purchase of equipment, etc.

I wonder whether, after all, the provinces will not be contributing the lion's share once again. And the federal government will say: Well, we have given you such and such a thing. But the provinces and their citizens will be paying three times the value of what they will have received. We find that the federal government is willing to grant or rather to guarantee the loans made to provinces to enable them to build facilities and schools, give those courses and buy equipment, but it will still be the provinces, since the federal government is no longer able to borrow money, which will borrow for a period of 20, 25 or 30 years and will once again be burdened with those debts from which the federal government will perhaps have taken 50 per cent of its funds, while saying: We are the ones who have paid for those buildings.

A bill such as this, Mr. Speaker, always seems to bring on new taxes. That is the reason why we are asking so many questions.

We are well aware, looking at the history of the various governments which succeeded one another here, that when a government wants to help the people, it promises them two dollars but extorts five from them.

These are the points which we wished to call to the attention of the minister. We will keep our eyes open in order to see what advantages the Canadian people will reap from this. I am one hundred per cent in favour of training, but if the country does not benefit from this training, we shall have to think twice about it. I say that because precisely I received letters, four or five letters from young people and adults in my riding who after having attended refresher courses last winter or two years ago, have been unable to get a job. They cannot find a job, even with their competency card. It is very well to have 90 per cent of the population educated but it is better to have 100 per cent of the people employed.

Everyone knows that despite all our efforts in the field of education, our young people are deserting the province of Quebec which pays for their instruction, their education. In fact, one thousand, fifteen hundred and even two thousand technicians are leaving every year for our neighbour country to earn their living, after we have defrayed 100 per cent of the cost of their education and training.

In addition to this proposed training, which is good by the way, as long as we remain within the limits of delegated powers, my contention is that the government should also take into account those who are going to graduate, in order to provide them with a job on the day after they obtain their certificate.

Mr. Speaker, we will certainly have further comments to make, as we examine this bill clause by clause, but I simply want to warn the government that it should not act like in the past, in short this should not be another opportunity to intrude a little further in matters of provincial jurisdiction.

[*English*]

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Revelstoke): One becomes a bit pessimistic of these opening statements on second readings of bills, Mr. Speaker, that are presented with considerable flourish and skill, along with promises of a new world beginning with the passing of legislation in whatever area may be the subject matter of the bill. When one examines this bill, it becomes clear why the premier of British Columbia objected to the dropping of the shared cost programs following the last federal-provincial fiscal conference. There is one thing about a shared cost program; it becomes a little difficult to sort out who pays for what. I suppose that in some ways it is more desirable for the federal government to announce that they are going directly into the field of adult education, because it does become more apparent how large or how small is their contribution in that particular area.

[Mr. Gauthier.]

• (9:30 p.m.)

We know that the premier of British Columbia is not alone in his concern about the changeover from shared cost programs to this type of program. For we are told that eight out of the ten provinces involved have already told the federal government that there will be serious difficulty with the bill that is before us this evening. Why should we be optimistic about the bill, Mr. Speaker, in view of the gaps that developed in the implementation of the Canada Assistance Plan? Why should we be optimistic about what is going to happen with adult education in view of some of the gaps that are developing in the implementation of the guaranteed annual income program in so far as it ties in, or rather fails to tie in, with the Canada Assistance Plan? For example, some of the funds for this program are being borrowed from the War Veterans Allowance Act, instead of being provided under the guaranteed annual income program.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the concern about this legislation that has been brought to my attention in a letter from the secretary-treasurer of the board of trustees for school district No. 22 at Vernon, British Columbia. In a letter addressed to Hon. L. R. Peterson, the minister of education at Victoria, they express very great concern over the problems created at the local level by the passing of Bill No. C-278. They go on to say:

> With the withdrawal of grants in aid for vocational and upgrading courses it is practically impossible to provide courses of this nature at a fee that the general public can afford to pay.
>
> We would therefore urge the provincial government to continue the system of grants for vocational courses being offered through our adult education department as has been done in the past.

At the moment, Mr. Speaker, neither the minister in British Columbia nor the minister in any other province can answer this letter because the bill has not been passed. However, I am sure that after we do pass it provincial ministers will still have great

difficulty in answering any similar letter to this, as they await the implementation of the various clauses in this bill. Again I see very little cause for optimism, that the transition from the previous vocational training subsidies paid by the federal government to the payments provided under this legislation will be smooth.

I feel that the provisions in this legislation dealing with the classification and ages of adults show a serious lack of concern for, or knowledge of, the school rhythm as pupils move through from the system. It is common practice across this country to set the age of 15 as that at which compulsory education ends. The age may be raised to 16 in some provinces, though by no means in every province in Canada.

Anyone who has worked in a school, Mr. Speaker, knows that a great many who become eligible for this kind of program are just waiting for the day when they can leave school. This is not necessarily a criticism of the school system; it is in a way a fact of life. They wait for this day, and by the time they are 15, many of them have been waiting nine years until the day they could leave, at 15. It is not going to mean anything to these people when you tell them: "Perhaps you had better not leave yet, because if you leave now you will not be considered an adult by the federal government; you will have to wait three years. Therefore you had better stay in the school system for another three years".

Despite the hopes of the department of manpower in presenting this bill, I am aware that this sort of admonition to the teenager who has waited seven, eight or nine years to leave school will not be sufficient to retain him in the ordinary school system for a further three years, and he will leave regardless.

One of the previous speakers referred to the only road that opens up to early admission into the program. The teenagers of this country will need neither the previous speaker nor myself to tell them that they can quickly find a way out; that if they happen to have someone wholly or substantially dependant upon them for support they will then be able to qualify.

Although I think it is very much the role of the federal government to concern itself with adult education and with vocational training, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is the role of the federal government openly to encourage early marriage, as this bill does. I think all of the family planners, juvenile courts and school counsellors across this country are united in their efforts to postpone early marriage for any of these people. Yet we have in this bill a policy which these people will be very quick to see enables them to qualify for the program two years and three months sooner than they would otherwise have qualified for retraining assistance.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, these teenagers would not even need to move away from home. We already know that many of these early marriages are supported in part by the parents of the young people involved. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, there is built into the bill the incentive to marry early in this country.

We might also ask why the legislation does not spell out a little more clearly that private training courses will be used fully as well as the public school system. This is an area of education which private enterprise began to develop very early in Canada, and developed to a very great extent. There are many occupational groups which are served entirely, or virtually entirely, by private training schools. I think of hairdressing as one example, and there is of course the business field. There is tremendous involvement on the part of private enterprise there.

The Association of Canadian Commercial Colleges is not satisfied with the provisions of this bill as they have been announced. They would like some emendation so as to include the idea that it is highly desirable to employ the resources of the private sector of the economy of Canada in all such efforts to further the policy of this bill. In spite of the reassurances given by the parliamentary secretary this evening, I think it would be of interest to this group and to the members of this house to have these reassurances spelt out a little more clearly.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Again, Mr. Speaker, why should we be optimistic about this government's concern for private enterprise in view of the problems which will be created with the proposed future implementation of the medicare scheme? Why should we be optimistic when we know that this government's attitude to private enterprise has been that private enterprise is either an unmitigated evil, or at best a necessary evil? Why should these schools find any reassurance in the bill presently before us?

Another area of legislation concerns me very much. It is that part to be found in clause 13 of the bill which reads:

Where a person has received a training allowance to which he is not entitled or a training

allowance in an amount in excess of the training allowance to which he is entitled, the amount thereof or the excess amount, as the case may be, may be recovered at any time as a debt due to Her Majesty or may be retained, in whole or in part, out of any subsequent amount payable to that person as a training allowance.

Why should we be optimistic about what will happen once this bill is implemented, considering what happened under the old age security legislation and the War Veterans Allowance Act. This government has persistently gone after people who through no fault of their own have received overpayments. What criteria will be used to recover repayments made under retraining courses? Will a person be charged with having accepted an overpayment if, through no fault of his own, he is forced to drop out?

Worse than that, will the government inveigle people to come back and finish their courses, that the overpayment paid to them may in some mysterious way be recovered? Will the strange system of bookkeeping be used by which the government imagines that by providing courses and withholding part of its allowances it will in some strange way recover overpayments?

It would be better if in the future we could introduce in this country a system of primary education that, beginning with kindergarten levels, will make sure that the education given to people is effective education. We ought to find ways and means to encourage the right people to take up teaching; we ought to have great numbers of the right sorts of teachers, that our young people beginning school may not be frustrated, may not be short changed, but may receive a sound foundation in education. By doing that we should reduce the need for the type of retraining programs that affect people later in life.

Mr. J. Chester MacRae (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, I enter this debate to discuss the important measure before us. As my colleague, the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes (Mr. Régimbal) said a little earlier in the debate, the government might be criticized on the ground that seven weeks have passed since Bill C-278 was introduced. This is one of the most important measures to have come before this house for a good many years because it deals with the lives of so many of our citizens.

Before proceeding with my remarks I wish to commend the former minister of labour, the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr), for the very fine and constructive measure he introduced when he was minister, the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act. In doing my homework for this speech I read the minister's speeches on this subject, and I thought they were excellent.

It is easy to understand why this measure is before us. The effects of technological change are being felt more and more every year. Recently, when somebody commented on the year that has just passed, 1966, he said that it would be known in years to come as the year of the strikes. We had many crippling strikes in this country last year. Some of those were for higher wages, some were caused by union rivalry but it seems to me that in no small measure many strikes were caused by something not so evident, that is, unrest and the fear of working men who see that their skills are no longer in demand. It is tragic to see men who for many years have worked well with their hands being told one day that they are not wanted. Many of those men have families.

When I was home during this past week end I saw a delegation of railwaymen who were deeply concerned because two trains were being taken off the Canadian National Railway. It was the old story: More can be done with the big diesels than ever could be done in the days of steam. One man told me that he had worked on the railway for 26 years, had six children, and had been laid off. He would not be able to find steady work. This sort of thing causes a feeling of unrest among our workingmen, and that in turn causes some strikes.

Let me talk of automation. I was born on a farm, and as a young man I can well remember how lumbering was carried on. Of course the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming) one of the most proficient lumbermen in eastern Canada is more competent to speak on lumbering than I am. In my boyhood it took two men with a cross-cut saw to cut down a tree. A few years later came the chain saw enabling one man to do three or four or five times the work that a man with the cross-cut saw had done. Tractors replaced horses; and so it went. Men who were in demand on the railroad and lumbering industries are being told that there are no more jobs for them.

We in the House of Commons are on the mailing list for every publication, probably, in the country. In a recent issue of the *Ontario Logger* magazine, an article said that one man operating a logging machine which had taken ten years to develop and which cost a third of a million of dollars could do as

much work as scores of men had done previously.

All that the operator, who is enclosed in an air conditioned cab—and that is a far cry from the old conditions—has to do is to select the trees. The machine will remove the bark, limb the tree, cut it into eight foot lengths and stack them along the road. One man with one of these machines can do in one hour what it would have taken more than 20 hours to do with a chain saw. There we have an example of what has happened in a basic industry.

I am interested in this measure because I am a teacher in the field of technical and vocational training, and this bill deals with that subject. A few years ago I took part in an interesting experiment in the retraining of workers. In my constituency there is a cotton milling town named Marysville. Some 12 or 15 years ago, due I believe to financial difficulties encountered by the parent company, the mill was closed and many workers were thrown out of employment. This mill had been in operation for almost 100 years and generations had worked in it. When their employment ceased they had no skills except those of cotton workers.

• (9:50 p.m.)

The minister of labour at that time was Hon. Milton Gregg, V.C. who represented my constituency. Later he became a political opponent, although we have always remained the closest of friends. He arranged with private industry and the department of education of the province of New Brunswick to retrain these people who had lost their jobs in the mill. I personally took some 30 or 40—I forget the exact number—and retrained them in office skills. The scheme worked very well. Unfortunately, a few of them did not have the necessary basic education, and this was the only reason they did not succeed. The rest worked hard at their courses and the great majority of them are still working, using the skills in which they were trained at that time.

It is impressed upon us every time the subject of education arises that education is a provincial matter under the terms of the British North America Act. The province from which the minister comes, the province of Quebec, which is also the province of my birth, is more conscious of this particular right than any of the others, and guards it more jealously. But I have reached the conclusion with the passing of the years that when we rewrite our constitution, as eventually we shall have to do, this is a situation which we shall have to change to some extent. In 1867 when this nation was formed people travelled very little. They grew up, married and died, not more than a few miles from the village in which they had been born. Now we travel back and forth across this continent in a few hours. A few years ago I taught a student, a soldier's daughter, who in the course of 12 years had gone to 15 different schools. It is surprising that this child had done so well in her studies. If we are to have ten systems of education it will be necessary to find some way of co-ordinating education in this country of ours.

I wish now to make a plea on behalf of a very special group of educators who are interested in this measure. The hon. member who spoke before me, the hon. member for Okanagan-Revelstoke (Mr. Johnston) raised this matter and I should like to elaborate on it. When he was presenting the minister's statement this evening the parliamentary secretary told us that the facilities offered by private educators would be used in connection with this measure. The hon. member for Okanagan-Revelstoke drew attention to the fact that there is in this country a very special group of private educators, the private business school people. Several hundred of them are meeting here in May and bringing distinguished educators from Britain and from the United States to their convention. I want to put the following facts on record for the benefit of the minister, his parliamentary secretary and those who are doing the work of the department.

The private business colleges of this country can do, and have been doing for more than a hundred years, a completely efficient job in the field of adult training and retraining. Many members of this House of Commons in the course of achieving an education have gone to private business schools to learn the business skills. Business colleges are established throughout this country and are grouped in an association known as the Association of Canadian Commercial Colleges. They are very much aware of the problems involved in adult education and are able to adjust quickly to solving them. Many of them are already participating in program five training, that is, the training of the unemployed. The minister told us the federal government will pay the cost of training all adults in occupational training courses not operated by the province or an employer. This is the point in which I am very interested and in which the private business schools are interested. These colleges have the plant

and equipment available, and they also have the staff capable of undertaking these services.

Most of them are small, and this makes for flexibility; they can meet the needs of the students more effectively. They are open 12 months of the year. They hold both day and evening classes in addition to summer schools and Saturday morning classes. Business colleges can do a more effective job in this field than public schools can, because their overhead costs are lower. I say this with some authority because I have worked both in public schools and in private business schools in my own province.

I feel strongly that the government should use existing facilities of these private schools in the development of its program under this act. The admission of the private sector could affect the very existence of the private schools. It is true that education is a provincial matter, but the federal government is not intruding upon the education field as far as the young are concerned; it is adults who are to be trained. Again, the federal government is paying the cost and it seems to me only reasonable that in these circumstances it should be able and willing to direct.

There is nothing wrong about the government purchasing the services of private enterprise in connection with any endeavour upon which it has embarked. As a believer in free enterprise I am of the opinion that the more we use free enterprise, the better it is for this nation. I should like to suggest to the minister that in the regulations related to this measure he should incorporate the following principles. First, it is the sense of this legislation that it is highly desirable to employ the resources of the private sector of the economy of Canada in all efforts to further the policy expressed in this bill. Second, that in this respect the participation of private enterprise may be procured. Third, that the director and the heads of any federal departments or agencies to which the conduct of programs described in this act have been delegated shall take such steps as may be desirable and appropriate to ensure that the resources of private enterprise are employed to the maximum feasible extent in the programs described in this bill.

I am serving notice to the parliamentary secretary that in committee of the whole I will introduce an amendment to one of the clauses along these lines.

We realize that in the private school field there are some schools which are not doing a good job. But there are many hundreds of these schools which are doing very well indeed. I could name many of them in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario—indeed, in every province. But naming one or two would be unfair to the others. The minister will have heard of them and I am sure other members of the house know about them because they have spoken to me with regard to them on many occasions.

• (10:00 p.m.)

I would refer again to the question of accreditation. For the most part private schools operate under the jurisdiction of the trade schools acts in the various provinces. I know this is the case in my own province of New Brunswick. In the case of Ontario and many other provinces exactly the same situation exists. Where schools operate under a trade schools act they must be accredited and they are thoroughly supervised by the province. I see, Mr. Speaker, my time is up for today. I would hope to continue when we return to this particular measure and I advise the parliamentary secretary that I will be introducing an amendment at the appropriate stage.

May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the house leader would inform us about the business for tomorrow?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we would start with the third reading of Bill C-243 and, if that is concluded, we would continue the discussion of Bill C-278. Then we have the interim supply bill and the rules, in that order. There are one or two other items on the order paper that members should be ready for on very short notice.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

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

VETERANS AFFAIRS—CAMP HILL, N.S.—REPORT OF LACK OF HOSPITAL ACCOMMODATION

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, since the time allotted to us under the rules at this point is very limited I shall deal with this question as quickly as possible. On April 3 I addressed the following question to the Minister of

Veterans Affairs (Mr. Teillet), as recorded at page 14421 of *Hansard*:

Is the hon. gentleman aware of the charges and accusations that have been made that legitimate, pensionable veterans have been refused bed space in the Camp Hill Hospital while merchant seamen from Canada and other countries are occupying beds? Will he investigate this matter?

The minister replied:

I have certainly not heard of this. I will look into it but I very much doubt the accuracy of that report.

I followed this up with a question to the acting minister on April 5, which he took as notice. On April 10 I again brought it to the attention of the Minister of Veterans Affairs and he very kindly stated that he was having an investigation carried out regarding a particular case. At that point I brought to his attention the fact that the hospital director, Dr. C. J. MacDonald, according to a report in the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* of Wednesday, April 5, even before the minister had a chance to report to the house, had given this statement to the press:

"Veterans have always had priority of admission —and always will have," he said. "In fact, we have never found it necessary to refuse admission to anybody. While we have been short of beds, we have never been without them."

So apparently all these complaints I have received mean only one thing, that everybody is out of step but Charlie. Again the minister very kindly on April 19 gave a somewhat similar reply, and at that time I indicated I would like to deal with the question at the adjournment of the house, under the rules, which I am now doing.

This problem was first brought to my attention by a veteran in the town of Sydney Mines, and I would like to put his letter on record. I might say that he is a 100 per cent pensioner. His letter reads:

Having been a pensioner for a number of years, and going back and forth to Camp Hill up until 1960, and receiving good treatment, on March 7th of this year I had need to go to Camp Hill hospital for treatment. But on word from the D.V.A. doctor in Sydney, Dr. Ross, that there were no beds for me in Camp Hill, I finally told him I had to go. He then told me to go and when I reached there, the same story would be related to me of no beds.

After a lot of discussion and dickering, I finally received a bed.

When I was able to move about, I found out that if you are not a veteran you will receive a bed more promptly than a veteran.

In one room there were three Russians, Turks, Spaniards, and to top it all, Chinese doctors that were almost impossible to understand. I don't think this is one bit fair to a veteran. The country doesn't owe us everything but at least we should be provided with a place to die in peace.

We were, at one time, proud of our hospital until we were sold down the river by someone.

Will you please let me know if we have any right to a bed in what used to be our hospital, or not, and what priority we have.

Enos Ashe,
136 Fraser Avenue,
Sydney Mines, N.S.

Incidentally that gentleman is a member of the town council of Sydney Mines and is quite prepared to appear before the minister, or any inquiry at any place, at any time, to support his statements.

Following this I received a letter from Wilbert Hupman of R. R. 1, Port Mouton, Queens County, Nova Scotia. It is as follows:

Dear Sir, I am writing you re your statement in the Commons concerning veterans in Camp Hill. This is 100 per cent true in some cases as it happened to me also. I do not believe in unnecessarily complaining, but this is carrying things very recklessly and if it keeps up where can a veteran turn for help. I was more than pleased that someone brought this to the attention of those responsible and I have also written the veterans minister. In closing I wish to thank you for bringing this to light.

Then I should like to quote this portion of a letter from a person named Lawrence Walker of Summerville, Hants County, Nova Scotia:

I am a veteran of two wars. I thought Camp Hill was established for us, but I find it half full of fishermen.

Further on in the letter he says:

What to my mind is needed is a board of inquiry where we can testify to what is going on.

I also note this letter to the editor, from one Bernard O'Neil of Digby:

Sir: Having just arrived home from Camp Hill Hospital I should like to make some comments about the hospital as I observed it while I was there for about a week.

First of all, I feel that veterans who served their country in time of war are not getting a fair shake at Camp Hill.

While it may be true that veterans are not refused, they certainly get deferred, sometimes for a month.

In my own case an attempt was made to defer me, but my local doctor pressed the matter and I was admitted.

When I arrived in Camp Hill I found that there were a number of beds empty. Also I discovered that there were a number of compensation cases who were not veterans, who were patients in the hospital.

I was also told that beds were being occupied by marine insurance cases, also non-veterans.

As far as treatment and care are concerned, I feel that there is insufficient staff, particularly medical staff, at Camp Hill. The doctors are definitely overworked and sometimes cannot get

to examine or treat the patient until he has been in hospital for several days.

In my own case, I was at Camp Hill for four days before I was examined. My bed went unmade for two days even though I asked to have it made.

Although I am a D-Day veteran and served overseas until V-E Day and am also a pensioner, I was advised I would have to pay a fee for doctors' services while at Camp Hill. I understand this fee is based on patient earnings and is a custom which has only recently been instituted.

I do want to say in defence of Camp Hill that the food was very good while I was there and the staff was most friendly and kind, even though badly overworked.

Here again everybody is out of step but Charlie.

I have here a clipping from the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* of April 8, 1967. The heading is "DVA Is Criticized at Legion Zone Meeting" and it is as follows:

The Department of Veterans Affairs was criticized at a meeting of Zone 12, Canadian Legion, in Clark's Harbour, presided over by zone commander John Freeman, of Sable River.

With delegates in attendance from Yarmouth to Lockeport, Comrade Freeman was critical of Camp Hill DVA for not sending a representative to this important meeting, which was concerned with obtaining information on pensions and treatment.

Then further on:

Several veterans told of being released from Camp Hill Hospital without, what they claimed to be, proper justice.

In conclusion Mr. Brown urged branches to send delegates to the Sydney Convention.

Mr. Speaker, all I ask the minister, who has been very courteous, is whether he would refer this matter to the standing committee on veterans affairs, and then if everything is in order, as suggested by the minister and the doctor in charge of the hospital, no one has anything to worry about. I would suggest that this would be the way to clear up the matter once and for all.

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I accept unreservedly the attitude of the hon. member; that is, he is interested in the welfare of our veterans of Canada and the presentation he is making this evening is simply in an effort to help us provide the kind of service which we all believe the veterans of Canada should have. My answer to him will be in the spirit of that idea.

• (10:10 p.m.)

I fully appreciate that our people are overworked and understaffed, and that we have difficulty in finding the professional staff to man our hospitals. The hon. member has underlined the quality and the spirit of our hospitals. While these people are overworked they do go out of their way to serve the veterans of Canada.

[Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria).]

Let me place a few facts on the record. There is always a bed available for the admission of a veteran for treatment of a pensionable disability, and such veterans have first priority if prompt admission is medically indicated. After the treatment of pensionable disabilities, the next priority is in respect of persons whose treatment is the responsibility of other departments of the federal government. We have a responsibility in this regard. The next priority is the treatment of various categories of veterans for non-pensionable disabilities, and eligibility usually involves their type of service and financial circumstances.

It is the responsibility of the department and doctors to determine whether treatment in a departmental hospital is required, whether it is for a pensionable or non-pensionable disability, and whether the admission is urgent or elective.

For part of last winter Camp Hill hospital was operated at almost full capacity. Indeed additional beds had to be set up to accommodate all admissions. However, at no time was admission for treatment of a pensionable disability, which was required immediately, delayed or denied. This can also be said in respect of treatment for non-pensionable disabilities.

For a short period during this winter, admissions which were not urgent were postponed briefly to a more appropriate time, in the interests of best treatment. The complaints received make it appear that these decisions on the basis of the opinion of departmental medical officers were sometimes in conflict with the wishes of the veterans, who desired immediate admission, even though they were not immediately medically necessary.

I conclude by thanking my hon. friend for giving me this opportunity to put these facts on the record in order to clear up any misunderstanding which may have occurred.

WATER RESOURCES—PARTICIPATION BY CANADA IN "WATER FOR PEACE" CONFERENCE

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I must say that I appreciate the presence of the minister here this evening. I congratulate him for the work he has done in

his department in connection with this very important question of a national water policy, and I congratulate him for his part in organizing the conference held a few months ago on pollution in our environment. The speeches he has made throughout the country indicate his concern about this whole question, and I congratulate him for his work in reorganizing certain administrative features to deal with this whole problem more efficiently and effectively in years ahead.

Let me say that the minister and I have a sort of mutual disability. We both suffer from water on the brain. This very important question of water pollution is one of concern to many Canadians at this time. Water is priceless, and it is becoming of more importance every day.

One can exaggerate the value of many things, but not the value of water. Not one plant, animal, or even a beautiful woman can exist without it. We cannot maintain or improve our living standards without an ample supply of pure water. Without any doubt our health and our recreational facilities for generations to come will depend on action by the federal, provincial and municipal governments in the very near future.

This matter was again brought to my attention quite recently by an article which appeared in the April 22 issue of the *Financial Post* written by Mr. Clive Baxter, and entitled "Water, water everywhere—and Ottawa knows why". It reads as follows:

Canada will be represented in force at the big Water for Peace Conference in Washington May 23-31—but the lack of enthusiasm could show through.

It is no secret the Canadian government was miffed when President Johnson announced the 60-nation conference two years ago—without bothering to consult the other governments. It forced everyone's hand and Ottawa was annoyed.

Until Ottawa and the provinces can agree on a long-term water-export policy, federal officials have been sidestepping suggestions from any source that a U.S.-Canada water conference might be useful. When the Water for Peace meeting was scheduled, there suddenly appeared the dangerous prospect of "talks within talks" that could put the Canadian delegation in the position of having to take a stand on transborder water sales.

When it was learned the conference organizers were planning a North American regional session, the danger suddenly appeared acute. Ottawa immediately objected and managed to get that part of the agenda changed.

It now appears likely that embarrassing confrontations can be avoided. The agenda is suitably broad to make bilateral water discussions inappropriate if not impossible.

Canada's delegation will comprise federal and provincial government representatives. Energy, Mines and Resources Minister Jean-Luc Pepin told FP they will go to Washington with an agreed Canadian position on the need to co-operate on the whole question of water use, hoping to set a good example to other federal states in battling pollution and water waste.

Then the article goes on to deal with other aspects of this conference. I trust that when our delegation goes to Washington it will be united in agreement, because without a doubt they will find the United States delegation united and determined in their actions with respect to the years ahead.

I just want to quote from a very interesting book which was recently published, entitled "Water, The Vital Essence". It indicates how important it is at the present time that our delegation goes in agreement and stands united. I will quote this from page 209 of the book.

An official in the United States, who shall otherwise be unidentified, was once heard to suggest that the ultimate solution to the water supply problems of the northeastern United States would be to divert large amounts from lakes in the Province of Ontario—and that if Canada should object, then the United States would simply have to take it over.

I have the transcript of that address and the name of the person who stated that. It goes on to read:

Canadians are perfectly aware of the interest of the United States in their water. In spite of strong political opposition, Prime Minister Pearson has been willing to discuss the matter. "The United States," he said in a televised address, "is finding that water is one of its most valuable, and becoming one of its scarcest, resources, and we have—well, we have lots of water." "Exporting water", he said, "can be as important as exporting wheat or oil. This can be one of the most important developments in our history." An official inventory is being taken in Canada, which has one-sixth of the world's fresh water supply, to see how much could be spared from its two great north-flowing river systems, the Mackenzie and Nelson, or from the province of Ontario, where one acre out of every ten is under water.

I am quite sure that since the present minister has taken office the Prime Minister would not make a statement similar to the one he made on television during that election. However, it is because of this concern that I asked the minister the following question on April 21:

I wish to address a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

At that time the minister was absent on official business.

Can the minister inform the house the number of federal and provincial government representatives who will be attending the Water for Peace Conference in Washington from May 23 to May 31 this year, and can the minister inform the house whether these delegates will have an agreed

Canadian position on water policy, water pollution and water waste?

● (10:20 p.m.)

It was at that point, Mr. Speaker, that you shot me down and forced me to stay late this evening in order to get an answer to my question. Let me say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that Canada expects every member of the Canadian delegation to this conference to do his duty on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to shoot the hon. member down a second time.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): I cannot help but thank the hon. member for his very watery compliments, Mr. Speaker. Even I might bloom under such care. His first question had to do with the number of people who are going to attend this conference called "Water for Peace" in Washington in May. I cannot provide a definite, final figure as yet, but a figure of 60 delegates, federal and provincial, will give a good indication of what it will be. There will be an about equal division of federal and provincial representatives. Some of these people will be full fledged "representatives", others will be "ministers accompanying the Canadian delegation" and others will be "experts" and "advisers". I might indicate that there will be also a category known as "observers". They will not be members of the Canadian delegation; these will be individuals from Canadian universities and from engineering firms who have asked to be invited by the secretariat in Washington. They will be attending on an individual basis. This gives an indication of the composition of the Canadian delegation. Every member of that delegation, be he a federal or provincial appointee, will speak as a member of the Canadian delegation and not as a provincial or federal spokesman.

Mr. Herridge: Good.

Mr. Pepin: The second part of the question has to do with the policy we are going to uphold during that meeting. May I underline that the "Water for Peace" conference is not an intergovernmental negotiating or policy making meeting. As a matter of fact, Canada would not have accepted an invitation to that kind of meeting. This will be a rather informal gathering at ministerial and technical levels for the purpose of exchanging information and ideas, and of fostering co-operation between different countries and different parts of the world. Consequently, there is no need for absolute unanimity or uniformity of views as between the members of the Canadian delegation.

There will be, however, a "country position paper". It will be a review of the Canadian situation with regard to water. This Canadian paper has been prepared by a national committee made up of representatives of the federal and provincial governments. To speak very frankly, the paper will be a descriptive paper of what exists in Canada and is not a policy making paper. It is more descriptive than anything else.

I might add we are going to have, in a few days, here in Ottawa, a meeting of all or most of the Canadian delegates to Washington in preparation for this conference, in order to co-ordinate our views as much as possible.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister's time has expired.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE—ARDA—APPLICATION IN LOWER ST. LAWRENCE—GASPÉ AREA

Hon. Renè Tremblay (Matapédia-Matane): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, on orders of the day, I put a question to the hon. Minister of Forestry and Rural Development (Mr. Sauvé) because last weekend an extremely important event took place on the lower St. Lawrence.

A meeting was held at Cabano of representatives from three counties comprising the nine ridings which make up the pilot area of the lower St. Lawrence, Gaspé peninsula and Magdelene Islands. It was decided, by a majority vote, that a council would be organized but that this council would remain independent from the rest of the area in order to pursue the specific objectives of the three counties, namely Kamouraska, Rivière-du-Loup and Témiscouata.

The reason why I raised this question is that it fits into the framework of the general plan of the lower St. Lawrence and Gaspé Peninsula Development Board.

As we know, the federal government, through the ARDA act, administered by the Minister of Forestry and Rural Development contributed 50 per cent of the cost of those studies. The cost of such studies was considerable at $4 million and the 50 per cent federal contribution, under ARDA, will amount to something like $2 million.

Therefore, it is very much in our interest that this project as put forward by the Eastern Quebec Development Board should

be implemented. But before discussing that particular problem of bringing the structures of the plan into being, I would like to recall the six objectives mentioned in the development plan. I quote:

1. Modernize traditional basic fields (farming, fishing and partly forestry) in which is found the concern for redevelopment, the utilization of resources contained in the second alternative;

That is the alternative where all the resources of the territory would be fully used.

2. Create new dynamic activities (tourism, industry and mining) which imply that considerable efforts will be made in those fields to keep the territory's population at a minimum of 325,000 people where it is economically realistic to supply them with the urban services they want;

3. Increase the value of manpower seeking to establish the geographical and vocational mobility required by the contemplated development and use of resources, the promotion of proposed new undertakings and the accepted rate of emigration.

4. Establish a planning and participating institutional framework likely to provide an institutional basis for the planned regional development in cooperation with the population;

5. Build up a regional awareness which will result in a popular sharing in the objectives and the method of proposed development and, finally;

6. Rationalize the regional area to provide at a practical cost the regional population with the urban services they hope for and which will create the basic conditions essential to the development of certain sectors, particularly tourism and industry.

The fourth objective, the establishment of a local body to implement the plan is precisely the subject of discussions between the various sectors of the region.

• (10:30 p.m.)

I wish to point out that the decision made by the Grand-Portage area with regard to the three counties of Kamouraska, Rivière-du-Loup and Témiscouata, may not meet the legitimate wishes of the people of the area, but that such a stand should perhaps not be considered as jeopardizing the implementation of the program in the whole territory. That is the point I want the minister to answer.

Mr. Speaker, this very costly plan has also given rise within the population to great aspirations towards improved economic conditions, and the people should not be deprived of advantages they normally expect because of the partial implementation of that program.

It may also be necessary to somewhat restrict the scope of the original plan, so that we, from other sections of the area, from Matapédia-Matane, may be able to contribute to the achievement of those aims. I know that the federal government has not only helped to finance these studies but already begun talks with the authorities of the province of Quebec concerning the implementation of this program.

Therefore I would ask the hon. minister to shed some light on his talks with the provincial authorities, so that we may see how soon the inhabitants of that region may expect to see realized the aims of the program which I have just enumerated.

Because we are very far from the great urban centres, because the people in our region, unlike those of many other areas in the country, have not benefited from natural and other advantages, I believe they may legitimately aspire to receive through ARDA, both from the authorities of the province of Quebec and the federal government, the help they need.

In concluding my observations, I should like to thank the minister for his unfailing concern in the implementation of this development program, although I would like his answer to my question to give reassurance to the people of this area.

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry and Rural Development): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the hon. member for Matapédia-Matane (Mr. Tremblay) for having brought this matter to the attention of the house, because I believe it is most important for the people of that area.

Hon. members will remember that in July the authorities of the Eastern Quebec Development Board submitted to the provincial government and federal authorities a report, in six volumes, which they had taken three years to prepare.

Since then, the provincial and federal authorities, at the level of each department involved, have studied these recommendations. Several meetings have taken place between provincial and federal officials. Meetings have even been held at the governmental level.

I am pleased to say that the implementation of that development program, which will require a special agreement between the Quebec government and the government of Canada, according to the terms of the existing federal-provincial agreement, will be undertaken, I hope, between now and September or October.

On May 28, at Chandler, will be held a meeting of all the representatives of the

corporate bodies which were mentioned at Cabano, and I then think that the provincial and federal authorities will be in a position to announce the decisions confirming the intention of both governments to proceed with the program.

Large amounts of money will be involved and federal authorities have already organized a contest to recruit personnel for the area.

Let it suffice for me to say that the problems involved in setting up the organization come under the exclusive authority of the province and that discussions which may have taken place in the area and which were referred to by the newspapers, reveal the social interest of the area which was sought by the Eastern Quebec Development Board, has produced most interesting results.

Just because certain sections coming under the Eastern Quebec Development Board believe different organizations should be set up does not mean that the development program is endangered. On the contrary, it indicates a particular interest by the population, and I should like to reassure my colleague on the implementation of the plan.

I have no hesitation in stating that in the present circumstances, if the federal and provincial authorities continue to co-operate as they have been doing so far, it will be our pleasure before the fall, to sign an agreement which will be a feather in the cap of both the provincial and the federal governments involved.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, April 25, 1967

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

THE LATE KONRAD ADENAUER

TRIBUTE ON PASSING OF FORMER GERMAN CHANCELLOR

Mr. Speaker: Order. May I on behalf of all hon. members pay tribute at this time to a great statesman of modern Germany, former Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, whose memory was honoured today at a state funeral in Cologne cathedral attended by dignitaries of many nations and at which Canada was represented by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin).

In many places throughout the world people will be paying homage today to a life long and rich in accomplishment. The right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), on behalf of Canada, has already conveyed to Chancellor Kiesinger the assurance that we in Canada will remember Dr. Adenauer as a firm and resolute ally of the west who led his country to reconstruction and rebirth, as a friend who led Germany to membership in the Atlantic alliance and to a prominent place in the European movement. Today the constructive role that the Federal Republic of Germany plays in world affairs is the legacy that Dr. Adenauer has left this century in a few short years.

• (2:40 p.m.)

These are his accomplishments, and they will have earned him a special place in the history of our country. We extend our sympathy to our German friends at a time of national loss, and particularly to our parliamentary colleagues in the federal German Bundestag.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REQUEST FOR EARLY RESERVATIONS BY MEMBERS FOR EXPO VISIT

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I believe it is understood that on Thursday it is proposed that the house shall not sit, that members of the House of Commons and the other place may go to the opening of Expo. I have been asked by the Canadian National Railways, because of the difficulty of obtaining accommodation, to say that it would be appreciated if members and senators wishing to travel by rail to Montreal for the official opening of Expo would telephone the local reservations desk today and book their reservations. The C.N.R. will make every effort to provide a sufficient number of rail cars to meet the requirements of members, senators and their wives, but it will facilitate matters greatly if it is known in advance what is likely to be the number of members so travelling.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

CONSENT OF GOVERNOR GENERAL NOT REQUIRED BEFORE THIRD READING OF AMENDING LEGISLATION

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, yesterday at the conclusion of consideration of the committee stage of Bill C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre raised a question as to whether this bill affects the prerogatives of the crown and therefore requires the consent of His Excellency the Governor General before it is given third reading in the House of Commons.

I referred this question to the law officers of the crown, and I have been advised that such consent is not required. The term "prerogative", according to Todd, "On Parliamentary Government in England", volume I, page 383, may be defined as expressing those political powers which are inherent in the crown and that have not been conferred by act of parliament, and which accordingly continue within the competency of the Sovereign except in so far as they have been modified or restrained by positive legislation.

The parliament of Canada has for many years legislated with respect to the organization and administration of the armed forces of Canada so that, in my view the crown's prerogative in this respect has "been modified or restrained by positive legislation" and therefore no longer exists in these areas, which are the areas affected by Bill C-243.

While the letters patent constituting the office of governor general provide that the Governor General is commander in chief of

Canada, Bill C-243 does not affect his position. Any responsibilities or prerogatives respecting the organization and management of the armed forces that may at one time have been in the commander in chief have, as I have said, been removed by successive acts of the parliament of Canada legislating on these matters.

As I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, there is no requirement to obtain the consent of His Excellency the Governor General in respect to the introduction of this bill. May I say, however, that as a matter of courtesy His Excellency was apprised of the tenor of the bill.

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that we return to the presenting of reports, that the hon. member for Hamilton West may present a committee report?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Joseph Macaluso (Hamilton West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have the honour to present the sixteenth and seventeenth reports of the standing committee on transport and communications, in English and French.

TRADE

REPORT ON FIRST MEETING OF ANGLO-CANADIAN MINISTERIAL COMMITTEE

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): On Wednesday and Thursday of last week a Canadian delegation led by the under secretary of state for external affairs and including the Ministers of Trade and Commerce, Industry and Defence Production, Energy, Mines and Resources, Agriculture and myself, participated in the first meeting in London of the Anglo-Canadian ministerial committee on trade and economic affairs. In the absence of both the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Minister of Trade and Commerce I should like, with the leave of the house, to table the official communiqué issued at the conclusion of the London meeting.

Mr. Speaker: Has the minister leave the table these documents?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Sharp: As hon. members will recall, the establishment of this Anglo-Canadian ministerial committee was agreed upon by the two governments last year. While there are many occasions for British and Canadian ministers to meet, at Commonwealth gatherings at the United Nations and in a variety of other international bodies, it was felt that a joint ministerial committee could usefully supplement existing channels of communication and provide a most valuable means of consultation between the two governments. In this time of rapid change in Europe and the world at large it seemed to us that a committee of this kind with Britain, our second largest trading partner, would be especially useful and timely. As hon. members are aware, we have similar joint committees with the United States and with Japan.

Our experience has been that periodic ministerial meetings of this kind provide a unique opportunity for frank and intimate exchanges of views on a wide range of international and bilateral matters of common concern, and contribute to a better understanding of respective policies and problems.

I believe my colleagues on the delegation would agree that the new Anglo-Canadian ministerial committee got off to a good start, and that the very frank and cordial character of the discussion amply fulfilled our expectations. As indicated in the communiqué, British and Canadian ministers reviewed major current international issues including Viet Nam and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons at the opening session at 10 Downing street under the chairmanship of Prime Minister Wilson. On that occasion there was also an exchange of views on the present situation with regard to Britain's possible approach to the European economic community and the important implications of this issue for Britain and Europe, for the world trading community as a whole and for trade between Canada and Britain. It was agreed that consultations on this subject would continue.

At its subsequent sessions in Marlborough House the committee discussed international and bilateral trade and economic matters including prospects for the economies of both countries; international liquidity; developments in the Kennedy round of trade and tariff negotiations including discussions of a multilateral cereals agreement; trade and aid for developing countries, including food aid, the prospects for a second United Nations conference on trade and development and development assistance in the Commonwealth, notably in the Caribbean area; and a variety of bilateral trade matters.

It was agreed that the committee would hold its second meeting in Canada at a date to be determined later.

IMMIGRATION ACT

AMENDMENT INCREASING AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR TRANSPORTATION EXPENSES

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution, which has been recommended to the house by His Excellency:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Immigration Act to increase from twelve million dollars to twenty million dollars the present limit on the total amount of outstanding advances at any one time that may be made to enable the Minister of Manpower and Immigration to make loans to immigrants to assist them with the expenses of their transportation to Canada.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

REQUEST FOR CALLING OF NATIONAL CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. In the light of his speech last night in which he recognized the need for a new look to be taken at Canada's constitution, will the right hon. gentleman seriously consider calling a conference on the constitution during the centennial year, as a centennial project to chart a new course for Canada for the next hundred years?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): What I said last night was that one day the constitution will have to be changed, and changes will be made to bring it more in accord with conditions in 1967 than those of 1867; but we should be careful not to rush into this procedure before all the preparatory work has been done. As far as the federal government is concerned, this preparatory work is going on and I think it would be unwise on our part to call a conference before it is completed. I can only hope it will be completed before the centennial year ends.

Mr. Starr: The Prime Minister says this preparatory work is being carried on. Can he tell us who is engaged in this task?

Mr. Pearson: Well, Mr. Speaker, many officials; and we are now giving consideration to the appointment of a high ranking official in the Department of Justice who will be especially charged with this responsibility.

Mr. Starr: As a further supplementary question, will they wait until the report of the

B and B commission is submitted in order to take that into consideration?

Mr. Pearson: Not necessarily, Mr. Speaker; but the information I have received recently in the publication of certain preparatory work in other provinces—I am thinking of Ontario—confirms my own view that we should be very careful before calling a full fledged conference, to make sure the preliminary work is well done.

Mr. Starr: In view of the answer given by the Prime Minister that they will not necessarily wait for the B and B commission report, will he consider asking this commission to make available its report on the studies it has already made in order to save the taxpayers some money?

Mr. Pearson: I shall be glad to look into that, Mr. Speaker.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, in view of the right hon. Prime Minister's remarks last night on the constitution and his report to the house today that federal officials are studying constitutional change, I would now ask the Minister of Justice is the government seriously considering a role that could be played by federal legislators, the elected representatives of the people, in obtaining constitutional modernization during centennial year?

Mr. Speaker: The suggestion of the hon. member is very large in its import, and I do not think his question asked in this way should be asked at this time.

Mr. Grafftey: Well, I will reword my question and ask the Minister of Justice, in view of the Prime Minister's statement last night and his report to the house today, whether the government is now seriously considering setting up a parliamentary committee to study the constitution during centennial year.

Hon. P.-E. Trudeau (Minister of Justice): As the hon. member knows, Mr. Speaker, the constitution of the country is not a matter exclusively for the federal legislators. It is a matter which concerns all the country, and the view of the federal government is that we should have the officials prepare the work and then the next stage will be met.

Mr. Grafftey: As a supplementary question, in view of the fact that officials are now working is not it only fitting that the elected representatives should get to work too?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Speaker: Order. The supplementary is argumentative.

Mr. Grafftey: Under the carpet; sweeping it under the table.

[*Later:*]

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Justice following upon his answer to the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi. If I heard the minister correctly he said that when the present study was completed the next stage would follow. Perhaps the minister would be good enough to inform the house what next stage is contemplated by him or the government. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure the minister was listening. Probably he had more important things to do.

Mr. Speaker: I hope the hon. member does not propose to repeat his question.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I should like to repeat it with your permission and I hope the minister will hear it and then answer it. Obviously he has not heard me before.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to be insistent on the question I asked. I waited to see that I was not taking up time that other hon. members wanted. Your Honour did not indicate, when you asked me not to repeat the question, whether you considered it out of order or whether it was because the minister simply did not answer. I noticed that the minister was otherwise occupied and did not hear me, and with your permission I should like to repeat the question.

I was asking the Minister of Justice a question following his reply to the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi, in which he said the position of the government was that these studies by officers of various departments should be completed and then the next stage would follow.

Would the minister indicate what in his view and the government's view the next stage is to be after the completion of these studies, and would he also be good enough to indicate whether in the government's view the legislators either in parliament or the legislatures will have nothing to do with the next stage following completion of the study?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Having heard the question the second time I must say that it is out or order.

[Mr. Grafftey.]

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not often do this but may I recall to Your Honour's memory that my question follows directly from the answer given by the minister in which he said (a) that there would be a next stage and (b) that this was not a matter for legislators. I am following that answer.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. My suggestion is that we should not try to go through the whole alphabet.

DRUGS

CONSIDERATION BY JOINT COMMITTEE OF LEGISLATION RESPECTING LSD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare with regard to the government legislation which is now before the other place dealing with the problem of LSD. Since this legislation will probably have to be introduced in the new session I want to ask the minister if he will consider having the legislation referred to a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons in order that professionally competent persons may be available to give expert opinion on this very complicated matter?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, it would be my hope to deal with the legislation in this house before the end of this session. I do not know whether that will be possible, but in any event if necessary we could review the situation when the new session begins.

CANADIAN CENTENNIAL

PROVINCIAL APPEALS FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO COMPLETE PROJECTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of the problems being faced by the provincial governments in their centennial project financing, has the government arrived at any decision with respect to provincial appeals for additional funds to assist in the completion of centennial projects?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, no decision has been reached on that matter.

IMMIGRATION

GERMANY—REPORTED CHARGES RESPECTING JAIL BREAK BY CANADIAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Could he inform the house whether he has any knowledge of Canadian authorities actually assisting in the jail break of one Eric Knapp from a jail at Zweibrücken in Germany?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I doubt if this question is in order.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In the light of the serious implications of the previous question I put to the minister, which was not answered, would the minister inform the house if Mr. Eric Knapp was in fact employed by the Canadian government in eastern Europe?

Mr. Speaker: I doubt very much that this question can be asked at the present time.

Mr. Winkler: With all deference, Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely serious charge which hangs over the head of the government. It is possible that the minister can give an explanation on behalf of the government.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is another question which might easily be considered at ten o'clock.

[*Translation*]

ACTION BY DEPARTMENT TO PLACE IMMIGRANTS FROM FRANCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

If, after being accepted by the Canadian immigration office in France, some French immigrants are unemployed for seven to eight months after arriving in Canada, does the department of the hon. minister find work for them?

Mr. Speaker: The question of the hon. member is by far too general in nature and may not be asked at this time.

Mr. Caouette: Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

WINTER WORKS

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PERIOD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration in his capacity as looking after the winter works program. Because of the adverse weather conditions which have existed on the prairies and elsewhere in Canada during the month of April, will the minister consider an extension of the cut-off date for the winter works program?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I answered a similar question a few days ago. I told the house at that time that the purpose of this program is to combat unemployment during the winter peak. To extend this program at this stage would defeat the purpose of the program itself.

Mr. J. R. Keays (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question which I will ask in French because there will probably be a better result.

[*Translation*]

Since the minister has received several resolutions from cities and municipalities of the lower St. Lawrence area calling upon him to amend section 2 of the winter works incentive program regulations, could he reconsider his decision of last week?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, I answered that question two days ago—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think this same question has already been put in English.

[*English*]

Mr. Keays: Mr. Speaker, as I consider the decision may be unfair and damaging, I should like to discuss it at ten o'clock.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR DISCUSSION OF NEW DAIRY POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

In view of the growing protests from Quebec farmers and Canadian dairy producers, and seeing that thousands of them may march on Ottawa soon, does the hon. minister

intend to see very soon the representatives of these farmers unions in order to establish, through consultation, a true dairy policy based on the needs of these farmers?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is asking a question which was asked yesterday.

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

BELL ISLAND, NFLD.—ASSISTANCE TO UNEMPLOYED MINERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Joseph P. O'Keefe (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the urgent need to assist the unemployed of Bell Island to find alternative employment, would the Minister of Manpower and Immigration consider assigning Canada manpower personnel to Bell Island on a permanent basis so they will be able to counsel the residents of that island in respect of the training and mobility services which are available to his department?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, recently my department opened a temporary office on Bell Island to provide the necessary services on a full time basis to the workers of this community. It is staffed by one resident manpower counsellor and two itinerant officers. Additional personnel will be added to this task force as required.

This measure will make available immediately to the laid off workers of the island the full extent of the services provided by my department. As of today the district vocational school of the island is enrolling 175 adults in courses to prepare them for jobs at Churchill Falls. In addition the departmental officials, in co-operation with the provincial authorities, are examining the possibility of opening several classes for training in basic skills.

REQUEST FOR LATEST FIGURES ON UNEMPLOYMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Would the minister inform the house what are the most recent figures on unemployment?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me that the hon. member is asking for statistical information. An hon. member suggests it is an embarrassing question, but it is not being ruled out of order on that ground.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REPORTED STATEMENT BY MINISTER ON NUCLEAR STRIKE POWER OF R.C.A.F. IN GERMANY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address this question to the Minister of National Defence. I apologize for not sending him notice, but there is a measure of urgency because I have been asked to appear on a television program.

Is the minister correctly reported in *Hansard* as saying that the nuclear striking power of the R.C.A.F. in Germany at the present time is greater than all the bombs that fell on Hiroshima, equalling one million tons of t.n.t.?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Perhaps the hon. member might arrange for the ten o'clock proceedings to be televised.

TRANSPORT

ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW RAILWAY COSTING METHODS AND TECHNIQUES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Transport arising out of order No. 123994 dated April 5 of the Board of Transport Commissioners setting out all the factors to be included in computing railway costs. In view of the several positive assurances given in this house by the minister that public hearings would be held by the transport commission before these costing methods and techniques were established, would the minister inquire into this, perhaps with a view to having the order rescinded, so that interested parties may make representations respecting this whole matter?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should clear up a misunderstanding about this, particularly in view of assurances I did give in the house, and of course those assurances will be carried out. When the new transport commission is established one of its first duties will be to hold hearings on costing techniques. Meanwhile part V of the act has been brought into operation, and it cannot operate without an interim arrangement on costing techniques. If the hon. gentleman will look at the

order he will see that the present board is quite prepared to hear any representations concerning the interim costing arrangements, and as soon as it is possible to set up the commission a full and proper hearing will be held. In the meantime, if the law is to operate there must be some interim arrangement.

Mr. Olson: As a supplementary question I wonder whether the minister could give us an assurance that hearings will be held on these costing methods and techniques without any initiative coming other than from the government or generated from within the commission itself.

Mr. Pickersgill: It is the intention, Mr. Speaker, that when the commission is set up no unnecessary time will be lost in holding these hearings, because they are central to the whole work of the commission.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since there is a grave danger that the session may end very soon, does the minister not feel that he should tell us what has happened to the new transport commission? Specifically, may I ask the minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question is hypothetical.

CANADA PENSION PLAN

INQUIRY AS TO REFUNDS TO EMPLOYERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the Minister of National Revenue. It arises from a great number of representations which I, and I am sure many other members of this house, have received with regard to overpayments by employers into the Canada Pension Plan. Has the minister devised a scheme or a system whereby these overpayments will be repaid to employers the same as they are to employees?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue and President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to the previous announcement I made in this regard in answer to questions, at which time I indicated that when the data was available we would study the matter further.

Mr. Hales: A supplementary question, Mr Speaker. Could the minister advise the house when he proposes to give an answer stating these figures?

Mr. Benson: In due course, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

LABOUR RELATIONS

REFERENCE BY C.N.T.U. TO LABOUR RELATIONS BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration

Will the minister tell us whether he has noted the important statements by Mr. Pepin, president of C.N.T.U., on the Canada Labour Relations Board and the serious interference of the Canada Labour Relations Board with union freedom?

Is the minister in a position to say whether he intends to take the necessary measures against these attempts on union freedom made by the Canada Labour Relations Board?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I read the papers as the member for Lapointe does.

Mr. Grégoire: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Could the minister state whether, apart from reading the paper, he is slightly concerned with his department and with the workers who have complaints against the Canada Labour Relations Board?

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

REQUEST FOR PAYMENT TO CANADIAN WORKERS IN U.S.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Jean Berger (Montmagny-L'Islet): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Labour. Since he is not here however and since the matter is urgent, may I put my question to his parliamentary secretary, so as to get an answer as soon as possible?

I wanted to ask the minister, in view of the acuteness and importance of this problem for our area in particular and the fact that the minister met with the United States Employment Security Commission in Augusta, Maine, U.S.A., if he could give us some information on the possibility for Canadians working in the forests in the said state to obtain or claim from now on unemployment insurance benefits? This is most important for several counties in our area.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

IMPORTATION OF CHAROLAIS CATTLE THROUGH CANADA BY U.S. INTERESTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. S. Smallwood (Battle River-Camrose): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Is the minister aware that Charolais cattle, owned by United States interests, are quietly being imported into Canada from areas other than France without complying with the elaborate quarantine regulations at the station at Grosse Isle, Quebec, which is set up to receive Charolais cattle from France; and that the Canadian government is being used by United States Charolais breeders to circumvent United States laws banning French cattle from that country? I am referring to shipments of Charolais cattle from the Bahamas and St. Pierre.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question should be placed on the order paper.

GRAIN

REPORTED INTENTION TO REDUCE SHIPMENTS THROUGH CHURCHILL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but in his absence I will direct it to his parliamentary secretary. In view of the reports that grain shipments through the port of Churchill will be reduced this year, I wonder whether the parliamentary secretary could enlighten the house on the reason for this.

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this question as notice.

STATEMENT ON PROTEST AGAINST SLOW MOVEMENT FROM LAKEHEAD

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer a question asked yesterday by the hon. member for Springfield with regard to negotiations between the shipping companies and the wheat board. I am advised that negotiations between the Canadian Wheat Board and the lake shipowners have resulted in a solution to the problem, and vessels are now loading grain freely at the lakehead for both the domestic and export markets.

[Mr. Berger.]

PUBLIC SERVICE

SUPERANNUATED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—REQUEST FOR INCREASED PENSIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works in his capacity as government house leader. In view of the fact that this session, which by tomorrow will be the longest in history, might soon end, will he speak to the chairman of the committee on the public service of Canada to make sure that that committee reports to the house before the end of the session on the question of increasing the pensions of retired civil servants?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to take up this matter with the chairman of the committee.

THE SENATE

NOVA SCOTIA—INQUIRY AS TO FILLING OF VACANCY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. O. Bower (Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister. Since the province of Nova Scotia has been one member shy in the other place for a year and a half, creating a rising sense of dissatisfaction, particularly in western Nova Scotia, will the Prime Minister give an assurance that this deficiency will soon be corrected and that he will give maximum weight to the French Acadian fact in making the appointment?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This is hardly an urgent question.

FINANCE

REGULATIONS UNDER DEPOSIT INSURANCE LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. During his absence the hon. member for Edmonton West and I asked the acting minister when the regulations pertaining to deposit insurance might be referred to the committee on finance, trade and economic affairs. Can the minister answer this question now?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Minister of

National Revenue spoke to me about this inquiry. I would have been happy to recommend that it be referred at any time, since I had some hopes about the early end of this session. Now I doubt that it would be worth while. However, if this session goes on I shall make the recommendation tomorrow.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

AGREEMENTS RESPECTING REFUSAL OF POLITICAL ASYLUM TO EXPO VISITORS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs but perhaps in his absence I might direct it to the Prime Minister. Has an agreement been made with a foreign government or governments that visitors to Expo from such countries will not be granted political asylum in Canada?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, but I will be glad to look into it.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

CONTINUATION OF OFFICER TRAINING CORPS IN CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence which follows a question asked last Wednesday by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. May I ask the minister whether it is the intention of the government that those serving in the regular officers training plan in universities shall be required after graduation to serve in the forces for six years instead of three years?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, last year we increased the length of service required for future graduates from three years to four years. As I announced in the house the other day, it is the intention, commencing this fall, to require students who take aircrew training to serve for a period of five years following graduation. I think that is the policy as it stands at the present time.

Mr. MacEwan: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I take it from the minister's answer that this applies only to those who will take or are taking aircrew training; that is, that they will be required to serve for five years?

Mr. Hellyer: That is correct, Mr. Speaker. The previous obligations will apply in respect of all others.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In what way will this policy apply to those who have signified their intention of taking aircrew training and have been in the R.O.T.C. for the last couple of years?

Mr. Hellyer: It does not apply to those who have begun their aircrew training. They will not be affected. It commences with the graduates of this year, those who will graduate in the month of May. If they elect to take aircrew training they will be required to serve the additional time; if they elect not to take aircrew training, the present provisions will apply.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REQUEST FOR ANSWER TO QUESTION ON ORDER PAPER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. and learned Minister of Transport. Could I ask the minister whether he would give consideration to setting up a task force within his department to help him prepare an answer to my straightforward and precise question of January 13 regarding the ferry service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, thus preventing said question from becoming the most ancient on the order paper?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I think the task force has at last completed its work, and it is possible that if the session goes on until tomorrow this question might be answered.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES

QUEBEC—REQUEST FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Has the Quebec government asked for federal co-operation in the administrative application of the new provincial family allowances act?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, we have had a request from the government of Quebec, conveyed through official channels, that

we make certain information available to assist in the administration of the new family allowance plan of that province, and we have complied with that request.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Knowing the minister's liking for both languages, I shall put my second question in French. Has the provincial government announced to the federal authorities its intention to bring family allowances under its exclusive jurisdiction?

[*English*]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, no—

Mr. Knowles: En français.

Mr. MacEachen: —communication has been received with respect to this point, to my knowledge, since the health ministers' conference of January, 1966.

FISHERIES

BRITISH COLUMBIA—DAMAGE TO SALMON SPAWNING GROUNDS BY LOG RUN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. I should like to ask the minister whether he has any knowledge of a recent announcement by the minister of lands and forests of the province of British Columbia that a log drive is to take place on the Stellako river. Could the minister tell us, if in fact such an announcement has been made, what he and the government of Canada intend to do to protect this very important segment of our salmon spawning resource on the Pacific coast?

Hon. H.-J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the minister of lands, forests and water resources of the province of British Columbia made a statement some days ago to the effect that engineers of the British Columbia forest service have under way at the present time an economic and feasibility study of other means of moving logs from François lake to the Stellako river. I understand, according to the minister's statement, that this report should be available by May 1, or some time next week. I am not in a position to make any comment until the report is made available to us.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF MUNICIPAL TAX PAYMENTS TO ATLANTIC PROVINCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Digby-Annapolis-Kings): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. I apologize for not giving him notice, but he may take the question as notice if he cannot answer it today. In view of the fact that it is the end of the municipal taxation year and the municipalities are trying to strike their assessment rolls for the year, will the government entertain immediate consultation with officials of the Canadian Pacific Railway to remove the discrimination against the Atlantic provinces, under which the Canadian Pacific Railway property is exempt from municipal taxation, yet the same company agreed to waive this taxation in the western provinces in order to assist the transportation bill being passed by the house?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is referring to the Dominion Atlantic Railway, that is a matter of provincial legislation and his observation should be directed to the government of Nova Scotia.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Nowlan: I should like to ask the Minister of Transport a supplementary question in view of the answer he gave me. I should like to ask the minister if he or his officials would exercise the same leadership in attempting to arrange some deal with Canadian Pacific officials, regardless of whether the D.A.R. or any other property in the maritime provinces is federal or provincial, such as was arranged in the west. All I am asking is whether he will consider holding consultations with Canadian Pacific officials to see if they will agree, not the provincial authorities but the Canadian Pacific officials—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am sure the minister has noted the hon. member's additional representations.

Mr. Nowlan: His answer was a red herring.

SHIPPING

NOVA SCOTIA—ASSISTANCE FOR SURVIVORS OF MEN LOST AT SEA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of

Finance of which I have given the hon. gentleman notice. Now that the request for a federal contribution to the *Cape Bonnie* disaster fund has come to the federal government through proper provincial channels, would the minister give immediate consideration to it?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, when I see the request through proper provincial channels I shall give attention to it.

OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING

[*Translation*]

REPORTED STATEMENT IN DEBATE BY PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, responsible for reading the newspapers at the government's expense.

Could the minister tell us whether, while reading the newspapers, he took note of the speech delivered yesterday by his parliamentary secretary (Mr. Munro) while introducing the debate on Bill No. C-278, and can he tell us also whether he fully endorses all the statements then made?

Mr. Speaker: The question is out of order.

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

AMALGAMATION OF NAVY, ARMY AND AIR FORCE

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence) moved the third reading of Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. Churchill: Call the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Division

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (3:30 p.m.)

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Hellyer) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Allard
Allmand
Andras
Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe)
Badanai
Barnett
Batten
Béchard
Benson
Berger
Boulanger
Brewin
Brown
Byrne
Cameron (High Park)
Cantin
Caouette
Cashin
Chatwood
Choquette
Chrétien
Clermont
Comtois
Côté (Dorchester)
Côté (Nicolet-Yamaska)
Cowan
Crossman
Davis
Deachman
Dionne
Douglas
Drury
Dubé
Duquet
Émard
Ethier
Faulkner
Fawcett
Forest
Gauthier
Gendron
Gilbert
Godin
Gordon
Goyer
Greene
Grégoire
Groos
Guay
Habel
Haidasz
Harley
Hellyer
Hopkins
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jamieson
Johnston
Knowles
Lachance
Laflamme
Langlois (Chicoutimi)
Langlois (Mégantic)
Laniel
Laprise
Latulippe
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Leboe
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard
Lewis
Lind
Macaluso
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacInnis (Mrs.) (Vancouver-Kingsway)
Mackasey
McIlraith
McLean (Charlotte)
McNulty
McWilliam
Marchand
Martin (Timmins)
Matheson
Matte
Morison
Munro
Neveu
O'Keefe
Olson
Orlikow
Otto
Patterson
Pearson
Pelletier
Pennell
Pickersgill
Pilon
Prittie
Prud'homme
Reid
Rideout (Mrs.)
Rinfret
Robichaud
Rochon
Rock
Roxburgh
Saltsman
Sharp
Simard
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart
Tardif
Teillet
Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Tolmie
Tremblay
Trudeau
Tucker

Division

Turner	Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Wahn	Whelan
Walker	Yanakis—127.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken	MacInnis (Cape Breton South)
Alkenbrack	MacLean (Queens)
Ballard	MacRae
Beaulieu	McCleave
Bell (Carleton)	McIntosh
Bell (Saint John-Albert)	McKinley
Bigg	Madill
Bower	Monteith
Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)	Moore
Cantelon	More
Chatterton	Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Churchill	Muir (Lisgar)
Clancy	Nasserden
Code	Nesbitt
Crouse	Noble
Danforth	Nowlan
Fairweather	Nugent
Fane	Ormiston
Flemming	Pascoe
Forbes	Peters
Forrestall	Rapp
Grafftey	Régimbal
Grills	Ricard
Gundlock	Rynard
Hales	Scott (Victoria (Ont).)
Herridge	Sherman
Howe (Wellington-Huron)	Simpson
Irvine	Skoreyko
Jorgenson	Smallwood
Keays	Smith
Kennedy	Southam
Kindt	Starr
Korchinski	Stefanson
Loney	Watson (Assiniboia)
MacDonald (Prince)	Webb
MacEwan	Winch
	Winkler—73.

• (3:50 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Beer: I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. Macquarrie: I was paired with the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Had I voted I would have voted against the measure.

Mrs. Wadds: I was paired with the hon. member for Niagara Falls. Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. McCutcheon: I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Bill read the third time and passed.

[Mr. Speaker.]

OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING

PROVISION FOR PAYMENT OF COSTS, AGREEMENTS WITH THE PROVINCES, ETC.

The house resumed, from Monday, April 24, consideration of the motion of Mr. Chrétien (for Mr. Marchand) for the second reading of Bill No. C-278, respecting the occupational training of adults.

Mr. J. Chester MacRae (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, when the time for debate expired last evening I had just finished putting on record the case for private industry and, more specifically, the case for the private schools of Canada so far as this measure is concerned. The subject of the present dispute between the department of education of Ontario and the government of Canada has been raised on several occasions. I am sure the minister will deal with it fully in the course of his remarks before second reading, and I invite him to do so.

In the course of doing my homework to be ready for this debate I took the time to read, among other publications, one entitled "Skill Acceleration", a 1967 publication of the Ontario Economic Council. This publication sets out five recommendations concerning policy in relation to long-term manpower problems and I should like to place them on record believing they are of sufficient importance to justify my doing so. The first deals with the need for additional research and reads as follows:

> Additional and continued research is required to identify educational and training needs in the light of the over-all environmental factors affecting human resource development. As many of these problems are of a Canadian rather than a provincial nature, at least some of this research should be co-ordinated centrally but with sufficient regional representation to reflect regional differences. Responsibility for implementation should naturally lie with those levels of government most directly involved.

So the first point is that there is need for additional research into this whole broad field.

The recommendations continue:

> One of the problems, and at the same time one of the differences between Europe and Canada, is the lack of social status associated with vocational jobs.

I remember very well as a boy in high school that those who took vocational and commercial courses were not considered to be the same level as those who took academic courses. It was as though students who took vocational training lacked the ability to do

the other. This has been a problem over the years. As is pointed out, it does not exist in Europe to the same extent. To continue:

It is not realistic to expect a young man to enter an apprenticeship program with the certain knowledge that his wages will be low for a long period of training and that when he becomes a skilled or highly skilled worker his income may not be much more than that of a man who took on a well-paying specialized job with short training periods.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Job security may be less in such specialized jobs, but this is irrelevant during a period of economic boom. Moreover, a feeling of inferiority may arise in the individual who is not able to achieve an accepted academic standing.

The attitudes of some high school counsellors and teachers tend to foster the feeling "either I'm a university graduate or I'm nothing."

Unless young people are encouraged to undertake work of a vocational nature, and unless the community accords the right status to such occupations, this problem will continue. Making vocational occupations attractive is, however, only one part of the challenge. Another is to create exit points in the educational system prior to grade 12.

Anyone who now leaves school prior to grade 12 is called a "high school drop-out," and there are too few provisions for a smooth transfer into other types of training situations.

As parents all of us have noticed that when a boy or girl does not complete high school it is considered a tragedy in the family because so many avenues are closed to the student who does not finish high school.

To provide for such exit points will require research into curriculum development and post-school programs of education and training.

One of the major hurdles facing Ontario's educational system is the shortage of vocational teachers.

Of course the shortage of teachers is a chronic situation in most provinces. There always seems to be a shortage of good academic teachers, but I know from practical experience that the shortage of vocational teachers is even more acute and more serious.

Such teaching positions at this time are still relatively unattractive, both from a status and financial point of view. Basic changes in both monetary and social rewards are needed.

To summarize this particular point, vocational training should be upgraded. There should be more status afforded to vocational training teachers and there should be exit points provided in the high school curriculum. The third point, which I think is very well made by the Ontario Economic Council, is:

Apprenticeship and short-term on-the-job training are suffering from too great a degree of segregation. It should be possible to develop a comprehensive training program with logical exit points which would allow trainees to leave the total training system at such points.

In other words, there should be a comprehensive training program but not all those undertaking it should be carried to the ultimate end of the program. That is understandable. There should be exit points along the way.

An analysis of present apprenticeship practices is indicated, with particular reference to shortening the training period. There are many practical examples where companies, particularly in Europe and the United States, are developing, in less than half the time, highly skilled employees of equal or better competence than those graduating from apprenticeship programs.

We are familiar, of course, with the old principle of British apprenticeship under which young lads went into the shipyards of the Clyde, Newcastle-on-Tyne and Aberdeen—at the last place I had the opportunity to see them at one time—at the ages of 12 or 13 and spent from five to seven years as apprentices. It was a long, thorough apprenticeship—I think perhaps too long because they were paid practically nothing. But the net result was that the shipbuilders who were developed on the Clyde and the Tyne were known all over the world. The Scottish marine engineer is one of the most highly skilled men at his trade anywhere in the world.

In effect the third point which is made is that we could very well do with shorter courses. I think the last two points are very important because they deal with the part which private industry and labour should play in this whole matter that we are discussing today.

Industry and commerce must assume a greater responsibility for the development of operating skills.

Of course the bill encourages this.

The costs of "raiding" could be alleviated, at least in part, by providing tax incentives or subsidies to companies for educational programs, including such activities as vestibule training or non-production on-the-premises training.

I am not quite certain what is meant by vestibule training, but non-production on-the-premises training is self-explanatory.

Such a policy would invalidate the oft-repeated argument that employees are only trained for other companies.

I know the minister is aware of this because in his remarks on the resolution this matter was raised.

Management and supervision could also be given more direct responsibility for training. There is a variety of sound, on-the-job training programs which utilize either supervisors or experienced employees for instructional purposes.

In other words, the fourth point in these recommendations is that industry should become much more involved than it has up to the present.

The final point deals with labour. Just today during the noon hour many of us met with Canadian shoe manufacturers who are facing a real problem because of low cost imports of shoes and boots. I could not help but be impressed, and I said so during the course of the discussion with the large group present, that labour was well represented. Representatives of the labour unions in the shoe industry attended. That is a good thing. They seemed to be deeply conscientious and aware of what was happening and were anxious to help the industry with this problem. The fifth point in the recommendations is:

> A major challenge in vocational development falls upon organized labour. The welfare of the union member can no longer be related to short-term contracts. Moreover restrictions applying to job transfers in contracts do not, in the long run, make economic sense for individual employees. Organized labour could make a genuine contribution through a re-evaluation of such points as they relate to:
>
> (a) the need for including education in job responsibilities;
>
> (b) the real needs to be served by apprenticeship programs;
>
> (c) the opportunities for employers and union members to benefit from individual educational efforts.

The article concludes.

> Such re-evaluations have already resulted in unofficial changes in practices in many locals. This practical proof could well be recognized in terms of official policy.

It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that the machines that will do the world's work 25 years from now have not yet been invented. I believe that. It has also been said that a very large proportion of our working force today will not complete their working years at the skills in which they are now employed. That is true, and that is the whole purpose of what we are here for this afternoon.

I said at the beginning of my remarks that this measure is one of the most important to come before the house for many years because it deals with the lives and the livelihood not only of our people today but of those generations to come, and for that reason it is vitally important. I may disagree with some of the provisions included in the measure when we reach them. As the minister knows, I have an amendment to submit. I hope he will look upon it favourably. I understand the principles of government of course but I would ask him to look at my amendment carefully. I wish him well on this measure, and I also wish the government well because in wishing the government well I am wishing the people of this country well, and that is what we are here in this house to do.

[Mr. MacRae.]

Mr. J. R. Keays (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, in his opening statement yesterday the parliamentary secretary endeavoured to make this bill controversial by insinuating that the opposition has delayed its passage by discussing the unification bill and, I might also add, by discussing the medicare bill. We would have welcomed this bill's appearance on the order paper much earlier, and had the government given priority to it the other two bills I have mentioned could have been dealt with subsequently. I can only say that there has been poor government planning in this regard.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Because of the haste with which these adult training courses were initiated no definite regulations were established and no proper organization was set up to deal with this program. I believe that the 100 letters I have on file justify the statement on my part that no proper organization was set up before these adult training courses were established. Many people believe themselves to be discriminated against. A good deal of explaining will have to be done to justify the position which has been taken in respect of these people. The blame in this regard can only be attributed to the minister. No planning or study sessions were held with the provincial governments or with the educators and the managers of the manpower centres. Although I was informed that the selection committee in each region would be made up of the manpower centre manager, the chairman of the regional school board and the head of the local school board, this apparently has not been the case and the managers have had to carry on alone.

I have no right to speak about the qualifications of the managers. I do, however, ask myself whether the manager of a manpower centre who is placed in this position can take a decision with regard to whether or not a person can qualify for these courses. Had the program been properly organized with the school board authorities, either local or regional, I am sure that a more proper assessment could have been made of the eligibility of persons. In this way many of the criticisms which have been made and the impressions which people still have to live with could have been eliminated. These

procedures which were adopted in haste have caused an undue strain, serious emotional stress and financial loss to many people who are able to qualify.

As has been mentioned by the parliamentary secretary, this measure provides that the government will be the financial agent for the hundreds of thousands of Canadian workers whose future earnings are dependent on more training. He went on to say that this is not a form of relief. I would love to believe this. Many of these people do not even receive unemployment benefits because they cannot qualify for them. These people are the recipients of social allowances. They did not find sufficient employment during the year to qualify for unemployment insurance benefits and therefore found it necessary to apply to social agencies in order to obtain some of the money necessary to support their families.

The minute either a husband or wife qualifies for these courses the social allowances which have been paid to them are cut off. In many cases many of those who attend these courses are not available to the labour market. This can be proven in respect of many regions. Of course I speak mostly of the rural areas of the country. Those who did qualify received these payments which were agreed to by the provincial authorities. However, many who were unable to qualify for these courses have been deprived of an education which would have made it possible for them to obtain better employment.

I am all in favour of upgrading the training and education of these people. I am wondering, however, whether the practice which has been followed this past winter will solve the problems. We are moving ahead and entering into the courses when no firm regulations have been laid down. Most of the people who enter these schools are receiving social allowances rather than unemployment insurance. Therefore we are bringing to the schools people who possibly never will be available for the labour market. In this manner we are depriving those people who could get into the labour market of the opportunity to attend these courses and receive this assistance.

I understand that the agreement concerning where and how these courses will be given, as well as the amount of the allowances which may range from $35 a week to $90 a week, is made with the provincial authorities. The allowances are based on the average revenue in each district. I find it difficult to understand why the national government which is paying the shot should allow a province to determine exactly what amount of money should be paid. Is there any reason why a person who is living in an outlying district and attending these courses should be paid $35 a week while another person living in a different area is entitled to $50 or $60 a week? I believe this is very unfair to those who in order to upgrade themselves wish to attend these courses. There is discrimination at the national level which extends through the provincial level.

If we are to pay for these courses, then I believe the same rate of payment should be available to all Canadians whether they come from one part of the country or another. I cannot understand how there can be any justification for the fact that different rates are payable across the country. I believe there is discrimination because, as I said before, I do not believe the manager of a manpower training centre alone is qualified to decide who should attend these courses. I should like to quote from a brief submitted by C. H. Rushton, co-ordinator, Ontario manpower retraining program:

> The Department of Manpower and Immigration, and the provincial department of education are having serious difficulties in co-operating due to the fact that Canada manpower centres are neither knowledgeable nor humane in respect to the educating and training of individuals. Is the minister aware of the fact that persons are being directed to training by placement officers who have no more than grade 10 education? The staffs in many local manpower centres are totally inadequate in so far as training and qualifications are concerned to determine whether or not a man has the academic qualifications to enrol in a skill training program. The minister himself would be hard pressed to determine, in a twenty or forty minute interview, whether or not an individual requiring skill training is functioning at a grade 10 level. Nevertheless, in their ignorance, local manpower placement officers are being instructed to make judgments of a nature which educationalists with years of training and experience would not dare to make without comprehensive testing and counselling.

• (4:20 p.m.)

This is exactly what I have been referring to. I believe that those people who will occupy positions in the manpower centres across the country should be properly prepared and educated to enable them to interview and assess the value of those applying for the right to attend these courses, whether they are courses in adult education or vocational training.

I should like to quote now from a speech made by the minister in Ottawa on February 21, 1966. He said:

[*Translation*]

> In spite of the prosperity experienced by Canada, there is still poverty in many localities; in several areas the standard of living is inferior

to the national average and too many people lead sterile and degrading lives either because of their age, their lack of education, physical handicaps, or because they are unable to find decent and remunerative employment. Our ideal of justice and equality demands that we give every citizen the means to lead an honourable life, not for some altruistic reason or other, but due to the obligation we have of using to the maximum all the energies at our disposal.

[*English*]

I believe no one can disagree with those words. I believe also that the minister is very sincere in facing up to the problems of unemployment and preparing our people, especially our youth, by means of an education which will permit them to enter into many spheres of industrial operations. However, I do not know how we are going to solve this problem in the rural areas of our country, and I am not certain the minister knows. Not many of our legislators come from the urban areas of our country and are competent to deal with the problems there. How many of those who work with the minister or with the heads of the departments are familiar with the problems which exist in the rural areas of the country? I am speaking now of all the rural areas because that is where we most often find chronic unemployment, with people having been unemployed for years and having no hope of finding a job anywhere in this country. As I said, I do not know what the solution to this problem will be, but one thing is definitely clear to me, that we should concern ourselves with helping these people to find employment and preparing them for it.

There are many pockets of unemployment across the country where people look to the future with dismay and a lack of hope of ever being able to do what others seem to be able to do. This is a very distressing situation. Above all, we must think of those who are chronically unemployed because they must not be allowed to face the future knowing they will have to depend on welfare benefits for the rest of their lives.

I am not speaking strictly of this government but of governments in general. I believe there is a lack of co-ordination not only among ministers but among their departments. It seems that the right hand of government knows not what the left hand is doing. There is a duplication of efforts.

At this point I should like to suggest a few of the areas where duplication exists. We know that at present there is a housing problem in this country. It is a problem that faces Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation which is answerable to parliament through the Minister of Labour (Mr. Nicholson). At the same time the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Laing) is preoccupied with the problem of housing in the national parks, and the Minister of Forestry and Rural Development (Mr. Sauvé) is dealing with housing under the ARDA program. It seems to me that we are leaving the main street and entering many side streets from which there is no return. We are not concentrating our efforts in one direction. If we wish to solve the housing problem the efforts of all the departments concerned should be directed toward that objective.

Again I am reminded of the time last year when the government, in co-operation with private industry, announced that a heavy water plant was going to be built in Nova Scotia. I have no objection to that but I do object to a second heavy water plant being built in the same province when other areas of Canada with the highest rate of unemployment in the country, areas which could offer the same natural resources and all the labour needed to operate a heavy water plant, have been overlooked. I think it was the government's responsibility to establish the second heavy water plant in an area of chronic unemployment. This is where the government has fallen down. The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, for example, does not seem to be aware of the problems facing the Department of Labour and the Department of Manpower and Immigration. If the efforts of all the departments had been directed toward solving this problem the second heavy water plant might have been established in the Gaspé.

Another matter that comes to my mind concerns the most natural harbour in the world which is to be found in the Gaspé and today is being wasted because we cannot find any use for it. First of all, we should try to establish industries in these areas so that those people whom we are helping to prepare themselves for employment will know that they will be able to find it when they complete their training. At present they are preparing themselves to return to school for another year without the hope of finding employment later. This is a sad situation.

• (4:30 p.m.)

I am in favour of adult education and vocational training and I agree we must prepare our people for future employment. However, I cannot understand why only one out of four factories in this country provides any training whatsoever. It has been said that employers

feel they will be training people for their competitors. Those who operate factories and large corporations are supposedly intelligent people and they must know that they have a part to play in the whole problem of employment. They should be told that they must also train people whether or not they lose some of their trainees, because the end result of this program will be increased productivity in our country. This will improve our position in the economic field where for the last ten years we have ranked as the fourteenth nation in terms of real productivity.

There is an obligation on government and employers in this respect. They must realize that we will not remain competitive if we take a lackadaisical attitude toward productivity. Increased productivity will be attained by increased education. We must tell corporations and employers that they have a part to play, and they must know that a program of this type is also for their own good. All the blame should not be placed on the employers. On two occasions recently I have spoken to union leaders and told them that they should not concern themselves only with getting members for their unions, that they should not spend their time fighting each other but should undertake a program of education for their members and show them that increased salaries will only be brought about and justified by increased productivity. This is not a one-way street. It is quite important that both parties play their part and give to this country a better competitive position than we have today.

I do not intend to speak any longer on this subject. I endorse this legislation in part but hope that in view of the developments of the past winter the government will learn a lesson and never introduce or put new legislation into effect unless preparatory work has been carried out so that justice may be done to all those who are eligible for employment.

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make some remarks on this bill in the context of the new government policy in regard to education and training and then I shall make some comments about the specific provisions of the bill. The bill arises from decisions taken by the federal government after the federal-provincial conference of last fall. Apparently the main decisions were taken by the federal government on its own. They consulted the provinces but it seems to me that the major decisions were handed to the provinces by the federal government. In place of the former policy of co-operative federalism we have had what might be called unilateral federalism.

What were these main decisions concerning education and retraining that were taken at the conference last fall? First of all there was the decision of the federal government to withdraw from what they call the field of education and concern themselves only with what they call training. They made a distinction between education and training. It was an arbitrary decision, and had to be. People who have worked for years in the field of education have not been able to make this distinction, but it has been made in this instance.

Apparently education is a process which takes place in the elementary and secondary schools and colleges and universities, and is to be paid for in the future by the provincial governments. The federal government, of course, is transferring certain percentage points of taxes to the provinces to assist them in what is called education. Training is something which takes place not in the schools but is for adults, people who have been out of school for at least three years, if they are single, or for a lesser period of time if they have dependants. So we have this distinction between education and training. I think it is a rather false distinction and a very hard one to make. Hence it had to be a quite arbitrary decision.

It was an arbitrary decision and it was not in the spirit of the co-operative federalism we have heard about in Ottawa for the past several years. This is not an easy term to define. I have a whole file of speeches made by Mr. Favreau, Mr. Lamontagne and the present Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Pepin) who have been going around the country explaining co-operative federalism. I would think that among other things it certainly means co-operating with the provinces on joint programs. However, I shall refer to some of the definitions used and relate them to this subject. I shall first quote from a speech made by Mr. Favreau on October 20, 1964, to the Chamber of Commerce of Montreal. He had this to say:

> For we believe that the indispensable counterpart of provincial autonomy is a permanent interdependence of the provincial and federal governments. This interdependence grows first from the participation of all these governments in a common monetary and trading system; but it is necessary also because many of the fields of jurisdiction that our constitution has distributed to Ottawa and the provinces are complementary or concurrent. One need only study any aspect of our federal foreign policy—immigration, defence, cultural relations, trade—to catch the reflection

of problems which preoccupy, in the first instance, the provinces; unemployment, industrialization, education and productivity.

I would point out that he used the word "education". Then he said:

And of course, the influence of provincial policies on those of Ottawa is at least as powerful. By the very complexity of our federalism, the provincial and federal states are called upon to recognize their deep and inevitable solidarity.

But, one may ask, how can you express this solidarity without threatening the fruitful autonomy of each level of government? We reply: by permanent consultation and co-ordination in all questions that invite Ottawa and the provinces to take joint action. It matters little whether this action arises from officially concurrent fields of jurisdiction—

I suppose such as agriculture and immigration.

—or whether it is inspired by a newly discovered overlapping of interests; the essential aim is to develop within the federation a stable and flexible method permitting the federal and provincial governments to act together, when they so wish, and for the common good. Obviously, this co-operation must be agreed to freely; for co-operative federalism affords no place to coercion.

I cite that particularly because as far as we can determine this new training plan was handed to the provinces as the result of an arbitrary decision, not one reached after co-operation between the federal government and the provincial governments. With reference to the federal system and how the governments which make up the federal system should work to solve our problems and arrive at workable solutions to the problems which face the country, I wish to quote again from one of the many speeches on co-operative federalism made by Mr. Favreau. This speech was made on May 4, 1964, to the Canadian Club, Montreal.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond but I am trying to decide how he can relate his remarks to the subject matter of the bill, which is an act respecting the occupational training of adults. He can make general observations about the policy that has been put forward by certain ministers respecting co-operative federalism. However, we have a specific bill before us with respect to the occupational training of adults. I know that the hon. member can make references to opinions which have been expressed by certain members of the government, but to indulge in a lengthy consideration of these opinions is, I believe, outside the scope of the bill now before the house.

[Mr. Prittie.]

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. Prittie: I do not have any difficulty in relating these remarks to the bill. When speakers from the various parties were making their comments on the bill last night they mentioned several times the arbitrary fashion in which the decision was taken by the federal government to withdraw from direct financial support of education and to scrap the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act. I believe my remarks are related to the bill because I am complaining about the fact that the decision to undertake this program was a unilateral one and not in keeping with the policy which has been expressed so frequently in the past by various spokesmen for the government. I should like to hear from the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources before this debate is completed to ascertain if he can make any sense out of the many things he has been saying over the years about co-operation with the provinces. How can he accept the type of action which we have before us?

This measure, Mr. Speaker, does involve the provinces. The measure it is replacing, the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act, involved the provinces. I am talking about methods which the two levels of government in Canada should use to bring about the best type of co-operation in order to evolve workable plans for the implementation of particular policies. I believe, therefore, that to this extent these remarks are relevant.

However, the point is that what the government is embarking upon now represents a very sharp change from the policy of the past few years of co-operating with the provinces in joint schemes. If a province did not want to have the federal government in a particular field, provision was made for that province to opt out. It seems to me that was not a bad policy in a complex country such as Canada where we have to make all sorts of compromises. Now, however, we have gone back to what hon. Mr. Favreau called the classical way of operating a federal system. The federal government says, you look after your affairs and we will look after ours; we will keep them separate as much as possible. It seems to me that in 1967 we cannot operate in this way. Certainly we cannot operate in this way in the fields of education and manpower because people are mobile. They move from one province to another, so this type of action goes against our whole industrial structure.

The decision has been made by the government not to be involved in education as they define education. They are going to be involved in retraining. The bill contains some points which I think are good. The level of payments to be made is certainly better than the level of payments made to those receiving unemployment insurance benefits. It would certainly pay a person to undergo retraining rather than to be unemployed. While I am on that subject, I believe that the unemployment insurance benefits have been in need of revision for some time. No one will get rich under this scheme but at least he will be better off than he was in the past.

In addition, I like the provision that a person does not have to be unemployed in order to qualify for retraining under this new measure. A person could be employed at a low level job which did not suit him and if he had the ability he could be referred for retraining and receive an allowance for his expenses. This is a good feature.

There are a number of weaknesses in the bill. I believe that many of them result from the fact that the kind of consultation to which I was referring a few minutes ago did not take place or was limited to consultation with provincial authorities. I have made it my business to talk with people who are involved in retraining and adult education in the major metropolitan centres of Canada. These people have not been consulted. These are the people who are daily working in the field. They know what the problems are, how you organize a course, who should be admitted to the course, how many instructors are available to teach these courses. As far as I can determine the bill was drawn up by people in Ottawa, undoubtedly very well qualified and well educated, who have had no actual experience in the field of retraining and adult education. I can say this with certainty because I have been speaking to the people concerned in the major cities of Canada and they were not consulted. It seems to me if they had been consulted many of the questions and problems which are being raised now could have been avoided. I am going to raise some of these problems later.

I am going to pose some questions, and I imagine the minister will be answering later so his staff may wish to take note of them. The first one is, what is the role of the universities? Are they able to contract directly with the federal department to provide training? I mention this because it is important. Universities are more and more becoming creatures of the provincial governments. This position flows from the decisions taken last fall. If they can only provide training contracted with the provincial government's approval, this further reduces their capabilities for independent educational action.

The second question is, what is the intention of the manpower department with respect to holding clients who are eligible for training and allowances but for whom a particular course may not start for two weeks, a month or possibly six weeks? What happens to them during the interval? The local authorities, whether they be provincial or municipal, who provide some courses will have to have time to organize the courses and find teachers. What do they do with these people during that period? Are they on allowances or unemployment insurance benefits during that interval?

Since many people would find part time training better suited to their needs, why has provision not been made for the cost of part time training, including part time allowances? In one city I know that more than half of the people entering the adult education program were people who were taking night school training. They were not asking to leave their jobs to go on full time allowances, but they were taking this form of training to improve their standing. The people who attend evening classes are not concerned about the question of allowances, but will the bill permit their tuition fees to be paid?

There are other possibilities that could be considered here. It might be that some people could work half a day and attend courses for half a day. Is there any provision in the bill for allowances to be paid on a pro rata basis in that type of situation? In the large cities such as Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver and Winnipeg, you will find a large number of people in this category. In order to function at all well, a local manpower office operating under this new measure will have to have access to the most up to date and comprehensive information about training and upgrading throughout the country. What provision is being made to accumulate and continuously process this kind of information since at present it is not available anywhere in Canada?

The task of accumulating this information, it seems to me, will be tremendous. Undoubtedly some of it is available at certain levels in the adult education departments but it will take quite some time for the departments themselves to gather the necessary

background information. The provision of an adequate information service to support the manpower training program will cost a great deal. The estimates of the manpower department do not appear to include any such major items. Are we then to conclude that the manpower department is expected to function without the provinces or adequate information services? In so far as the budget is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I really do not know how the department is going to operate this rather ambitious program next year with the amount of money shown in the estimates at the present time.

Why does the bill specify that research costs must be shareable with the provinces? Should there not be substantial sums available for contracting research directly from various agencies in addition to such research as naturally involves provincial governments, departments of education and so on?

• (4:50 p.m.)

Another question is: Is it not true that the implication of this bill is that the least qualified people in society will be turned on to the labour market for a one to three year period? I am thinking particularly of the youngster who leaves school at the age of 16 or 17, the type previously referred to as a drop-out. At the present time he can enrol at a vocational school and receive training right away.

I realize that the answer has already been suggested by somebody, namely, that the province can pay for that. But I do not think that this is a good way to operate. If this same person gets married after one year and then has a dependant, he immediately becomes eligible for training under this bill. Therefore it seems to me that there are certain discriminations and inconsistencies here which really do not hold up very well.

Another question which comes to mind is whether there has been any consultation between the department of manpower and officials of ARDA. ARDA is concerning itself with education in certain depressed regions of the country. I rather like the ARDA approach; they are concerned with the social aspects as well as the economic. I have the feeling that the attitude of the department of manpower is a direct result of the report of the Economic Council and is perhaps too much economics-oriented without taking into account social aspects.

However, I should like to ask what co-operation or discussion has taken place with ARDA officials, who as I say are involving themselves in education and retraining in certain areas of Canada. The previous speaker, the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Keays), mentioned that there are too many cases where one department of government does not know what another department is doing.

I have said that there are some good aspects to this new bill. I have also made certain criticisms of it. However, I think it is a great shame that the government is taking an altogether different approach from that taken under the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act. That act did not meet with very much opposition from the provinces of Canada. Certainly there was a federal involvement in the field of education or technical and vocational training, or whatever you want to call it, but there was no great objection to that and the act worked quite well. There were certain faults. People had to be unemployed to qualify under that act. However, it seems to me that if that act had been retained and amended to bring in some of the good features in this bill we would have been much farther ahead.

It seems to me that this bill has been designed to meet particular doctrines or policies that the government has adopted. Very often in the past we in this party have been accused of being doctrinaire. It seems to me that this may be said of the government at the present time. They have said that they will have nothing to do with education as they define it, which seems to me a very doctrinaire approach, certainly not the kind of approach that will solve the problems of a modern industrial society with a mobile population.

The majority of the provinces of Canada had no objection to the type of operation that we had in the past to give federal assistance to education. There were some objections from the province of Quebec, and this sort of thing was handled by opting out provisions and by making money grants available. I do not know why we cannot continue in that way. To me this bill is a move in the wrong direction.

I should now like to say a few words about the staffing of the department, I know that the intention is to make it a prestige department, to recruit university graduates, bright, able people, and to give the department a good salary level. At one time the government was talking about trying to make the department a prestige department like finance or external affairs. That is fine. I think the stigma which attached to the unemployment insurance offices in the past was undesirable,

and anything we can do to raise the prestige of the manpower department is all to the good.

An active recruiting campaign is now on to attract able people to the department to be the counsellors. However, the job of counselling is a very important one and it seems to me it can only be done well by people who have lived for some time and have gained some experience. The person who is newly out of university or who has very few years of experience is not going to be an effective counsellor for quite some time. True, you should hire them and use them in subordinate jobs. But the type of people who should do the counselling of the people who need retraining should be mature adults with a number of years of experience and living behind them.

It occurs to me that this type of person does exist in many of our cities across the country. I think, for example, of people employed by school boards and boards of education. I hope some method can be worked out among local manpower centres whereby the staffs of the manpower centres, many of whom will be new and inexperienced, can rely on the experience which has been gained by these other people I have just mentioned.

There is one other point in connection with counselling that I wonder about, and again I raise it in the form of a question. I believe there are to be five regional directors across the country who will have very great powers. They will have a great deal of discretion in decision making. They are to decide who should take re-training and who should not. One would therefore hope that different criteria do not apply in different parts of the country but that a plan will be worked out so that some common denominator applies. I say this because people could be admitted for training in one part of the country because of the attitude of the particular regional director and his staff but the same people would not be admitted in other parts of the country because other centres operated under different criteria and arrived at different decisions.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have noted that other speakers in this debate have, like myself, raised a great many questions, and rightly so. This is a most important measure and I hope that the staff have been taking note of these questions. I would inform the minister that we will want to hear answers to these questions either before second reading or in committee before this measure finally goes through.

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): Mr. Speaker, it is very unfortunate that this very important bill follows so closely on the heels of the unification bill which has just been passed this afternoon because long after the arguments which have been presented during the last two or three weeks have been forgotten the effect of the bill will be with us. The beneficial results of this bill, if properly applied, will mark the minister as one of our great ministers and, as you know, I do not say that lightly.

This is a bill which deals with individuals, not with groups. It deals with the individual's rights, his apprehensions and fears, and indeed with whether or not the individual Canadian is going to be able to make a living. As time progresses and these awesome changes in technology take place from day to day, it is all very well to say to a welder, for example: "We have just developed a brand new machine and instead of you standing over a piece of steel for days on end you will just have to put it into this machine and it will weld it for you". That is fine. The great benefits of automation are not realized by workmen who think their jobs are in jeopardy. The workman fears the new technology and fears the way it will disrupt his life. He resists change. This bill attempts to alleviate his fears by saying: "Look, you need not worry. You will survive and enter new employment fields. We have staff and research facilities behind us and we shall make sure that your training will benefit you and the nation."

• (5:00 p.m.)

That there will be many difficulties connected with this measure is true. I submit that its success depends on those clauses of the bill having to do with research. I am amazed sometimes at how slow educators, technicians and tutors are to accept the realities of the moment. Let me give an example. I have had 18 to 20 years experience in the construction field. Under a program similar to this one vocational schools are training plasterers although plastering as a trade is dying. In other words, when the student has finished his course there will not be a job for him. The same might apply to carpenters, plumbers, and electricians.

In the construction field we need installers and assemblers, but difficulties are created because one group of tradesmen instals windows, another group instals kitchen cabinets, another instals plumbing, another instals

doors, and so on. A great change is contemplated in clause 10 of the bill which will provide for real research in the field of technology. If the government assembles a competent research staff I am sure that adults taking the courses will benefit greatly.

It must be remembered, nevertheless, that we are dealing with human beings. It is all very well for counsellors to say, "You ought to be retrained because your trade is vanishing", but the applicant's feelings as a human being must be considered. In this regard the government ought to co-operate with management which, contrary to popular assumption, is willing to co-operate in this field.

It must be remembered too that when a man retrains for a job his living standard drops by about 25 per cent. Tradesmen retraining are willing to put up with hardships. Nevertheless it is difficult, having qualified for a trade and worked at it for 10 or 15 years, to be told that the old skills must be forgotten and that new skills must be learned.

Nothing is as valuable to management as an old, experienced employee. Such employees are loyal, they know the work and they are a very real asset. I am an employer and I should be only too happy to pay tradesmen seeking retraining $10, $15 or $20 to keep their services. One man has been with me for a long time and I should like to keep him. I should like to see the government co-operating with management much more than it has in the past. In fact, I think that management will co-operate more readily than will the provinces.

That brings me to my second point. During his remarks the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond (Mr. Prittie) said that we have lost sight of co-operative federalism. I say, of course, that nothing will be more conducive to co-operation than this measure. It is senseless arguing that education is of local or provincial jurisdiction. On a man's education depends his standard of living. On the education of the labour force will depend such things as national unemployment or employment, the increase or decrease of production, the fall or rise of our balance of payments and whether the national economy prospers or falters. The provinces jealously guard their jurisdiction in the field of education. Their jurisdiction is concerned with individuals. Do the provinces say when unemployment strikes: "Fine, we will look after the unemployed in our provinces?" I submit they do not. Unemployment remains a federal responsibility and it ought not to be argued that education, especially adult education, should not be a federal responsibility.

The British North America Act, one of the loosest constitutions in existence can be interpreted in almost any way one wishes. I suggest that the British North America Act applies best to the government that is quickest to take the initiative. I doubt that the people of Canada would support the argument of the provinces that education ought to be within provincial jurisdiction. Indeed, I am quite sure that all Canadians would be willing to have education under federal jurisdiction. This bill will only succeed in its aims if the minister insists that its subject matter comes within federal jurisdiction, with the senior level of government assuming the responsibility for payment as well as responsibility for administering the legislation.

It is incorrect to think that the Canadian people will not support the idea that adult education should come under federal jurisdiction completely. Some imagine that in this country we have two groups of taxpayers, one supporting provincial governments and the other supporting the federal government. That is not so. The same taxpayers support the federal and provincial governments and pay taxes to both levels. The tax revenue of the country still comes from the country's taxpayers. If we recognize that matters such as the economy, unemployment and productivity are of national concern we should recognize that education, especially adult education, ought to be within the national jurisdiction.

• (5:10 p.m.)

A further point I should like to raise concerns unemployment insurance. I realize this is touched on briefly in the bill before us and I am in support of the clause which deals with it. At the same time it must be remembered that if we are to expect Canadians to take advantage of facilities for adult education it will be necessary to convince them that they will not suffer undue financial hardship as a result. It is not likely that Canadians will be willing to lower their standard of living to an appreciable extent merely because through no fault of their own their jobs have disappeared. So we must arrange these payments in such a way that a man will receive not less than 75 per cent of his former earnings while he is retraining.

This a matter which ought to be taken out of the municipal field because the municipalities are governed largely by a group elected

by the establishment. Similarly, the provincial governments are in effect representative of the establishment. On the other hand, we in this house represent the disestablished, and it is the disestablished who must take advantage of this bill.

The minister should pursue the course he has set himself with strength and vigour. I am sure the consequences of this measure will be rewarding if its terms are put into effect stringently, vigorously and with some thought for the future.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): Mr. Speaker, the deafening applause when you called on me makes it difficult for me to collect my thoughts.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fairweather: I wanted to say that I feel this bill would have received more meaningful consideration by parliament had it gone before one of the committees of parliament before this debate began. No matter what one may think of the unification bill, the transport bill or the Bank Act, each of these measures is in its own way the better because the opportunity was taken to examine it carefully in a committee of parliament.

I myself feel in some need of adult retraining in this very sphere. I recognize that the minister and the government are captives of the parliamentary timetable. Because of the demands of this timetable they may be in danger of asking parliament to enact legislation which has not received sufficiently thorough examination by members of parliament or by the provincial governments.

I do not intend to speak for very long. I am sympathetic toward the basic objectives of this legislation. But if I were ever to ask the Canada Council to give me a grant I think I would ask that I be allowed to conduct a study in the use of what I call irony, a study of the use made by governments, by ministers, by all of us, of what might be called ironical defences of what we propose to do. I think that the subject of manpower retraining would be a good place to start. If I wanted somebody to come to my defence—because on a number of occasions I tend to be open-minded—I would choose as a supporter of my views none other than the distinguished chancellor of Queen's University who has had some interesting things to say about the constitutional position vis-à-vis education.

I was interested, as I suppose all of us should be, in the government's about-face last October, its retreat from concern with assistance to higher education. At the time of that retreat it made an advance in a related field, and this legislation is obviously part of that advance. The irony on which I like to reflect is that we can find a neat constitutional excuse for enacting this bill at the very time we are finding a constitutional excuse for withdrawing from a field which I feel is of equal importance and concern to the government of Canada, that is, the field of higher education. Perhaps my council grant would run out if this were the only evidence I could bring to bear on the use of irony. But why can we not be frank with the people of Canada once in a while?

I also wish to express regret that I have had no opportunity to study the letters from various provincial jurisdictions expressing the concern they feel about the working out of the formula for manpower retraining. This is despite the fact that the minister kindly promised to table them. I have had to rely on newspaper accounts which are not the best evidence, I admit. Apparently the reporters are able to see mail which members of parliament up to now at any rate have not had the opportunity to study. As I say, the minister did agree to the tabling of these letters subject to the consent of the provinces concerned. I make no charge, no criticism. I presume that some at least of the provinces have not yet agreed to the tabling of the correspondence. Apparently, though the province of Ontario has done so, because in the *Globe and Mail* of April 22 there is a fairly extensive article entitled "Queens' Park Points A Finger At Ottawa". The subheading reads: "The Retraining Row". Far be it from me to feel under any obligation to present a case for the province of Ontario, but it is my impression—the minister may correct me if I am mistaken—that there is a very genuine concern felt about this legislation, not just a timid reaction but a genuine concern among all the provinces save two. This arises, if my information is correct, from a feeling there has been insufficient consideration of the regulations and of the effect of this new concept.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I share several of the views expressed by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond (Mr. Prittie) as to the working of the ARDA program. I have been following the developments in northeastern New Brunswick with a great deal of interest. Of course anybody who represents any part of that province knows of

the drastic need for an ARDA program, in fact for adult education and a thorough-going upgrading of the economic and social life in that part of New Brunswick. But I hope, as did the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond, that the manpower retraining program will be dovetailed with the ARDA program and that the human and social needs of the people will be the prime consideration.

I have an idea that the minister has a very genuine feeling for human problems. This has been demonstrated in other areas of his departmental concern, particularly in the very much improved immigration procedures that he announced. By the way, Mr. Speaker, I think that announcement shows the benefit of a parliamentary committee's thoughtful consideration of a program, and had a parliamentary committee had the opportunity to examine this bill I think it would have been so much the better for it.

I also hope there will be a close tie-in of this program with the developing facilities for educational television. That also needs thorough research and examination by parliament. We shall have other opportunities to speak on this aspect, but may I just say I hope ARDA will be tied in with manpower retraining and that those who are administering this bill when it has been passed by parliament will not forget the advantages of educational television.

To return for a second to my feeling about the use of the word irony, may I quote a comment made by Dr. Corry in what I think was a very important speech which he made on October 26, 1966, to the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. As hon. members will recall, the government staked out the federal role in cultural matters, manpower training and research in its public announcement about the same time last October, or in early November. Dr. Corry had some comments to make that I think are relevant to this bill and to a consideration of what I might with great respect say was the over-simplified view of the constitutional aspects of education given to us by the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto). If it were as simple as the hon. member suggested I am sure the minister, as spokesman for the province of Quebec in the federal cabinet, would feel that a good many of his worries were over.

Dr. Corry said:

> In a number of quarters we are being warned that the very existence of our country depends on vastly more Canadians becoming bilingual—in essence, acquiring some facility in French as well as English. Without judging this contention but allowing that it may well be so, could we count on nine English speaking provinces grasping this urgency and making the necessary educational provision? Would the sum of these efforts add up to enough? Is it not clear that there may well be the need for emphasis, support, and direction being provided by the government of Canada?

This is the key question that Dr. Corry asked:

> Is it not strange that numbers of those who warn us of the critical nature of bilingual needs should in almost the same breath be saying that the government of Canada has no role to play in education?
>
> But, it will be asked, does not section 93 of the British North America Act give exclusive power over education to the provinces? This is correct, subject to a limitation that is likely to become more portentous as time goes on. Literally, the words of section 93 are "In and for each province, the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education."
>
> If there are national needs and objectives that require concerted educational policy in two, several, or all provinces, no provincial legislature is by itself competent in the matter, and judicial interpretation on other comparable aspects of the distribution of powers under the British North America Act makes it clear that parliament is competent, under "the peace order and good government" clause.
>
> It must be on this ground that Prime Minister Pearson, in his proposal to the federal-provincial conference now meeting—

This speech, of course, was made, as I have said, last October 26.

> —asserted federal jurisdiction in the training and retraining of adults for participation in the labour force. It is to be hoped that a reading of this particular assertion along with other general disclaimers in the text of his proposal about federal authority in education will not give rise to inferences that the federal government has neither status nor lively concern in the education of highly skilled and highly educated manpower in the universities.

May I interpolate here that this is the point I want to make in my few remarks on this stage of the bill. Fine, go ahead with the manpower retraining program with basic enthusiasm for its objectives, but do not in the same policy announcement, so to speak, and in the same area of vital national concern ignore the need for highly educated specialists coming from the universities. To return to the speech made by Dr. Corry.

> It would be incongruous to be asserting federal authority over training for run-of-the-mill jobs in the labour force and abandoning it totally for all professional, scientific, and technical personnel educated by the universities. It is the latter who will be critical for national objectives in the future.
>
> ... The federal government is attempting to make clear it has a constitutional responsibility for adult

retraining programs, research, and cultural development, and that these are not, constitutionally speaking, educational matters falling within the jurisdiciton of the provinces, from which the federal authority is excluded.

I hope I have an opportunity before very long, perhaps arising out of the speech from the throne in the next session, if there is any next session for those of us who have been waiting for it for a little while, to be able to support enthusiastically a vigorous program of financial help for the very areas of highly skilled people in another aspect of Canadian need that has been so clearly set out by Dr. Corry.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this bill would have been better had we had the opportunity to examine it in a committee. I had hoped to have an opportunity to study or take into consideration the serious doubts about the mechanics of this legislation as carried out by the provinces. Unfortunately that is not to be. May I also re-echo the plea made by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond that this new program not be isolated from those projects envisaged by the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act. Lastly, I hope that the as yet untapped area, untapped in Canada but used to a particular effect in Italy, of educational television will not be neglected when the minister goes about establishing this new policy.

• (5:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to take part in the debate on the occupational training of adults, and also assure the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) that it is not merely to seek publicity in the newspapers that I do so. I wish the minister would be kinder with me and be willing to believe that I am taking part in the debate in the interest of my fellow-citizens.

It may be that the minister would rather see someone else take the floor, a Tory, a Grit or anyone else, instead of "little Grégoire" as he calls me, but at any rate someone who would not say a word. Then the minsiter might have some peace and might be able to read the newspapers, his favourite hobby. If no member rose to speak, the minister could read his newspapers undisturbed.

But you must not always be quiet when you are a legislator. He may compare me with the fly on the wheel, but a fly is often of great help to get an old horse moving, particularly when it stings the old horse at the right time.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would apologize to the minister, if I must apologize for taking part in this debate, for disturbing his peace, for disturbing him in his newspaper reading. Unfortunately, we cannot all be yes-men. Parliament cannot include only men who are always in their seats, and the minister must get used to that.

The minister says that I want to look like a great man although I am only a midget. Mr. Speaker, I will tell the minister that it is true. I admit that I am not a great man but I will tell the minister that the first thing one must learn is that one does not know anything and I would ask him to apply it to himself.

After those preliminary remarks, Mr. Speaker, I should like to go directly to the heart of the matter.

Mr. Marchand: That is good.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, it did not take me half a day, like the minister, to set the record straight. It took him half a day to make charges such as those I have just mentioned, whereas it took me barely two minutes to make a correction.

Once again, I apologize to the minister for disturbing him while he is reading the newspapers but, you know how it is, Mr. Speaker, I have electors to represent here and I will do it to the best of my ability.

I, therefore, come back to the bill dealing with occupational training as I understand it.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation as introduced in Bill No. C-278 is one that enables everybody to evade their responsibilities.

As far as providing our people with the means and the opportunity to secure a more advanced occupational and technical training, I am all for it. But I am not so sure about the means that are being suggested. To support this, let me refer to the answers the minister himself gave to certain questions we put to him when we asked: How is it that so many Quebec people cannot follow the occupational training courses? And the federal Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) replied: It is because the province of Quebec lacks the necessary facilities to enable the unemployed to follow these training courses.

So, if all our citizens who need them do not follow the occupational training courses this year, next year or two years from now, the

minister will simply rise and say: It is not our fault if the provinces lack the facilities. We are ready to pay the provinces if they provide the facilities. Yes, we will pay the provinces, but if they lack the facilities, that is not our fault. And the minister can quietly sit down and say: I have done my duty; I have introduced legislation that does not apply to everyone because the provinces lack the required facilities. And he can blame the provinces and the minister can continue to read his newspapers in peace.

But if people vote as they are doing now against legislation that is not implemented as it should be, the minister will call them young punks, and to those who feel that things are not going fast enough, the minister will say, as he is wont to say in his rigmarole, that they are irresponsible. The minister will also say: If we only had members who would stay put and keep quiet! He will go to their constituencies and say: Elect a Conservative, a Liberal, or a "caille". As far as he is concerned, it is all the same thing provided they stay put. That is the first requirement. And the minister will say: I put legislation through. It is not my fault if other governments cannot do any better. It is never the fault of any given government, but always somebody else's fault.

It is the way the minister has been answering. When he is asked: How is it that our labourers who need retraining cannot take this training because they are refused in the manpower centres in our ridings? The minister says: It is not our fault, it is the fault of the provinces that are lacking in facilities. This bill enables all concerned to evade their responsibilities or to pass the buck. Then he can sit down saying: I put legislation through. Some people talk too much while it was being considered, but it was finally passed. If it does not operate as it should, well, it is not our fault, it is somebody else's fault.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, as drafted now in Bill No. C-278 cannot have any other effects. It is the system which is wrong. When there is an objective to achieve, when we want to assist some groups of people, we always have to involve two governments in the deal, and two governments which interfere with each other, two governments which have administrative expenses, whose functions overlap and where no effort is being made on one side or the other to make the legislation operative, because when things do not operate as they should, or successfully, one just has to fold one's arms and say: It is the other government's fault.

That is what this legislation has again in store for us. I would not want the minister to think that I am opposed to adult occupational training. The minister cannot detect in anything which I say now the slightest opposition to adult occupational training or to retraining of those who have been displaced on account of automation or modern production technology. No, that is not the case.

• (5:40 p.m.)

On the contrary, I would like to see an act like this one—there are good things in it—to be really applicable, without loopholes, one that does not allow the blame to be put on someone else, one that assigns responsibilities in such a way that, if it fails to operate, we can point a finger at one government, and not two, and say: You are to blame if things are not working out; and do not try to put the blame on another government.

Mr. Speaker, once again, even if the matter is as vital, important, and necessary as the training of adults, because many individuals are still being displaced by automation and modern techniques, implementation of the act is entrusted to two different governments, two different organizations, two bureaucracies, and consequently causes double expense.

It is the individual displaced by automation, for instance, or the man employed in an industry where technical changes are expected to take place who will want to take those occupational training courses and he will apply first to the manpower centre, a federal institution.

You will note the intricacies of this administrative process. This federal manpower centre will have to turn to provincial organizations and administrations to know about the opportunities and facilities for receiving such or such individual; and then, that will fall back into the hands of the provincial authority.

The provincial authority will report on such opportunities to the federal manpower centre and this centre will return the individual involved, like a football thrown from hand to hand, to the provincial occupational training institutions. When the time comes to pay for the courses, the federal centre will pay the provincial centre, and when the time comes to pay the living allowances, again the federal government will pay the individual. And there will always be overlapping. That individual will be sent for retraining—he will practically be sent on a bicycle—from the

federal to the provincial government so that the individual will always be caught between two governments, two administration centres.

We will have to pay taxes to cover the administration costs of the federal manpower centre, we will have to pay more taxes to the provincial government to support the administration and pay the cost of the paperwork and the provincial bureaucrats who will look after this individual, and there will always be duplication in administrative and bureaucratic expenditures.

The poor Quebeckers will have to deal with two ministers, two deputy ministers, federal and provincial bureaucrats and auditors; they will have to foot two expense accounts and will also have to pay taxes twice to cover administrative expenses, once to the federal government and again to the provincial government.

This is absolutely abnormal, Mr. Chairman. This is another proof that our system is basically wrong, since each time we want to pass legislation in the interest of an individual, of a group of individuals, or of a class of people, two governments must deal with it instead of one.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill No. C-278, is another intrusion by the federal government into a field which is not its own, the educational field. And this is not the first intrusion by the federal government into the field of education.

I can well remember that my hon. colleague, the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Allard), has written a little booklet that everybody should read, giving a detailed account of all the intrusions by the federal government. But we are concerned here with the retraining of manpower, and even if the present intrusion by the federal government, into the occupational training field will not prevent directly the provincial government from setting up an over-all plan for the retraining and training of citizens, whether they are students, teenagers or adults, it will nevertheless prevent the establishment of an over-all program controlled by a single authority in the educational field, so as to provide a link between the training of young people and their further training, once they have become adults, in order to cope with the never-ending technological changes.

There will be no overall plan, but two separate programs, one for secondary education and one for adult education. As a result, it will be impossible to establish an overall system which would co-ordinate education in Canada at all levels, enabling people continually to adjust to evolution, modern technology and automation.

Let us take another example concerning refresher courses under the Adult Occupational Training Act. Let us take the case of a grade 10 school teacher who has a diploma from a teachers' college. Would not modern progress require, Mr. Speaker, that after some five years' teaching experience this man take a one-year sabbatical leave to see how grade 10 is taught in other schools, or else, return to other specialized schools, to learn new pedagogical developments and new teaching methods for grade 10 teachers.

I see that the minister nods his head. It is precisely there that the federal government takes charge of this grade 10 teacher who wants to improve his education for one year. This, in my opinion, has two serious shortcomings; first, a teacher is taken away from a provincial system of education to be placed for one year under the authority of the federal Department of Manpower and Immigration. And then, is this not also intended to prevent a single authority in matters of education, that is the provincial authority, from looking after the further training of such a teacher who, after teaching for five years, seeks to improve himself?

Such a measure will, in effect, make a clean break, because it will bewilder such a teacher seeking occupational training as an adult, after having taught for five years. To improve himself, he will have to come under the federal Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

In view of what the minister has told us, he will probably be given newspapers, in order to teach him to read the papers. That is the way our school teachers will be trained.

Mr. Speaker, this is a clear case of intrusion by the federal government. I have only referred to two points, because the time available will not permit me to explain further, but I shall have the opportunity to refer to this again.

• (5:50 p.m.)

I shall have an opportunity to come back to them but, first of all and to sum up, they prevent the establishment of a general plan to co-ordinate the whole training of the citizen, whether it be during his technical, secondary or university studies, relating all these elements to his occupational training as an adult; the intrusion of the federal government makes here a clear break in the whole scheme that could be built around the Quebec citizen or the Canadian citizen.

It also prevents the formulation of a general plan for refresher courses, as I mentioned a moment ago, taking as an example school teachers who could, every five years, refresh or improve their knowledge either by seeing what is being done elsewhere, or by learning more modern teaching methods, for these also change every year.

Mr. Speaker, as far as work itself is concerned, this is also an intrusion by the federal government, since it prevents those who are empowered to act and who are responsible in this field, that is the provincial authorities, from setting up a comprehensive program so as to provide for a reduction of working hours, which is in keeping with the times. In the *Express* magazine, a French periodical, an article was published on April 22, I believe, saying that an American company, after a study based upon modern processing methods and computer operations, had established that in 30 years from now, the average working week would be about 24 hours.

Well, the authorities could draw up a comprehensive plan combining a reduction of the worker's time on the job and an increase in the time he must spend to complete an adult occupational training course in step with automation and modern production techniques.

This also, Mr. Speaker, comes under the provincial authority, but the program set forth today will prevent the development of such comprehensive plan by the authorities who have the jurisdiction in that field, to wit: the provincial authorities.

Mr. Speaker, I am not against—and I wish to point it out once more—a legislation concerning the occupational training of adults. I think that the legislation has very good points and I should not like it to be dropped merely on account of the basic matters which I have listed. Moreover, I do not want the citizens of Quebec to be deprived thereof, because a minister has deemed it advisable to bring down mixed legislation based on federal and provincial authorities, enabling each authority to back out of their responsibilities while holding the other responsible if the legislation does not operate successfully.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, instead of taking direct objection to this bill, I would rather move an amendment, because although in my opinion the bill, as drafted, could be greatly useful, I believe that the amendment I intend to move now, on second reading can be of greater service still.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

My amendment is as follows:

I move, seconded by my good friend the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Allard), to whom I am thankful because he shares these opinions as he is not a "caille", as the Minister of Manpower and Immigration says, but one of those who prefer to speak up even if it should prevent the minister from reading his papers, that all the words after the world "that" be deleted and replaced by the following:

> This house, while of the opinion that all necessary steps must be taken to ensure that proper occupational training is available to every adult Canadian citizen who needs it, also believes nonetheless that no legislation providing occupational training for adults would be sufficient unless it provided also a system of fiscal compensation for any province wanting to set up its own program of occupational training for adults.

Mr. Speaker, I could let you read the amendment to the house and continue my remarks afterwards.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member wish to continue?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Now, Mr. Speaker, I will go on with my remarks so as to enable you to examine the amendment.

The amendment is very simple. I do not want the disappearance of a piece of legislation on the occupational training for adults, far from it. On the contrary, I want to improve it. The provinces that will want to entrust the federal authority with—

Mr. Marchand: Just a minute.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, may we know what is happening with the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Lapointe?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair will read the amendment in a few moments.

Mr. Fairweather: En anglais, en français?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: I wish to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that if you have any doubts about this amendment, whether it is in order or legal, I could give you the reasons in favour thereof.

The purpose of the amendment is to improve this piece of legislation. You may note that I am not saying this is a bad bill; in the contrary, I think that any piece of

legislation which is intended to improve the occupational training of adults should be considered seriously and that we should try to legislate to that effect.

Now, my amendment will enable the provinces wishing to do so to entrust the federal government with the occupational training of adults.

Nothing will prevent Ontario, British Columbia, Alberta, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland or even Quebec from waiving their authority in favour of the federal government. Nothing will prevent them from doing so, under that amendment.

On the other hand, those provinces that will wish to legislate in that field, to have their own legislation regarding the occupational training of adults will be able to do so, under the amendment.

Those provinces wishing to take advantage of that amendment will be wholly responsible for the occupational training of adults. Then, not one member from Quebec will be justified in rising and asking what the minister is doing? As a matter of fact, he could say since the province insisted on being solely responsible, it must therefore assume its responsibilities.

Then, if a member rises in the provincial legislature and asks what the minister is doing, it will not be possible for that provincial minister to reply: It is the fault of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration who reads newspapers. He could say: It is my fault, since I am wholly responsible in the field of occupational training of adults.

The minister will find that, by the same token, if some provinces take advantage of that amendment, he will no longer have to say: It is not my fault, it is the provinces' fault. And he will be able to keep on reading his papers.

Mr. Speaker, such is the purpose of the amendment: to ensure that provincial jurisdiction is not infringed and that the provinces may establish their own occupational training program for adults; to see that, with this adult occupational training program, other larger over-all plans may be generated within those provinces such as, for instance the co-ordination and education of young people with that of adults. That is the improvement wished by those who not only have to face modern technology or automation but who wish to improve in other fields such as, for instance, in the teaching profession.

• (6:00 p.m.)

The provinces will be allowed to operate other over-all plans if they take advantage of the amendment. They could, for instance, combine the reductions in working hours and the increase in hours devoted to adult training.

Mr. Speaker, I move this amendment in the hope that everyone will realize that it is an improvement over the legislation before us at this time. Without taking anything away from the legislation, it represents an improvement which I hope the minister will accept, because it will not take anything away from it.

The amendment means simply that the provinces wishing and feeling able to do so could initiate their own occupational training plan. Then, the provinces will benefit from tax equalization, which means that the federal government will give back to them, in the form of tax equalization, what it would cost to implement that system in a given province.

For instance, should the plan be applied in Quebec, the federal government would cease to collect an equal amount in taxes and the Quebec government could thus benefit from that amount which the federal government would refrain from collecting, that is an amount equal to the cost to the federal government of implementation of the plan.

Mr. Speaker, under those circumstances the province collecting the taxes would implement its own plan according to the specific aims of the province. That would spare double administrative costs, and that is very important. In fact, we would no longer need to pay officials in Ottawa and Quebec city to implement the same bill. One single group of examiners, inspectors and bureaucrats would be enough. Instead of paying officials twice, we would pay them only once. Instead of paying a federal and a provincial inspector to check whether a building designed for occupational training of adults has actually been built according to standards, only one would be paid, and thus money would be saved.

Instead of paying two architects, one provincial and one federal, to supervise the works, only one would be paid. Instead of two accounting systems to ascertain whether an adult taking occupational training has received his school allowance or his moving expenses, we would have only one control system, and thus significant savings could be realized.

On the other hand, the provincial authorities could provide the adults with a much better occupational training system than the one suggested by the minister, on account of the savings effected in the administrative field, for there would be only one single authority to operate and administer.

That causes delays and involves half-measures. The federal government may say: We want this to be done in such a way, while the provincial authorities will say: We want it this way. Finally, nothing will be done.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe the amendment I move today will improve the bill and enable the provinces to exercise their jurisdiction and their authority as far as education and labour legislation are concerned, since tax equalization will provide them with amounts of money equal to the expenditures brought about by the adult occupational training program.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that if you have any doubts as to whether or not this amendment is in order, I am prepared to put forward arguments to show that it is in order.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: While consideration is being given to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Lapointe perhaps the hon. member for Simcoe East would like to proceed with his remarks. Before he does so, however, I should like to read the questions for the adjournment debate this evening.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—Air Transport—request for ban on use of highly inflammable fuel; the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Keays)—Winter Works—extension of period; the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Allard)—Food and Drugs—suggestion that directions be written in French and in English.

OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING

PROVISION FOR PAYMENT OF COSTS, AGREEMENTS WITH THE PROVINCES, ETC.

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Chrétien (for Mr. Marchand) for the second reading of Bill No. C-278, respecting the occupational training of adults.

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe East): I should like to make some comments on this bill, Mr. Speaker, and to compliment the minister for bringing in a bill which certainly seems to have concern for the people as its major objective. This measure, of course, eliminates the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act which was introduced in 1960 by the then minister of labour in the Conservative government, the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr). The need for education and re-education is something which nobody in this house denies today. We are in a world that from 1700 to 1900 amassed twice the knowledge it had previously, from 1900 to 1950 doubled that knowledge, and from 1950 to 1960 doubled it again. This is an amazing feat. Knowledge seems to spread. From 1960 to 1965 we doubled our knowledge again. I bring this point to your attention, Mr. Speaker, because it indicates that we have arrived at the stage of automation.

We find that a man who may have been fully trained in a skill or trade in 1960 is today looking for a new skill or trade. The job that he had may have been obliterated; it has gone into oblivion. We find that this situation applies to all of our courses of training. It is an axiom today that we train people to know more and more about less and less. When the need for a particular skill no longer exists we find that these people cannot turn to something else. They have to have retraining; they have to go back to school. This is one of the problems facing us today.

I feel we should take a good look at some of the things that have actually happened in Canada. In the year 1900 about 70 per cent of the people in Canada were engaged in farming. Today we find that less than 10 per cent of the people are engaged in this occupation. It is interesting to note that in those days the village blacksmith and the woodworker were the skilled mechanics, along with the man who ran the gristmill which turned the wheat into flour for making bread. These were the essential things in those days. Everyone was a skilled mechanic and was skilled in all the different phases of an operation whether it was making a wagon or whatever it might be.

Today we find that workmen play only a small part in the production of a machine. In other words, as I have said before, these skilled men know more and more about less and less. In the field of agriculture to which I

have referred, production efficiency has increased by over 50 per cent in the last ten years and is still increasing very rapidly as a result of the machines that have been produced. Last year, in fact, we were able to sell over a billion dollars worth of wheat to other countries. This situation was related to the mechanization and automation that have taken place over a period of years. Certainly this is increasing today by leaps and bounds. It is a fact of life that the training given today may be obsolete tomorrow. Therefore we need a training plan tailored to meet the problems created by automation.

• (6:10 p.m.)

Although many people will qualify for retraining, some will not have the required academic education, and I am wondering what the minister plans for these people. In addition, what about those who are too old for training? Every week end I meet someone in this category. We have to exercise a little care and caution in the changing world of today. I met one fellow who was trained in one skill but had to be trained in another skill simply because his original skill was no longer required. Does the minister intend to keep offering retraining courses? In this event we will find ourselves on a merry-go-round.

I now want to talk about technical and vocational training schools. The Conservative government passed the former Technical and vocational training act in 1960 under the guidance of the minister of labour of that day, the hon. member for Ontario. Over $300 million was spent in a very short time on building schools. The Conservative government put up 75 per cent of the cost of construction and equipment. We are now going to move in another direction, and I should like to know where the money is coming from to construct the schools that will be required. We are going to have manpower centres but unless we have training schools it seems to me this bill is a backward step.

We also have those people who were trained in Salvation Army homes and institutions. These people have been doing a good job. I think all of us would agree that places like Concord have done a wonderful job. Young men from that institution have taken employment and have been very successful in their work. Are these people now to be cut off? I should like the minister to inform us on this.

Let us take the case of a boy of 17 going to high school who is either on any academic course or a vocational course. In the province of Ontario it is difficult to take any further course. Are these students to be cut off too? Why are they discriminated against? I see the minister shakes his head, but according to press reports this is exactly what has been happening. A report in the *Globe and Mail* for Saturday last had this to say:

> Few of the 21,000 adults on job retraining in 54 communities in Ontario can afford to support themselves while attending full time classes.
>
> Why are so many training-hungry adults facing the loss of educational opportunities at a time when Canada is so short of skilled manpower?
>
> Part of the reason lies in good intentions on the part of new look federal cabinet minister Jean Marchand.

I would be the last to deny that the minister has good intentions. The article continues:

> He wants to upgrade the nation's work force fast. But Ottawa is inexperienced at the education game and has been unwilling to listen to advice from the provinces.

In this regard I am wondering whether Premier Stanfield of Nova Scotia, Premier Robarts of Ontario and Premier Roblin of Manitoba were sufficiently consulted. I think it would be interesting to see the correspondence in this regard. It seems to me there is an allegation here that the minister has not looked into the question or consulted the provinces sufficiently. The article continues:

> Another part lies in a liberal dose of what is described as bureaucratic arrogance by Ottawa, misunderstandings and some legislative bad luck.

I think the writer of the article is being very kind in his use of that last phrase. I bring this article to the attention of the minister as an indication that his public relations in this regard have not been very good. As I say, Mr. Speaker, I should like to see the correspondence that has been exchanged with respect to this plan. I do not think you can simply draw a line between the two as the minister has. I do not think there can be a black and a white in this regard.

When a student has completed an academic course of four years he does not want to loaf. He wants to go to work. He should come under the manpower training plan so he can finish his education in this field. In my opinion he has just as much right to manpower training as anybody else. I do not say this unkindly, but I submit that there are about 7,000 young people of Ontario who should not be placed in this position. Therefore I ask the minister to take another look at this question to see whether he can get together with the other provinces as well as my own province. Something must be done to ensure that these

young fellows do not become forgotten legions.

I now want to dwell for a moment on what the minister proposes to do with the business colleges and trade schools. I would remind the minister, though he probably knows this better than I, that in high school two courses can be taken to grade 10 before going to business college. On the other hand, you can complete four years to grade 12 at high school and then go to business college. Usually these positions are taken by girls, though there are some men who attend. According to the figures I have before me, 44,641 people were trained in business schools.

What is the position of the minister vis-à-vis the business colleges which are doing an excellent job? I was talking last night to some business colleagues who expressed the view that business colleges perform a very necessary function. They provide a finished training to equip people to go into business after a nine-month or six-month course following upon four years at high school.

Another point which I do not think has been sufficiently covered concerns trade schools. Last Saturday I was talking to a man who had employed a fellow who was trained at a trade school in Toronto, and he said that this boy was a dandy, that he does his job well and has other experience. Is the minister going to assist these people? I realize these schools are private concerns, but surely to goodness the minister does not think that good comes only from public enterprise. It has been proven over and over again that a complete education has great benefits. Over the years we have hired many stenographers and those who completed their education in the business schools have always been proficient and seemed to have a know-how to start with. I hope the minister will make certain that these people are trained and given allowances. If trainees come under program 5 there should be no discrimination because, after all, they are taxpayers of this country and are entitled to take private training if it is efficient.

• (6:20 p.m.)

I have grave doubts about the minister's bill with respect to its interfering with provincial affairs. I do not wish to say that the minister has been at fault; I think he is a nice fellow. But I do say that relations with the provincial premiers and ministers of education ought to have been better. Surely this whole matter could have been worked out before the introduction of the bill. There have been arguments; at least, that is the impression left in my mind. Whether it is correct I do not know but I should be interested to read the correspondence to see whether my assumption is correct. Perhaps the provinces may be hard to get along with, but the minister knows how to deal with them. He is a smiling, diplomatic sort of fellow who has handled himself well in the house. Surely he could have done a better job in straightening out the many difficulties in which he finds himself.

I hope the minister will answer some questions on this important matter. As I have said before, the plan is a good one provided it works and provided the minister is willing to iron out problems with the provinces. In the over-all picture, with the rapidity of modern transport whereby people can move readily from Quebec to Ontario or Ontario to Quebec, from Quebec to British Columbia or to the maritimes, there ought to be national direction with respect to education. Under the British North America Act education is a provincial matter. It is easier to go from the maritimes to Vancouver by modern transportation facilities than it was to go from one village to another 100 years ago. With people able to move so easily from one province to another we ought to have some agreed national direction in education so that students will not lose time or become confused by reason of different textbooks and differently constituted classes.

I support the principle of the bill though I have many doubts about the minister's ability to carry through its intention. I wish the minister well and I hope he will provide some answers before we finish considering the bill.

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I wish to begin by saying that I feel Canadians almost everywhere appreciate the concept behind this bill. Many Canadians felt when the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) was appointed that this country was pioneering in certain respects. With automation spreading most Canadians thought that automation was indivisible and that the labour force would be indivisible. They felt that provincial boundaries meant nothing when mobility of labour and conditions of labour were taken into account. People from coast to coast felt that with the technical changes of automation provincial boundaries ought not to be a bar to technical training and mobility. Many of us feel that the minister has espoused much of this concept. Some of us

admire the way he has refused to permit questions of manpower and training to be pushed into provincial compartments entirely. The minister knows that these matters cannot be fenced off by provincial boundaries.

Some of us think of making this land into a single country one day with room for all our diversities, our two major cultures and languages, and so on. We hope that ways will constantly be developed whereby it will be possible for ideas of one sort or another to flow across provincial boundaries, in that way bringing about true unity within this country. One day we hope to see that unity. We do not go along with the nineteenth century idea of chopping this nation into ten divisions and saying that each division shall run everything as it sees fit.

Mr. Cowan: That is right.

Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): That sort of thinking will not turn us into one country and it is time that some of us said so. We want to make room for the diversities of this country and we want to give special status where special status is needed. We certainly do not accept the unrealistic concept of fencing everything off behind provincial boundaries. That can be done, but if it is done we shall not have a country.

I do not think that the hon. member on the other side who echoed this sentiment really agrees with what I am saying. I feel that his efforts do not make it easy for all Canadians to accept the diversity of our two major cultures. Let me say that I believe in diversity. I do not want to see everything reduced to a monolithic culture.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): We shall be completely unrealistic if we fail to face the facts of the twentieth century.

Mr. Cowan: You are on both sides of the fence.

Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): No I am not on both sides of the fence. Because one or two provinces will not accept the facts of modern life is no reason for the other provinces to be held back by nineteenth century thinking when they need to be thinking in twentieth century terms.

I do not think there has been close enough co-operation between the federal government and the provinces in matters of manpower and manpower training. I know there have been difficulties for the minister and that he has been discouraged by certain actions. Nevertheless the minister must persevere and attempt to obtain a greater degree of co-operation than has been accorded him in the past.

In my hand I have a copy of the adult occupational training regulations, and I shall read regulation No. 14 under the heading of "General Regulations":

> 14. The minister may, at the request of the government of a province, join with that government in the establishment of a joint committee to assess manpower needs in that province.

• (6:30 p.m.)

I realize that the minister has been cautious in case a province might not want him there to help assess manpower needs. But there is a halfway house. I do not see why in the world the minister should not approach a province in order to find out whether or not they would like his help in assessing manpower needs. That would be entirely different from sitting in Ottawa and saying: If you come to me maybe I will help you.

I assure the minister there are provinces which would welcome far closer co-operation than has been the case in the past. I know from past history that once they see programs going well in other provinces there are provincial governments which, even though they may have been backward in the initial stages, would be anxious to go along belatedly and say "Me, too".

The concept behind this bill is a good one and the measure itself contains many good features. However there are other features which are not so satisfactory, and it is because I am accepting and welcoming the principle of the bill that I wish to mention some of its shortcomings and deal with them briefly.

I believe this bill falls short in its treatment of the young people. At a time like the present in which formal schooling is being found wanting in so many ways and when there is great fluidity in our approach to this field, many young people are dropping out of school. Unfortunately many of them also drop out of society; a great many of them get lost. I was impressed by a phrase used earlier by one of the members of the official opposition. He said we needed more exit points in the educational system. This manpower training program ought to be providing some of these exit points. I do not wish the Minister to become involved in formal schooling or to infringe upon provincial rights, but when the provincial education systems have been unsuccessful in holding our young people, this training scheme should be there, ready and

waiting to take them in without keeping them waiting until they are one year older than the school leaving age.

In the *Globe and Mail* this morning I read that in the province of Ontario a great many North American Indians are leaving the schools long before they reach school leaving age. I have no doubt this applies to other provinces too. I am sure a program of training in manual and technical skills would be of great benefit to these young people. Very often those who are suited for academic training do not recognize that young people are thinking increasingly in terms of vocational and technical training—in terms of the skills necessary to look after the machines which are so important today. The minister of manpower should be prepared to step in when the school system cannot help these young people or provide them with the particular skills they need.

An hon. member who sits on my left said there was a real danger that this manpower training bill might encourage teen age marriages to a far greater extent than is desirable, since candidates have to be at least a year older than school leaving age and looking for work on the labour market.

Teen age marriages are undesirable in cases where there is no proper economic foundation for them. Under these proposals young people can qualify for training if they have a family to support. Otherwise they cannot. This is a situation which should be looked into.

I turn now to the shortcomings in which women are involved. As far as I understand this legislation, I see no provision with respect to childless widows. There are a great many childless widows in this country, women who have been left without support and who need training in order that they may earn a living. Many of them have no skill which would bring in a private income. A childless widow can be just as badly in need of a job as a widow with children. I should like to hear the minister explain how this gap in the legislation can be filled. It may be that his attention has not been drawn to this aspect. I know a great many people who belong in this category and who need a chance to retrain.

Again, if I read the regulations correctly, housewives are not considered to be members of the labour force—this is presumably when they are living at home—and therefore they are not considered eligible for training. I would point out that housework is certainly

labour, though unpaid labour. We never object very much in this country to women working; what we object to is women being paid. Housewives should have the right to train. They certainly have the right to go out and work now, because they are out in great numbers indeed. According to statistics published by the Department of Labour some time ago it is estimated that by 1970 half the married women of Canada will be gainfully employed outside their homes in the labour market. I believe that at present about one third of the labour force is composed of women. If they have the right to go out to work, they should have the right to retraining under these proposals.

I turn now to a more contentious subject. When we talk about assessing manpower needs it should not escape the attention of the government that one of the most pressing needs facing us at the present time is an assessment of the place of women in the labour market and the training of women for the work force. I am thinking now in terms of the women who can qualify for training under this legislation—women with dependants such as children of school age. We do not know how many of these there are across Canada.

• (6:40 p.m.)

In 1965 there were 2 million women in Canada working outside their homes for pay, and 60 per cent of them had children under 16 years of age. When I brought up this subject earlier it was not during debate on this bill. It was on another bill which I admit was a bit off the mark, but the minister at that time was kind enough to tell me this was an important problem which would have to be debated some time. I think this is the time to do that, and today I want at least to broach the subject.

It stands to reason that since 1965 the numbers of such women have increased. The cost of living has forced more and more women into the labour market, and there are many more women employed today who have preschool children. I have two specific recommendations I would like to urge with respect to this problem in connection with the manpower training program.

These are not my ideas only. I have discussed the problems with people in a good many walks of life and people in many capacities, including the manpower training capacity. I urge that wherever women are taking manpower courses there should be established, as part of the manpower training

centre, a child care centre. This should be done in order to make it possible for women with pre-school children to attend training classes free in the knowledge that their homes and children will not be neglected.

I use the name child care centre. It could be called a crèche, a nursery school or a day care centre, but I believe the name child care centre combines all the elements of these others and is a more flexible way of putting the best of these three ideas together. I suggest that this be done in order to protect the children involved.

In this connection I am going to give a few examples from this capital city in which we live because it is typical of Canadian cities. Ottawa is by no means our largest city, nor is it the smallest. Of course it is the capital. Quite recently its welfare council produced an excellent report on day care needs.

A mother in Ottawa who is going to take manpower training, if she wants to place a child under ordinary care, will have to pay $40 to $60 a month to have the child looked after during the daytime, or $10 to $15 a week. It will cost her $100 a month to have two children looked after. If she wants a housekeeper it will cost her $125 to $150 a month for a housekeeper to look after two or more children. Obviously therefore, with the proposed manpower training allowance of $35 to $90 a week she is not going to be able to afford proper care for her children. In such a case what happens to the children?

I wish to quote from a report in the Ottawa *Journal* of April 23, 1966, just a year ago, to tell the story:

> Recently in an address delivered to the Ottawa Day Nursery annual meeting, J. A. Messner of the Children's Aid Society, pointed out that Ottawa's six day nurseries care for no more than 260 children. As many as 160 children are being left more or less unattended while parents work. Another 1,500 children are probably being left in less than ideal substitute care.
>
> According to Mr. Messner's reckoning, 13 per cent of children are being cared for by their mothers while at work; only 2 per cent are placed in day care centres or after school centres; while the care of the remaining 85 per cent remains unknown.

I am suggesting that one of our manpower training needs is to see to it that the children of mothers who are taking manpower training are looked after adequately in child care centres attached to the manpower training centres. This is necessary for the well-being of the children, and it is necessary to have the mothers safeguarded as students, because no mother worthy of her name as a mother can settle down to do manpower training, or work of any kind, if she does not know where her children are and how they are being protected.

As a second measure, I would urge the establishment of manpower training courses for nursery school helpers. In this connection I do not want to raise any problems about supervisors with the Nursery School Association. The supervisors in nursery schools and child care centres have to be properly trained people, preferably with a university degree. Such courses are provided in Carleton University and in other universities in various parts of the country. I do not quarrel with that. It is something which is essential for nursery school supervisors, but I do not believe it is essential for nursery school helpers.

Nursery school helpers should be comprised of two kinds of people. I believe that women with children, or children who have grown up, older women, who are badly short of income and who need a job, should take courses in being nursery school helpers, and then take jobs as nursery school helpers. Women who have married and who have raised their own families successfully would be very suitable to become nursery school helpers, and such jobs would provide them with an income. They would make up one group.

Then there are the girls who have found that high school does not hold their interest and who drop out after grade 10. I know some people might argue that they would not make good nursery school helpers. But a couple of years ago the United States had a national conference on day care centres, and a number of people occupied in the field of nursery care believed courses in child care should be offered to high school drop-outs, and graduates, in order to increase the supply of child care workers. If, with all the experience that the United States has in this field, it can urge such a step, I think we should experiment with it here in Canada.

There is another excellent reason for urging such a step. We in Canada talk about the need for safeguarding the home. We say the home is being subjected to all kinds of pressures, not the least of which are insufficiently trained young folk who get married without having experience of proper home care. I can think of no better help for young mothers and young families than for the mothers before marriage to become trained as nursery school

assistants under our manpower training program, and to have practical experience in a nursery school.

• (6:50 p.m.)

I believe this would be an excellent idea. I think it would be met with favour by women in all parts of this country. I see no reason why it could not be done. After all, these are the people who will be seeking employment and who will be the future mothers and heads of the many families which are supported by one parent. I should like to suggest that in this country we are a long way from achieving the progress which has been achieved in a number of other countries in this regard. I could mention what is being done in Australia, Switzerland, Sweden, Great Britain and in other countries. They have explored these courses in day care training. I believe this is something which could be done under our manpower training. There is a great shortage in this field.

I should like to return to the Ottawa Welfare Council report. This report refers to three sources of information—the International Labour Office, Public Health Papers, and the World Health Organization. The report quotes as follows:

> Today, for a variety of reasons, the need for child care facilities and services is greater throughout the world than it has ever been in the past. It is increasingly appreciated that such facilities and services are essential not only from the standpoint of child welfare and development but also from that of economic and social development in general.

Then further on we find the following in regard to Ottawa:

> A survey made in 1965 through 17 primary schools' health services (Public and Separate Schools) revealed 1,098 children characterized as having day care needs, and only one child having had the benefit of a day nursery. There were 288 of pre-school age. On both counts the centre of town had the largest concentration of both school age and pre-school age.

It is all very well to ask why we should not put these mothers back into the homes so that they would be able to look after their children. These mothers are away from the homes in order to earn the money which is absolutely necessary for their livelihood. In some cases they are earning the money which is necessary to supplement the family income in the face of rising prices and living costs. It is not a question of whether these mothers shall be placed back in the home or left out. The choice is whether when they are out of their homes the homes will be neglected or whether we will provide the kind of child care training which is necessary if their children are to be provided for. Here is another quotation:

> Statistics for Ottawa produced in 1961 by D.B.S. showed 7,016 working mothers from husband-wife families had 13,325 children 15 and under at home. The D.B.S. estimates that half of these mothers had pre-school age children. Therefore at least 3,500 mothers in Ottawa, working outside their homes, have pre-school children.

If anyone should suggest that a case cannot be made for such woman power training, I should like to say that I do not know where training is more necessary. This training should be an essential part of our manpower training courses at this time. I could go on. Here is another quotation:

> In the metropolitan area in 1961 there were 1,477 children aged 0-5 in one-parent families headed by women. Of these 1,283 children were from the city of Ottawa. There were also 3,889 children between 6 and 14, of whom 2,846 were in Ottawa. It is assumed that whether or not these mothers were working many of them might have needed day care services.
>
> Social agencies doing family counselling recognize the value of day care as a strengthening measure for family life. The facilities are not available no matter how acute the need. As a result families are broken and children suffer unnecessarily.

I should like to appeal to the minister. I believe he has a heart; perhaps it is because, since he has not been on the government bench too long, he has not yet lost it. In any event we in this party believe he has shown in many ways that he has a heart. He has shown this by his views about people being able to enter this country without discrimination and by his views concerning training. It is true that he has fallen down on some things; but who does not fall down occasionally?

I believe a terrific need exists. Half the people of this country are women. Their needs are tremendous because a large percentage of them ultimately have the double burden of having to worry about the family income as well as the well-being of their children. Women should not have to be torn apart through attempting to do two jobs at the same time when they know they are not doing justice to either. No woman can perform both functions adequately without help.

For these reasons and because there is time to bring about changes in respect of the flexibility of the courses since the program is still not law, I would urge the minister to visit my province so that he may learn how the people feel. If he is afraid of the premier, then he could find some place in the province where

he would have an opportunity to speak to the people. He would find a warm reception to the idea of training courses being made available for nursery school personnel, for the older women, and for those young girls who are fresh out of school and who need training in a very real and effective way so that they will be able to perform one of the most important occupations of their lives.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Prince.

Mr. David MacDonald (Prince): Mr. Speaker, in view of the time, I wonder whether I might be permitted to call it seven o'clock rather than get launched into my oratory at this point.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

SITTING SUSPENDED

SITTING RESUMED

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, may I say before we continue with the discussion of the bill before the house, that I believe I am expressing the wishes of the other house leaders when I ask that we continue to sit after ten o'clock tonight and that we meet tomorrow morning at eleven o'clock and sit continuously so that we may conclude this part of the business of the session tomorrow night.

I should also like to add that at some point after ten o'clock we will ask to revert to private bills for the purpose of passing those to which there is no objection.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed that the house sit beyond ten o'clock tonight and that some time after that hour consideration be given to private bills, and that the house sit tomorrow morning at eleven o'clock and carry on continuously during the day?

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, may I make just two comments. Surely the arrangements for tomorrow should not prejudice some agreement to take time off to eat once or twice during the day? Might it not also be appropriate to let hon. members know of the hope that by doing this we might conclude the present session's business some time tomorrow night?

Mr. McIlraith: If the house wishes me to do so I will be very glad to indicate that tomorrow we will try to deal with the adjournments for meals, depending on what progress we are making and on what agreement there is, and that the purpose of asking for the extension of hours is that we could complete the consideration of item 134 on the order paper, interim supply, the motion for concurrence in the adoption of the provisional rules, item 140 on the order paper, and the consideration of several private bills.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there agreement to that?

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, are we to understand that the only matter we will discuss after ten o'clock will be private bills?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, unless we finish the bill that is now before the house. I do not think we should preclude discussion of it for a short time if we are going to finish it.

Mr. Grégoire: Until what time does the house leader suggest we sit tonight?

Mr. McIlraith: I would hope we would adjourn some time before twelve o'clock, depending on the progress made.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is agreed and so ordered.

OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING

PROVISION FOR PAYMENT OF COSTS, AGREEMENTS WITH PROVINCES, ETC.

Ths house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Chrétien (for Mr. Marchand) for the second reading of Bill No. C-278 respecting the occupational training of adults.

Mr. David MacDonald (Prince): Mr. Speaker, as was said this afternoon, this is indeed one of the more important issues that we have faced in this session. One might even be inclined to say that this might be the most important issue in terms of its long range effects for the over-all good of the country. It is for that reason that it should not be passed over lightly, and I think it is somewhat tragic that it should have been dealt with in such a cavalier fashion to date. We are in fact dealing with a matter of great consequence to many millions of our citizens, a matter which affects their very livelihood, and affects their

training and education. Yet, somehow or other, for no explainable reason, this whole matter has been handled in a very confused and misleading way by the government which has almost refused to discuss overtly this important legislation with the very people with whom it hopes to co-operate.

I for one find it difficult to understand why it is that we should be discussing legislation in this chamber under which regulations have already been in force for some 25 days. If this is a foretaste of things to come, then parliament has again been put in the back seat in terms of its involvement and participation in the decision making which affects this country. Not only does it extend to this chamber but it extends to all the ten provinces as well. I remember hearing my own director of vocational training say to me, when he attended a most recent conference on these regulations, with regard to the attitude of the federal agencies, "We were handed the regulations and told these are what will apply; there is very little point in discussing them in terms of any changes that might be made."

We are faced in fact with a strange problem in that, unlike most legislation, the regulations are in force before we have even passed the bill. This gives rise to questions as to what will happen in this place if an amendment is put and accepted; or does the government simply conclude that no amendments shall be accepted, regardless of their validity?

Last night the parliamentary secretary who was acting for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) told us that the explanation for doing this was that the details of such regulations are in fact spelled out in the estimates. I conclude therefore that the details under vote 5 must read as follows:

> Administration, operation and maintenance, including the administration of the manpower mobility regulations and payments in respect of persons who are being afforded occupational training under the adult occupational training program in accordance with regulations approved by the governor in council.

• (8:10 p.m.)

Those few skimpy, paltry words are inadequate enough to deal with these regulations, but I think it is even more reprehensible when we remember that the only way in which these estimates have been handled to date for 1967-68 is through one month's interim supply, which allowed no time, as I recall it, for attention to be paid to the important questions of adult manpower training.

[Mr. MacDonald (Prince).]

The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond (Mr. Prittie) began his remarks this afternoon by talking about co-operative federalism. He said perhaps we had passed out of that era. There have been comments in the press recently to the effect that we have a new wave in this cabinet. Perhaps the era of co-operative federalism is dead, because we have witnessed twice today, I think, a new kind of federalism which can only be described, for want of a better definition, as the Trudeau-Marchand federalism in which we let the experts make all the basic decisions and the people's representatives in parliament act as a great, big 265- person rubber stamp. If that is the kind of federalism we have introduced into this house, I think we should open up that matter for very serious debate both in the house and in public circles. I for one wholeheartedly disagree with that principle and feel it is just one more opportunity for the people's wishes to pass out of their hands into the purview of experts who are installed on some lofty perches unavailable to the people, thus further alienating them in terms of participation in their own democracy.

What are the aspects of this new kind of Trudeau-Marchand federalism? There are at least four or five I can think of. First of all, it is that when you decide to do something, you make sure that you do not consult overtly with the people who will be involved, for fear the conclusions that have already been drawn up with your experts will in some way be immeasurably changed. Second, in order not to disturb things even further, you make sure that the matter is introduced quickly into parliament, by passing any possibility of parliamentary discussion in committee where a thorough examination might be given to these highly important matters. Here we have, for instance, a bill that has not been on the order paper very long. Perhaps I should not use the word "long", since I came into this house at the same time as the minister, but it is somewhat naïve to introduce a resolution on March 3 with the expectation that you will have regulations in force for the new act on April 1.

This does not square with parliamentary practice and tradition as we have known it in the past. Indeed, one can think of bill after bill passed in this house where literally months, and sometimes even years have gone by before regulations have been brought into effect, with no apologies, mind you, from any government. All of a sudden within a matter of days we find our government quite willing

to bring in regulations, put them into effect and then attempt to match up whatever legislation they might like to push through the house.

Further, as I said, this new kind of federalism seems to be of a kind that says you must do things quickly. We must not let people think about them too long either in this house or in public circles. Fourth, it would seem that at the heart of some aspects of this new Trudeau-Marchand federalism there is even the suggestion that we might be making some new definitions with respect to the constitution. May I quote one comment from the minister's remarks on March 3 when he stated in this house:

> The education of youth is a provincial, not a federal responsibility.

This is almost one of those accepted things that does not bear repeating in our country today unless there is some subtle meaning to it, unless we are to draw from that comment some kind of reference or meaning which, in the context of what we are asked to look at in this bill, seems to suggest that education or training for adults will in fact be the responsibility of the federal government. I have not seen these matters dealt with at any federal-provincial conference. I do not recall discussing these matters in the house. I do not even recall lengthy speeches being made on the subject by those who might be enthusiastic about this proposition.

Finally, this new kind of federalism has in it marks of a new kind of government, as implied by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Trudeau) this afternoon, where the experts, whoever they may be, are settling all our constitutional problems and at the appropriate moment they may deliver these good things as manna falling from heaven; so we have almost managed to produce legislation which does not need to be passed by this house because it is already working out nicely, thank you, with regulations that have been in effect for some 25 days. One might even question why the minister should have bothered bringing this matter before the house, if his regulations are working out so effectively. If that is the case, surely there is no need to waste the time of parliament to rubber stamp the machinery of his department.

There is a great deal more to this bill and this whole matter than simply a consideration of the way in which parliament seems very effectively to have been bypassed. There is the substance of the issue that is raised. The minister, and others perhaps speaking for him, have been making great point lately in clearly delineating a difference between training and education. I suppose the thought here is that education applies to a broad subject of cultural values, of one's own awareness of his total well-being and development, whereas training has specific application to a person's employment and his work.

There may come a day, and it perhaps is coming quite rapidly, when we can draw that nice, happy, simple line between these two areas. Perhaps the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen) when he discusses the guaranteed minimum income and its implications will say yea to that sentiment. But the fact of the matter is that today, in 1967, and I think for a number of years to come, the distinction the minister and others make between education and training is not a valid one, because basically whether a person is referring to his own education or his own training, it is by and large directed toward his future, or ongoing employment, and it is employment that concerns us this evening. I think it has been a phony division, to draw a line between training and education, because I do not think it squares with the reality of the situation as it exists today. The minister in his remarks of March 3 said at another point:

> From here on, vocational training ranks with work; it is no longer associated with unemployment or welfare.

I think in those few remarks he was perhaps laying the groundwork which has proved by and large to be unwise. Surely one of the reasons we are considering this bill this evening, one of the reasons the minister has been so anxious to get his regulations into effect, is that we are indeed concerned with the question of unemployment and the problems it has raised, not only the basic fact of unemployment itself but what has been happening to people year after year when they have become almost accustomed to living for a part of the year on unemployment insurance, and the kind of negative effect that has been having on people and their creativity.

If we cannot somehow correlate the question of unemployment and unemployment insurance with the need for training and skilled development we will have an act that surely in many areas will simply not meet the needs of people who should be benefitting under this legislation. Further, the minister said in the same speech in the house on March 3:

> The resolution proposes to extend training services and training allowances to all persons with adult responsibilities who can benefit from training.

There, it seems to me, he has made a very clear-cut statement, that the legislation he is introducing is going to benefit all persons with adult responsibilities who can benefit from training. He goes even further, if the point has not been made clear by then, because he says:

The program will respond directly to the person's need for training—

I emphasize this last part:

—not to his statistical classification.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Now, I think that those are words with which I can wholeheartedly concur. The tragedy of the minister's own words in this regard is that they have been denied in this legislation and in the regulations that he has introduced. I am told, for instance, that in the program we have been operating over the last year, of the many hundreds of people who have been benefited from the initial program of manpower training, as many as two thirds will be ineligible for any kind of major benefit under the program the minister has introduced. This results from the regulations that define an adult. This definition, in itself, is interesting, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure whether this is the first time we have started to define an adult as other than a person who has reached 21 years of age. We now have a new definition of an adult as one who has been out of school for a year. Does this mean that a 12 year old child who has dropped out of school for a year is an adult? Does this mean that a person who is 25 or 26 years of age and is still pursuing training has not yet become an adult? Surely there are a number of anomalies in the definition of an adult as set out in this legislation.

Certainly I find in both the bill and the regulations an inflexibility that is difficult to understand and is almost intolerable. Why should we be anxious and willing to introduce a program which the minister knows, because of the correspondence he has received, will mean that province after province will have to disfranchise many of the people who would benefit from it? Ontario talks about 7,000 students who will immediately be cast aside because of the specifics that the federal government feels should be honoured by provinces like Ontario. In Prince Edward Island, where perhaps only 500 students are directly involved in this program, at least 300 will be set aside because of the inflexibility of these regulations.

Even stranger is the effect this program may have on another aspect of the minister's own department. We are told, for instance, that immigrants coming into the country will be regarded the same as Canadian citizens, for inclusion in this program, if they have been on the labour market for three years, I believe, without dependants, or one year with dependants. They will then be automatically acceptable to this program for job retraining and skill development.

I should like to ask the minister this question. In many European countries, as he well knows, young boys—and they are boys—of 14 go on the labour market because their formal education ends at an earlier period. It is more than conceivable that many young men of 17 or 18 will come to this country as immigrants and will be immediately available for this kind of training, while many young people in this country who have become drop-outs, who have not been able to cope with academic problems, who are of the same age and apparently have the same qualifications, will have to wait for as much as three years before they can acquire the same benefits that are being made available to those who come to reside in this country. Here is one case where we have a reversal of the pattern. We are quite willing to be fairer to those who come to Canada than to those who are native citizens.

Further, I for one am quite depressed by the fact the minister has announced that as of April 1, I believe, the encouragement and activities that have gone on in his department to further training at the secondary school level will be abandoned, by reason of the rather paradoxical suggestion at this late date that it is not, after all, his constitutional responsibility. One could well raise the question of why the department entered into it in the first place, if it has now concluded it is no longer its constitutional responsibility. I wonder when we shall have an opportunity, in fact, to discuss the constitutional responsibility exercised by the department of manpower.

There is another strange paradox in this bill and in these regulations, because we are told that further money will be made available for capital grants. I believe this will mean a further, final allotment of some $4.5 million to Prince Edward Island. This amount is more than twice the required amount to construct further schools in Prince Edward Island, which in many cases will not be needed in view of the facilities that have already been established there. The failing is, I think, that we will make money available for further capital resources, whether or not they will be needed, and yet we are withdrawing from

some areas where it is vitally needed the assistance for operating expenses to carry on this important program.

Certainly, to the province of Prince Edward Island, which has a very slim tax base, this is a great set-back for its future vocational training program, to realize that there are many millions of dollars set aside for capital resources which will not be constructed, when the kind of assistance that is needed is operating grants. These operating grants cannot be made available because of the inflexibility that has been introduced into this program. I believe that in view of the necessity for academic training, we have been talking about giving certain upgrading courses to those who wish to improve their arithmetic and English in grade 9 and 10. Is the minister actually being realistic when he thinks that those who enter the labour market in the next five or ten years, even with some kind of skilled training and with partial grade 9 or 10, are going to find ready employment on the labour market? I believe he is not. I believe that shortly we will be faced with passing further legislation to deal with this short-sighted situation.

In addition, I believe we have tackled only one area of the necessity for manpower training. Surely it is an important thing, as we have been told in this house and will be told again, to provide the kind of opportunities we will provide for those who are now in the labour market, in terms of removing themselves from the labour market for a year, or perhaps two. However, I am concerned to see a program developed that will assist those who may not have to leave completely their specific job, but who could make use of night training or week end courses which would augment their present information and expertise. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we should be introducing that kind of flexibility in our program if it is going to meet the varied needs of the different skills and occupations across this country.

Further, we are told that the federal government is going to be able, under this new bill, to lend money to the provincial governments which they may use to erect various structures. Then, over a period of 30 years, the money will be repaid through yearly grants. This is a new, strange and complex way of financing, and it introduces some questions which have perhaps never been raised before. I would think the 30 year plan of rental and loan is based on the assumption that we will be operating, by and large, under this kind of legislation for the next 30 years.

Surely the minister knows that he is involved in one of the most dynamically changing aspects of society, man and his work. We can barely predict what kind of employment opportunities, what kind of skills will be needed five years from now; yet we are going to commit the provinces to a 30 year ownership of facilities. What kind of planning is that? Some governments, I do not know whether it will be provincial or federal, will be stuck with millions of dollars worth of hardware that will be out of date and obsolescent.

Earlier the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond (Mr. Prittie), in commenting on the need for more co-ordination, mentioned the fact we should very carefully examine how this program will relate to such a program as ARDA. I believe that is very wise advice indeed. I am struck again and again with the way in which government departments seem to operate, in many instances, in isolated ghettos. They have no real idea of the sort of thing that may be happening in other departments or how they could effectively harmonize with one another.

An even more important aspect of the ARDA program that should be considered is found in the Rural Economic Development program, or FRED as it is euphemistically called and which will, in fact, be involved in a major transformation of areas of great economic necessity. However, there has been no recognition that I have been able to discover of that fact in the bill or the regulations before us.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important when we deal with this legislation that we be given some assurance that in making provision for many aspects of this manpower training program, provision will be made also for giving assistance to the provinces in connection with the administration of this program. In larger provinces this may not be any great problem, for I know their vocational training divisions and departments have many officers, a great many provincial experts and the opportunity effectively to administer this kind of program.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Yet it is true, Mr. Speaker, that although you establish a program which may work effectively in a large province like Ontario, Quebec or British Columbia, when you come to a relatively poorer province like Prince Edward Island the administrative cost can be

an overwhelming burden and can well prevent a great deal of the program from becoming operative. Therefore I hope that the minister during the course of this debate will assure us that some recognition will be given to the problem of administrative cost in small and economically deprived provinces like Prince Edward Island.

In summary, let me simply say that I think this legislation is too important to be slipped through quickly, simply following the regulations which have already come into effect. I think it is important that we recognize that this is a matter of great national consequence. If the opportunity does not present itself tonight or within the next day or so to discuss the question of education, training and the responsibilities of federal and provincial government, then we must be given that opportunity soon. It is not enough to slip through some regulations and to bring in a bill without giving any consideration to the kind of precedents that we are setting or policies that we are following. We should not establish a whole new trend in federal-provincial relations without considering where we are going and when we hope to arrive.

It is also a little disturbing to realize that despite what I think the government would admit is its considerable inexperience in the field of education the government at Ottawa has been willing in this instance to make unilateral decisions with very little opportunity for consultation or creative discussion with the various provincial representatives.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, from meeting with other members the secret of this program, it seems to me, is found in its flexibility; and even the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) has talked about this recently. If we try to lay down hard and fast guide lines in Ottawa to accommodate ten provinces which are vastly different in their capabilities, we will introduce and pass a law here which will be a very sad thing indeed for many of the provinces. The minister's colleague in this house, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Trudeau), remarked shortly after his appointment that he had not been in the cabinet long enough to change his mind. I trust that the minister of manpower has been in the cabinet long enough to change his mind. I do not think it is a sign of weakness not to be able to change one's mind. I think it shows right thinking. I think it shows a willingness to grapple with the issues as they present themselves and to pass the best legislation possible.

[Mr. MacDonald (Prince).]

Mr. Jack Davis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the minister, who is a relatively new member of this house, for the impact he has had on the House of Commons in the short time he has been here, for the impact he has had on a new department and, more particularly, for the influence he has had on federal-provincial relations in this country. I think that that influence has been all to the good. He is now the minister responsible for manpower, one might even say the minister responsible for opportunities, certainly those opportunities that are open to adults in this country.

If we have anything in Canada, we have resources. We also have a lot of machines. We are told by the Economic Council of Canada that we have more machines per capita, certainly per employee, than any other country in the world, including the United States. We seem to have markets for many of our products but we are short of manpower. We have only 20 million people on a large half continent, and it is the way that we husband these human resources which will determine our economic progress in the months and years ahead.

Ours is a new country, Mr. Speaker. It is a country of great opportunity in terms of resources, in terms of new industries, in terms of occupations. In order to take full advantage of these new resources, industries and occupations our labour force has to be mobile. To be mobile it has to be educated. It has to develop new skills and through these new skills earn the greater returns that come to labour from these new endeavours. Canada must have policies which encourage education, and encourage mobility; and these are the type of policies which the present minister of manpower has been introducing.

Compartmentalization, in other words, is not for us. It cannot be the policy followed in a relatively young country like Canada. Compartmentalization in many areas means that we are not taking full advantage of those opportunities that are open to us. Compartmentalization can take many forms. It can be compartmentalization in respect to occupation; it can be compartmentalization in respect to the industry in which one is working; and in this country particularly it can be compartmentalization in the sense of being rooted to one locality or region. It means not being mobile enough to move to other areas where productivity is higher, where wages

are better and where the profitability of industry is on the increase.

Programs such as those incorporated by this bill lead toward this greater flexibility, this opportunity through education for our adult population. This program must be seen, of course, in conjunction with the manpower mobility program; but the two in harness provide us with an opportunity to make the best of our scarcest resource, which is manpower. We have the markets, we have the machines and often we have the money, but rarely do we have the manpower. Certainly we are short of skilled manpower.

I made reference at the outset of my remarks to federal-provincial relations. This area of education is always touchy because the British North America Act provides that education is a matter exclusively for the provinces. But education, I contend, as defined in the year 1867, is education of the very young, not of the adult, the mature Canadian, the person who, having come of age, should decide where he works, what his vocation is, and in what part of the country he resides. This is one of the reasons I welcome a rough division or breakdown in responsibilities in respect to education: education of the very young remaining the responsibility of the provinces; education, the training and opening up of opportunities for adults being a matter for the nation.

There are various definitions of the word "nation". They are areas in the world in which there is free trade in commodities—goods and services. They are areas through which there is free movement of capital. They are also areas through which the people of the countries concerned can move without serious impediment. We have seen a great improvement in manpower mobility in this country in recent years. The decline in unemployment in itself has helped people to move. The Canada Pension Plan and other measures to integrate welfare legislation provincially across the country have helped to make it easier for people to uproot themselves from one occupation, from one industry, and from one area often with a relatively low wage rate, to others which are more productive, whose industries pay more and where opportunities for one to make full use of his talents are greater, and more satisfying.

We have had through the National Employment Service and we now have through the manpower service centres the provision of information for people who cannot be expected by themselves to know where the best job opportunities are located across the country. The role of the manpower centres in explaining to the public and certainly to the labour force where these new opportunities lie is a crucial one.

• (8:40 p.m.)

It is a very difficult role to play, and the Economic Council of Canada itself is providing some guidance in this respect. The provincial economic councils can supplement this information, but the manpower centres will have to be very ingenuous and work closely with industry if they are to determine precisely what skills are required five or ten years in the future and where these sources of employment are, these opportunities to upgrade one's skill, these opportunities to satisfy the drives and ambitions of our people to better themselves, their families and their communities.

We have problems in this country, problems of adjustment between growth industries and industries which have either begun to level off or to decline. We must enable our manpower to shift itself as between these dying industries and the more dynamic industries which have growth opportunities. If these industries, the growth industries and the dying industries, were to be found side by side this would be easier; but in Canada, a country of vast distances, we have the problem of our five major geographic regions; and within those regions we have areas which have been designated as areas of slow growth, with other areas having greater opportunities.

The Economic Council has done a reasonable job in describing what has been happening in Canada, and the picture is not encouraging. Roughly, it is this: For the last 40 years, the years for which the Economic Council can find statistics, the relative income levels as between one part of the country and another have remained unchanged. The Atlantic region, in per capita income terms, has been 25 per cent below the national average since the early 1920's, so far as the Economic Council can determine Ontario and British Columbia, in per capita income terms, have run 25 per cent above the national average. In other words, we have areas which pay more and have been paying more than some other areas, and we have areas which have greater employment opportunities and less unemployment than other areas.

In pure economics one would expect a shift of people from the low income areas to the high income areas; and indeed that is what has slowly been happening in this country. However, despite the selective and specific policies introduced by successive governments, the margin between the Atlantic region and Ontario, or between Quebec and British Columbia has not changed very much. The situation has been described by the Economic Council in a series of charts which show parallel lines running up across the page. These parallel lines stand in strong contrast to those shown for the United States, where the differences of income between regions have been narrowing. We need to know more about why in the United States the income levels as between the deep south and the industrial north have been converging, and why the differences between the Atlantic seaboard and the United States west coast have been disappearing. Why have these regional differences been disappearing in the United States, and why have they been so persistent in Canada?

I might question whether some of our policies have been effective or well advised. Today we are in much better shape than we were in four or five years ago. We had to introduce special policies four or five years ago to employ people; to employ people, first, was all important. Now it is becoming increasingly important to make that employment more productive and efficient.

People should be moving out of the declining industries, out of the relatively static industries, into the growth industries of this country. That is the sort of function the national manpower centres must perform. They can perform this function, as I say, by advising people who want to better themselves, who want to know where new skills are required, what those skills are and where the growing opportunities are for those skills and occupations. They want to know the industries and the areas of the country where those skills are required. Knowing that, they can become more productive. It is that sort of opportunity that Bill No. C-278 describes—the opportunity whereby people can take time off from their jobs, at a moderate wage rate so to speak, and be retrained with an eye on a job that improves their prospects in the years ahead.

It is interesting to note that the differences in income across Canada which are so marked roughly parallel the differences in the education of the people. British Columbia has the highest educational standard in Canada in terms of number of years at school, and it pays the highest wage rates. Ontario is close to British Columbia. As I said before, the average per capita incomes in British Columbia and Ontario are almost the same. Quebec's average is a bit below the national average, being 25 per cent below Ontario and British Columbia. It is below Alberta and below Saskatchewan. The Atlantic provinces are lower again.

I suggest that the inevitable result of programs of this kind is to enable people to move to those industries and those areas with the highest rate of growth. People will also move toward the bigger communities, the bigger cities and towns; they will tend to move west as they have done in the United States. The centre of gravity of the population has been moving westward year after year. That movement is inevitable because greater opportunities lie in the west at the present time.

We need manpower centres; we need assistance for the retraining of adults to bring about this great improvement in productivity and to make our people more mobile. There is great talk, especially in Europe and on other continents, of free trade areas and common markets. The mobility of people on the European continent today is much greater than it was five or ten years ago, and ten years from now that mobility will be greater again. People will be freer to move in those new viable, vigorous expanding economies. You will also find the more productive industries in those great free trade areas.

Canada, by degrees I am sure, will enter into freer trading arrangements with other countries. It may also enter into special arrangements, industrial arrangements from time to time, with the United States.

What this increased competition means is change; and what change means is that production lines will be retooled, new plants will be built, some industries will go to the wall and others will take their place. This means that people must be told where the growth industries are, what the growth opportunities for their occupations are, and what they should be readying themselves for in the future. They must be told of the jobs which are most rewarding in so far as their own talents are concerned.

I do not think we can afford compartmentalization in this country either in terms of regional economics or provincial economics. We must not have a compartmentalization of industries, with some industries being favoured unduly over the taxpayers' expense;

nor must we have favouritism of other kinds which will unduly segment our country and reduce the opportunities to Canadians which would otherwise be theirs.

• (8:50 p.m.)

I will say this to the minister: The hon. gentleman has, through this bill, given us legislation which will make this country more viable and which will make it a better place for Canadians to live in. He has broadly staked out an area, one which I call training, which is truly federal. It will help to increase mobility within the totality of Canada. It will afford an opportunity for self-improvement to all Canadians, regardless of where they live or what work they are doing today. The bill itself is well drawn up and I find no fault with the provision by which young people must have left school for at least three years before they can take advantage of this program. I do not find fault with the provision that those who are married and have dependants should receive special preference in this regard.

There is one clause which worries me a little; it is on the lines of a clause which creeps into a good deal of our legislation, and it has to do with rates of pay for those who are being retrained. In effect these rates are tied to the national average for all Canada as published by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

Under this system people in the higher income areas will not find the level of pay as attractive as those in the lower income areas. Perhaps this will serve as a bonus or incentive to those in the lower wage areas to look for new jobs, to upgrade their skills and join the trend of the future. Perhaps we shall have to live with a national norm, but with this exception I am all in favour of the legislation before us. It is a useful bill tending to bind this country more closely together and make it more productive. By staking out clearly an area of federal responsibility and knitting it in carefully with provincial responsibilities and commitments in the field of education the Minister of Manpower and Immigration has gone a long way toward making this country a better country in which to live.

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words about Bill C-278 because I consider that the training of our labour force is an extremely important matter, and its solution the key to our economic situation and to the well-being of our labour force.

I do not intend to deal minutely with the provisions of this bill because a great deal of criticism has already been expressed with regard to the arbitrary manner in which the regulations were set forth prior to the passing of the legislation before us. Then again, some of my hon. friends have drawn attention to the almost violent criticism which has been forthcoming from the provinces, whose administrators are far better versed in the educational and training aspects of these proposals than anyone in the federal government. Since my hon. friends have dealt with many of the particular aspects of this matter, and its shortcomings, I intend to deal in general terms with the subject of training as a whole.

The opportunities for labour were excellent, I must say, in the field of education and training generally under the legislation introduced and expanded during our term of office, from 1960 onward. The present minister has accepted these policies and is carrying them on. In some areas he has made changes, and the effect of certain of these changes appears to be detrimental rather than an improvement of the work which was started and accelerated during our term of office.

It is well, on occasions, to discard one's modesty and to tell the history of certain things which have taken place. I intend to do this by discarding my modesty tonight —something I seldom do in this house—so as to remind hon. members of what was done during our administration with respect to the training and retraining of the labour force. In 1959 and 1960, after a careful survey had been made of the economic situation which had been left with us when we took office, it was found by the economists that only 30 per of all the jobs available in Canada called for unskilled labour. This was an alarming situation because many of those in our labour force were not equipped with the skills which had become necessary as a result of technological change and automation.

Moreover, it was predicted that 30 per cent of the unskilled jobs available would diminish year after year as progress was made in the field of technological change. Something had to be done, and in consultation with the provinces where jurisdiction over education properly lies we took this matter up. We were told that the provinces were prepared to undertake a program of retraining, provided they could acquire facilities which they did not then possess.

In order to make those facilities available, a bill was introduced in this house in

November of 1960. This bill provided for the participation by the federal government in the capital cost of construction of technical and vocational schools and additions thereto to the extent of 75 per cent of the cost. The provinces signed agreements in June of 1961, with the exception of Quebec, which entered the scheme some months later and then signed a similar agreement.

What is the result of this program? I want to say that this was one of the most massive programs of school building ever undertaken in the history of the country. From that period until the present day, or within six months of the present day, more than 800 new technical schools, vocational schools and additions were constructed across this country at a cost of some $1,200 millions. The federal contribution was close to 700 million.

The important thing is that these measures provided space for more than 300,000 students each and every year. This enabled the young people in our population to acquire the trades and skills which were needed because of the advances in technology and education. The program put in operation at that time was about ten years overdue. It was necessary to embark on a crash program in order to catch up with the needs. We were criticized in those years by people who said these schools would be empty. The fact is that immediately after their construction all of them were filled to capacity. And almost every one of them has a waiting list at this very moment.

• (9:00 p.m.)

The program did something else. It relieved the municipal taxpayers from the cost of the construction of these schools. When we realize that the cost of education to provinces and municipalities is now so heavy that in many instances 67 cents out of every tax dollar is spent on education, we can see that this program indeed greatly lessened the burden on the municipal taxpayer. I venture to say that instead of phasing out the program, as this government has done, it should have accelerated it because the need is going to grow each and every year. We will be faced with a crisis very shortly, within one or two years, and we shall have to re-enter this field in order to help the provinces and municipalities with the construction of schools.

I will even go further and say that the cost of education is now so great to the taxpayer at the local level that the time will shortly come when the federal government will have to participate, to the extent of 75 per cent, in meeting the cost of construction of all schools in Canada because the provinces and municipalities are unable to continue carrying the burden.

A few moments ago Prince Edward Island was mentioned. It has two schools, one at Summerside and the other at Charlottetown. These facilities have provided an opportunity for young people of P.E.I. to acquire new trades and skills, and every student graduating from these schools has a job awaiting. In fact the schools are filled to capacity. If that province could afford to pay 25 per cent of the cost of constructing another new school it would go right ahead and do so. It has a credit of some $4½ million, but this credit will not apply for the construction of the facilities of the type required for the training specified in this bill.

This bill says that the province must provide its own facilities with its own money, and in certain instances the federal government will pay a living allowance to those people who participate in retraining. Further, if the province does not have sufficient money to provide the facilities, it can borrow the capital from the federal government and repay it over a period of 30 years. The minister can correct me if I am wrong, but I also understand the province cannot apply the cost of the facilities it provides under this bill against the credit it now has as a result of the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act.

This bill sounds the death knell for the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act, and I do not think that the federal government is being fair to many of the provinces which are presently not able financially to carry out responsibilities as provided for them under the terms of this bill. If I am right in my reading of the bill, the federal government will pay subsistence to those taking training, and the provincial governments will provide the facilities. But if the persons taking training do not qualify under the regulations set out by the federal government, then the provincial governments must in fact pay their subsistence in addition to the cost of the facilities. As a result many of the provinces, like P.E.I., will not be able to provide more opportunity for their residents to train themselves and thus make a better living.

When we launched the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act in 1961 we were ten years behind in providing for technical assistance in Canada. This bill will throw us back another ten years, because of lack of participation by the federal government. It is

a great mistake, Mr. Speaker. The program under the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act should have been carried on and accelerated over the years because the important thing is that the facilities must be provided before training can be provided.

When we were in government we prepared a bill, separate from the technical assistance bill, to provide on-the-job training for those displaced by technological change and automation in industry. Unfortunately that bill was still on the order paper when we were turned out of office in 1963, and now the present government is sneaking in similar provisions under clause 6 of this bill. This is a move forward, but I believe the minister should call a conference of labour and management to get their ideas as to what type of regulations should be drafted. The co-operation of labour and management is needed, as well as co-operation between the provinces and the federal government.

This should not be a hard and fast piece of legislation; it should be flexible. However, the regulations that have been put into effect prior to the passing of the bill have provoked an outcry from provincial governments. In my opinion the provinces, with their experience, should know whether this bill will work or not, and since there has been an outcry from some of them I believe their representations should be heard, because education and training rightly fall under their jurisdiction. Why was no conference called prior to the issuing and the putting into effect of the regulations?

I read a newspaper report recently which said:

> Ontario education minister William Davis wrote Mr. Marchand expressing concern over the apparently arbitrary manner in which Ottawa was determined to lay down its new act. Mr. Davis warned that if chaos were to be avoided, a high-level meeting should be convened without delay.

That report appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of Saturday, April 22. In the Ontario legislature last Thursday Mr. Davis again requested a meeting with the federal minister, and later said he was sure a solution could be found to the crisis. However, I have yet to read that the federal minister has paid any heed to this warning or that he is prepared to call such a meeting to be attended by the provincial ministers of education.

Why has there been no conference? Why has this bill been put forward in such an arbitrary way, without the knowledge of the provinces and without their participation in any talks prior to the issuance of the regulations? Where is all this co-operative federalism that the government has been talking about for so long? I know the minister believed in co-operative federalism, but something has happened and now we see this bill being pushed through with no evidence of co-operative federalism. Why has the minister taken this autocratic attitude? Why is he putting it to the provinces on the basis of "take it or leave it"?

In the light of this, and in view of the apprehension that has been expressed since the regulations were issued, the minister should seriously consider withholding this bill. After all, he now has his regulations, and the bill is given to us 25 days after the regulations were issued. Is it not time to call a conference of educational ministers and try to smooth out some of their apprehensions? It might even be possible to amend some of the regulations, showing co-operative federalism at work and satisfying everyone who has to work under the regulations.

In addition to the provincial ministers of education the Indian population is irked by this bill. According to a report in the Montreal *Star* of today's date:

> The Indian-Eskimo Association of Canada is worried that Canada's new manpower training law will deprive thousands of unemployed and underemployed Indians of job training.

• (9:10 p.m.)

The report goes on to say:

> Mr. O'Connell said that more than one-half of the Indians are unemployed and many never entered the labour force. A recent survey showed that 61 per cent of a large sample group of breadwinners work less than six months a year.
>
> He said large numbers of Indian children drop out of school before the age of 16.

How are they to qualify under the regulations? This is one more reason that the government should hold up this bill, have this conference, and iron out many of the things which are brought to our attention. As members of this House of Commons I believe it is our duty to point out these things to the minister, in case they have not as yet been brought to his attention. Another question which arises in my mind is what happens to the youngster who has been out of school for one year and has not put in three years in the labour force. This youngster will be given no benefits under the plan unless the provinces are prepared to pay his subsistence. The federal government does not intend to do this. In this regard additional costs are being added

to the already overburdened provinces because of the high cost of education.

Unless this type of young person receives aid in the amount of 100 per cent from the provinces he never will be able to obtain the training which will be necessary in order to find employment or place himself in the labour force. He will never qualify. Yesterday the parliamentary secretary quoted some extracts from the minister's speech. I find these at page 15263 of *Hansard* of April 24. In quoting the minister he said:

> These facts were made public in October at the last federal-provincial conference. It was made clear that there was nothing to prevent any province from offering allowances to younger people without dependants, if it so wishes.

In other words, he is saying to the provinces: "Look, if these people do not qualify under our regulations, you can do what you like with them; it is your baby. Part of it is our responsibility and part of it is your responsibility." This, in effect, divides the labour force. It is the same as saying that these people will be responsible to the province for their training and that others who do qualify under the federal regulations will be a federal responsibility. This is something which has never been done before.

Under all previous training programs everybody came under the one act. Why is a distinction being made in this case? Why is it said that part of the labour force will come under provincial jurisdiction so far as training is concerned and that part of it will come under federal jurisdiction? I should like to quote the minister again:

> The new program will train at least as many workers as the former program did.

If the idea is to launch something which is new and revolutionary, I would think it would be suggested that it would at least double the number who will be trained or who will wish to be trained, because we are to provide the facilities. The quotation continues:

> The federal government is providing larger funds—

I suppose he means by that that they are providing a larger amount of money to pay for the subsistence of those who are taking training. Evidently it does not mean anything else, because he goes on to say:

> —as the provinces provide more facilities.

In other words, they are saying they will not pay the subsistence for these people unless the provinces provide the facilities.

[Mr. Starr.]

Then, if the provinces cannot afford to provide the facilities, it will not cost the federal government a nickel, because no one will be trained. That is what it amounts to.

In view of all these matters which I have brought to the attention of the minister, in view of those which have been brought to his attention by the former speakers, and in view of the inequities which appear in this bill I can come to one conclusion only and that is that the provinces cannot afford the cost of their participation in this retraining program, and therefore that I do not believe it will be successful.

There is, therefore, only one alternative, and that is to hold up this bill and immediately hold a conference with the ministers and others who will be directly concerned with this retraining in the provinces, to see how these regulations might be improved to the advantage of everybody concerned. Let us have practical co-operative federalism as it should be practised, and not this arbitrary attitude which we find at the present time in putting forward this training bill.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, before we reach the clause by clause examination of this bill I hope the minister will take the time which may be necessary to answer some questions which have been disturbing many of us who are participating in this debate. It seems more things have been unsaid concerning this bill than have been said by its supporters.

Perhaps it is easy to see the type of problems the minister has set out to correct. We have pointed out that the federal government should take greater initiative in the field of manpower programs. We have suggested that the shared cost arrangement leaves considerable discretion with the provinces. Those provinces which have the resources are able to participate, and those which do not have the resources are unable fully to avail themselves of the training. The fact that the federal government is prepared to play its full part in this particular regard is a very hopeful sign. However when, after accepting its full share, it acts in a way which antagonizes the best friends of this program, then we must seriously question the methods it has used.

When a vast group of persons who need training desperately—some people have calculated that the number is at least 200,000 young people of this country—is eliminated because of the attempt to cover the whole cost of the program, then I believe we need some answers to explain this type of attitude.

In the past we have pointed out that the allowances were inadequate. An attempt has been made now to correct these so that they are more realistic and will enable people to carry on with their training. However, while the minister is handing out better allowances with the one hand to some groups, he is taking everything away from another group. Where is the sense in this type of approach?

Surely, while we welcome the increased allowances, we must deplore the fact that the minister has practically eliminated an entire group of people from this program. This program has been enlarged to include those who are employed as well as those who are unemployed. Again I believe this is a forward step, a good step, which will lead to an all encompassing manpower program for the future. But the provisions which I criticized before in respect of those who are absent from school, those who have been employed for three years and those who have no dependants, is a retrograde step and certainly is not one which will help our manpower policy at all.

This particular group is the most sensitive one in our society; it is the group which needs the most encouragement; it is the group which, in social terms, will cost us untold amounts and cause us untold heartache unless we do something to provide those in the group with training and opportunities.

• (9:20 p.m.)

There does not seem to be any understanding of this kind of problem. When we try to understand the thinking of the minister in this regard we find ourselves unable to do so. Has he done this because he wanted to establish clearly what is under federal and what is under provincial jurisdiction? Did he try to draw a clean line by saying, "If you are in the work force for three years, then you are the federal government's responsibility; otherwise you are the provincial government's responsibility and the province will have to look after you"? Is there a big power play going on between the federal and provincial governments? Do we have two bulls butting at each other to see who gets hurt first? I hope the people who need retraining are not in the middle or else they will get crushed. I hope the minister will examine this bill and make the kind of changes that I think are necessary in it. I wonder sometimes whether the minister was frightened by his own liberalism when he said, "We are going to increase the allowances, and this will cost some money. Let us get rid of a whole bunch of people, let us chuck them right out of the program so it will not cost us that much money; then we will only have to pay a relatively small amount." I hope this was not his thinking.

I hope the time has come when the importance of manpower is recognized to the extent that the government will be prepared to allocate resources to this purpose, because we can all agree that any money spent in this area will be amply repaid to the nation in terms of increased productivity which will be created in that regard. It is particularly disturbing when we read in the papers about the concern of the educators who have participated in this program from the very beginning, people who have been dedicated to doing this kind of work. I should like to read from the Kitchener-Waterloo *Record* of April 20 in which an article appeared concerning an interview with Mr. Charles Rushton who is the head of the adult education centre in Waterloo. He is quoted as having said the following:

> Changes in the federal Adult Occupational Training Act may close the door to at least a third of the more than 800 who have been taking retraining courses at the adult education centre in Waterloo.
>
> The changes will alter the entire philosophy of the program.
>
> The young school drop-outs, housewives, recent widows and all those people who have not had three years in the labour force will be rejected.

I made a number of calls tonight to see whether I could get some information on how this affects people. I did not want statistics; I wanted to know how it affects these people in particular—not abstractions. For example let us take widows. There are many widows registered in these courses. They are without dependants, and many of them have not been in the work force. They cannot possibly benefit from the provisions of this act. Surely the minister must come up with some kind of answer as to how he will deal with this particular problem. There are housewives who have to go out to work because their husbands are ill or because they have family problems of one kind or another. If they have not been members of the work force, they also do not qualify under the provisions of this act. Does the minister really feel that he is promoting the manpower retraining program when he excludes people of this type, because of the rigidity of the provisions as set out in the bill?

Mr. Rushton went on to say:

> This seriously retards all the rehabilitative aspects of the retraining program that we have built up in the Kitchener-Waterloo area.
>
> Counselling testing review work and personalizing the day-to-day time table of the adult are all major factors if the trainee is to be successful in his course.

I understand that as things are at present the manpower centre officers do not have the necessary experience for this kind of work. This is not to say they will not acquire it in time. I understand there are some very able and capable people in the service. However, right now they do not have the experience, and yet people who have it are not being consulted. The program has been taken out of their hands. They were told: "Look buddy, thanks for the work you have done. We do not need you any more. You will do exactly as we say, regardless of whether you are more or less qualified than you have been in the past." I do not think this is the kind of program we want to run. I do not think we are really helping by doing this sort of thing.

Farther on in the article Mr. Rushton is quoted as saying:

> We are still optimistic that once the minister of manpower is made aware of the numerous fallacies in the act they will be corrected before it becomes law.

This is what we want the minister to do. We want him either to give us a reasonable explanation for his position or to make some corrections which will satisfy the objections we have raised.

I know that in the past it has been said that when people are close to the completion of their school education they will abuse this system. I can assure the house that I have studied the program five courses very carefully and have found that the number of people in that program who have behaved in this way has been infinitesimal. I think this danger is more in people's minds than it is a fact, and it is a danger of such insignificance that it would not warrant the setting up of provisions to prevent it. There are people who have gone back to program five only because they were able to obtain some assistance while they were taking the course.

I should like to read from the Kitchener-Waterloo *Record* of February 8, 1966. Mr. Rushton was asked how many of his pupils had difficulties, to which he answered that more than 70 per cent of the students have serious financial and social problems, along with a lack of educatiin or skills. This means that even if a few pupils drop out of school for a year or a lesser period in order to take the retraining course, they would not have been drawn out of school because most probably they would have dropped out of school anyway. Many of these drop-outs have to leave school for financial reasons. What is wrong with getting them back to school and offering them some financial inducements to do so?

If the minister feels that the three year requirement is necessary, then I think he should consider another program for those who have not been in the work force for three years. I think he should consider superimposing the program he is now advocating with the program we had before and thus establishing one which would be more satisfactory than the one proposed under this bill.

The editorial in the *Globe and Mail* issue of April 19, 1967 quotes Lieutenant Poulton of the Salvation Army as saying:

> A bill before parliament threatens to wreck the rehabilitation plans of many of those youngsters. ... The bill would cut off training privileges and allowances for about 80 per cent of the teen-agers and young men enrolled in the Salvation Army's House of Concord program in Toronto.

This has been an excellent program. Its objectives were to provide a home for youths who manifest a need for more intensive supervision and closer control than is normally given in a community. It operates in conjunction with the magistrate's court.

Mr. Marchand: Who told the hon. member that this program will be ended?

Mr. Saltsman: I am reading from the *Globe and Mail* which quoted Lieutenant Colonel W. C. Poulton. If the minister wishes to rise later on and give us an assurance that this program will not be ended or that the fears of Lieutenant Poulton are unfounded when he says that 80 per cent of the teen-agers and young men enrolled in the Salvation Army's House of Concord program will not be eligible, then I will be most delighted to hear him say it.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. Marchand: So be delighted.

Mr. Saltsman: Be my guest. In short, Mr. Speaker, I think that before going into the clause by clause examination of this bill the minister should rise and explain the various provisions, discuss the objections that have been raised, give us his reasons why the bill has been introduced in this particular form

and why it has met wih such antagonism from those who have been working in the program. We feel we are entitled to this kind of explanation and certainly it is incumbent upon the minister to make it.

Mr. J. E. Pascoe (Moose Jaw-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments to make on Bill No. C-278 but I shall be very brief so that the minister can deal with some of the problems we have raised. I can be brief because of the good points brought out by other members of my party, especially the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr). I share with him apprehension with regard to the possible curtailment of the program under the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act which was brought into effect in 1960, as the hon. member said, by the government in which he was minister of labour. The hon. member said he feared that Bill No. C-278 would sound the death knell of this technical and vocational training plan. I hope that is not correct, and I think we should take every step possible to see that it does not happen.

I agree that there is a need for adult training or retraining in this period of great technological and economic change. As the parliamentary secretary to the minister stated, retraining people whose jobs are disappearing is only part of the task. We must also train the adults who earlier were not able to get the training that is needed today. As did the hon. member for Gaspe (Mr. Keays) who spoke earlier, I object to the suggestion from the government side that our debate and study of the unification of the armed forces delayed consideration of other government bills. As the record shows, we proposed that the unification bill be set aside so that the house could consider more important legislation. The decision to go ahead with the unification bill was entirely the decision of the government. As has been said many times, the government sets the pace of parliament by the order in which legislation is introduced. I agree with the hon. member for Ontario that this bill should be delayed, but apparently the government will try to push it through before it is completely studied, as it has with respect to other bills.

I have said on other occasions that I regret that the government is phasing out, under a program announced recently, the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act. Under the operations of Bill C-278 we must make sure that the excellent results being obtained by the technical institutes built under the program brought in by the previous government are continued. If I may speak in a local vein for a moment, Mr. Speaker, there is a very fine technical institute in my home city of Moose Jaw. It has all the modern training facilities, the teaching staff is highly qualified and there is room for expansion at very little cost as compared with constructing new buildings. I point this out to emphasize that to obtain the best results Bill No. C-278 should be fitted in with the facilities of the technical institutes now established.

Under this bill the federal government proposes to pay for adult training. I suggest that the government should make sure that the money to be spent on this training is used in the best way possible. In my view this can be done by the closest possible co-operation between the local Canada Manpower Centre and the technical institute. There must be teamwork between the manpower counselling service and the technical institute. As the hon. member for Prince (Mr. MacDonald) pointed out a short while ago, the government is offering loans to the provinces to erect new buildings, with the loan repayment being made over 30 years. I suggest that a much better way would be to add to the facilities of the present institutes and work them into this program.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I am cutting these remarks short. I shall probably have more to say on this matter in committee when the bill is studied clause by clause. I have just one more brief observation to make. It is in regard to this statement made by the parliamentary secretary, as reported in *Hansard* on page 15259:

> Since 1949, for instance, over half a million farmers have left Canadian agriculture.

This was a very casual and off-hand comment by the parliamentary secretary with regard to a very serious problem facing agriculture. It is a comment that cannot be accepted so casually. We have pressed the government, and shall continue to do so, for more effective solutions to farm problems than merely having farmers leave the land. I know this is not the entire responsibility of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand), but I consider it is partly his problem under the manpower training program.

The hon. member for Royal (Mr. Fairweather) made some comments along this line. I agree with his suggestion that adult training under this bill must be dovetailed into the ARDA program. ARDA is aimed at the best possible use of land, water and other

resources. The objective of this bill should be to help farmers fit into the ARDA program. Representing an urban-rural riding, I consider that much greater effort should be made by the government to put agriculture on a more stable foundation. I shall not refer at this time to the need for some solution to the farmer's cost-price squeeze. That problem belongs to other government departments.

I suggest that the manpower training program should include a course for specialized agriculture, such as the best possible soil use, better cost accounting systems, greater production per unit and other aspects of modern agriculture. There should be training in operating irrigated land to help farmers in certain areas stay on their land. These farmers would be taught to take advantage of irrigation projects, such as the south Saskatchewan dam when it is completed. In other words, there should be a definite plan to educate young farmers to continue in agriculture rather than to allow them to leave the farm and train them for some other occupation.

I consider, Mr. Speaker, this is the part such a manpower training program could play. This is a part of manpower training which the minister has apparently overlooked. Perhaps he will comment on this aspect of the matter before second reading is given to his bill. I repeat that I consider the training of farmers in order to get them to stay on the land is more important to the economy of this country than to retrain them for other jobs after they have left the farm.

• (9:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I have some comments to make on this Bill No. C-278, an act respecting the occupational training of adults and on the amendment introduced this afternoon by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) suggesting a tax compensation for the provinces not wishing to participate in this federal legislation on vocational training and who might prefer an independent provincial legislation, an autonomous responsibility in this area.

I hope that when the minister rises to speak he will bring some clarification to this matter.

My remarks will be brief. For most of the day, I have been listening to the speeches of the hon. members. I have noted that many of them are confused and unsure as to how far the central government intends to go and proceed in this vocational training of adults and how far the provinces, wishing to legislate in a similar area, will go.

We would like to know if on the whole other provinces have given up their jurisdiction or whether they have delegated their responsibilities in this field. We have learned through the newspapers in the past few months that the province of Quebec and the province of British Columbia have many reservations and have warned the federal government before the introduction of this bill against proceeding unilaterally without a definite and comprehensive agreement on all legislation in this area.

A few weeks ago, some Quebec officials came to Ottawa, among whom Mr. Claude Morin, deputy minister for federal-provincial affairs, Messrs. Arthur Tremblay and Yves Martin, deputy ministers of education and Mr. Fernand Jolicoeur, general director of permanent education. They came to Ottawa to discuss with the hon. minister or his representative, probably Mr. Kent, the occupational training of adults and related matters, and probably explain to the central government that the province of Quebec is deeply concerned with the matter and intends to guard jealously its authority and autonomy in that field.

I do not know whether there was any correspondence exchanged between the minister and the various provincial governments, but I suggest it would be most interesting if such correspondence, if any, were tabled, so that we might be in a position to find out in this house whether all the provinces agreed with the provisions of this legislation or, if they did not, to see what one or more provinces objected to and what their plans are in this field.

As pointed out several times today, it would not be desirable for both levels of government, that is federal and provincial, to operate and compete in the same field, as this could give rise to constitutional crises or conflicts which we must seek to avoid, in order to achieve better harmony in Canada between Canadians and the various governments.

Did the minister state clearly the responsibilities of the central government and those of the provincial governments when he met the provincial representatives, especially those from the province of Quebec?

I hope that, in his speech, the minister will tell us about the talks he had and the correspondence he received. That is very important because Canadians must not have the impression that, in the House of Commons, the government is trying to introduce a measure without the approval and the understanding of all the provinces and their population.

The policy trend of the various governments in the field of occupational training of adults should be quite clear in the minds of both federal and provincial administrators.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation points to the urgency of defining the responsibilities of the various governments.

Members of various parties have often asked the government during our debates or the question period to establish a joint parliamentary committee on constitutional reform but, unfortunately, the answers given by the government have been unsatisfactory to many hon. members and to millions of Canadians. While we know that federal officials are competent people we do not accept, as legislators responsible for the political, constitutional and legislative policies of this country, that a committee composed of civil servants, whose names we do not know, be appointed to study constitutional matters.

Many members of this house feel that this responsibility is incumbent on the legislator and that in delaying the setting up of such a committee, the government is fostering the present confusion and conflicts, which is not in the best interests of Canada and does not help to promote understanding between central and provincial governments.

For my part, I am anxious to hear the minister make his statement at the end of this debate and give us some details concerning the correspondence exchanged and the discussions held with representatives of the different provinces. But I see, from the underlying principle of this bill, that the federal government continues to intervene, directly or indirectly, in matters concerning education, since this legislation itself deals with the occupational training of adults.

I understand that the minister has already stated, in speeches and conferences, that it was up to the federal government to provide customers for the provincial authorities and for industry, by taking over all the financial responsibility for the occupational training of adults. The minister will probably tell us that the central government has no intention, through its officials and its agencies, to give training and education courses to adults, that this is left to provinces. But this act departs from the spirit and the letter of the Canadian constitution.

Our constitution must be amended, at least reformed and modernized, to keep pace with the progress of science and modern industrial techniques. That is why the government must create this official framework for constitutional reforms.

• (9:50 p.m.)

That is why it is urgent for the government to set up that official framework for constitutional reform. But no, it is delaying the establishment of that framework and the official reform of the constitution, in agreement with provincial legislators and other Canadians, to continue to invade either directly or indirectly a field which, according to the spirit and the letter of the Canadian constitution, comes under provincial jurisdiction.

Of course, according to section 93 of our constitution, education comes under the exclusive authority of the provinces. It is clearly indicated in section 93 that education comes entirely and exclusively under the provinces.

Courts have been asked to give an interpretation of the word education. I think it was Justice Duff who, in his comments on the word education, wrote that it was used in a wide sense and included all fields of training.

It is also worth remembering that the 72 Quebec resolutions of 1864, which served as the basis for the drafting of the 147 sections of our 1867 constitution, in no way dissociated culture from education, or education from primary, secondary or university education, nor separated academic training from post-academic training; on the contrary, the wording of section 93 of our Canadian constitution gives full authority to the provincial governments.

I know that the minister or other hon. members will say that the central government will not, under this bill, give the courses itself, that it will merely pay the costs and allowances, but the fact is that in judgments rendered by the Privy Councill of London, which was our last court of appeal until 1949, many decisions were favourable to the spirit of a true federalism and recognized the sovereignty and autonomy of the federal government in matters coming under its jurisdiction by virtue of the constitution, but also the sovereignty and autonomy of the provinces in those fields set out in the confederation pact.

Decisions of the Privy Council, Mr. Speaker, have clearly established that the central government, since it has taken upon itself the major portion of tax revenue, cannot, in spending this money in Canada, do indirectly what the constitution forbids it to do directly.

While the government limits itself to paying allowances, travelling and retraining expenses, while it claims today that it does not intend to create the structure for training courses, in fact it is touching the ultimate goal, that is the field of education, although in the present bill it limits itself to those expenses.

That is what decisions of the Privy Council have called colorated legislation "pith and substance".

The central government does not have the right to spend that money which, in the final analysis, serves in fields of provincial jurisdiction. That bill originated in the Massey Royal Commission on national development in the arts, letters and sciences. In this report, there is a distinction between academic and post-academic education. We get the latter when we have left studying, when we live for good while we must increase our knowledge and our culture in the different working fields occupied by Canadians.

Well, now, these dissertations, these intricacies that have been used in the report of the Massey Commission do not, in the least, agree with the spirit and the letter of the Canadian constitution. Should not this constitution be amended according to the context presented by modern life in 1967? I think it should, Mr. Speaker.

However, this should not be done in a unilateral way, by a committee made up of federal government officials, because this is a responsibility incumbent on the members of this house who must also maintain a dialogue with the provincial legislators on such a vital and basic matter.

Therefore, I blame the government again, on consideration of this bill for having delayed action too long. We do not have constitutional and political information for the future of Canada, for a better Canada, for a better understanding, for a more realistic harmony between Canadians and the provincial governments. And the central government, until these reforms are brought about, should refrain from interfering and continuing the series of encroachments in a number of areas that, directly or indirectly, affect the provincial authorities.

[Mr. Allard.]

In conclusion, I shall tell the hon. minister that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Lapointe does not oppose nor demolish the provisions of his bill. On the contrary, it will allow all the provinces, like the province of Quebec, and maybe the province of British Columbia and others—since we are not aware of the correspondence and conversations which the hon. minister and his officials might have exchanged with senior officials of various provinces—to fully occupy this field thanks to fiscal compensation, and without interfering with the implementation of federal legislation and without preventing the provinces from entering into an agreement on certain terms with the central government.

That is why I would very much appreciate it if that the hon. minister and those who sit on his side would not refuse such an amendment which takes away nothing from Bill No. C-278 but which will avoid conflicts and constitutional crises in such an important field.

• (10:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I know that the house likes nothing more at this hour of the evening than a legalistic or constitutional homily. Because the house likes such dissertations I am ready to oblige. I assure hon. members that my remarks will be brief, but the point is one that should be made, and I welcome the attention the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) is paying to me.

This bill, if and when passed, will confer upon the governor in council power to make certain regulations. That power is specified in various clauses of the bill, with a particular list of such regulations being set out in clause 12. It is standard practice with respect to legislation passed in parliament for us to give the governor in council power, by regulation, to enact certain provisions which have the force of law.

However, one of the cardinal principles of our form of government is that the executive—the cabinet, or the governor in council—does not have authority to legislate except in so far as that authority is given to it by parliament. This is a principle to which lip service and obeisance are often paid; but there have been times in the history of our parliament when that principle has been violated. It is my contention that it has been violated recently by the present government.

I hold in my hand a copy of the adult occupational training regulations which were

passed by order in council and which are now in effect. The parliamentary secretary referred to them several times in his speech last night, and they have been referred to a number of times during the debate today.

When one looks at these regulations he realizes that they are the regulations which were intended to be passed under the provisions of Bill C-278 after that bill had been passed. As one looks closely at the regulations he realizes that more is included in them than would have been necessary to include in them, had the passing of the regulations awaited the passage of the bill. As a matter of fact in the regulations one finds, word for word, a repetition of a number of the bill's clauses. In fact the important clauses of the bill are set out verbatim in the regulations.

It is my contention that the government had no legislative authority to enact these regulations. If I may refer back to what I said a few moments ago, I mean that parliament has not by any statute given the government power to enact these regulations.

Last evening when I raised this point by asking a question at the end of the parliamentary secretary's speech, he replied in this fashion, as reported on page 15263 of *Hansard* for April 24:

> Mr. Munro:
>
> My information, and I believe it is accurate, is that the details embodied in this legislation were sufficiently set out in the main estimates in such detail as to give the government authority to embody its program in regulations, in order that we might get it under way.

I then asked the parliamentary secretary whether he was referring to vote No. 5 of the estimates of the Department of Manpower and Immigration for the current year, and he acknowledged that he was. These are his words as reported on the next page:

> I believe that is what I am referring to. The point has been checked and we have been advised that there is sufficient authority for the regulations we have made.

I have been here long enough not to be impressed by ministerial or sub-ministerial statements that the government has been advised that what it is doing is in order. The most glaring example that comes to mind, and this is within the memory of most hon. members, is the instance in 1962 when the former Conservative government passed an import control order by order in council, alleging it had done so under the authority of two statutes to which reference was made. We were told then that the government had been advised that what it was doing was right and sound. Most of us did not agree. A year or so later another government came to power and it was advised by the same officials that had advised the previous government that perhaps the order in council was not valid and that there ought to be legislation to validate what had been done. As I say, I am not impressed by statements such as those made last night, that the government has been advised that it is following the proper course.

By his answer to my question last night the parliamentary secretary revealed the basis on which the government contended that its action was valid—item No. 5 in the main estimates of the Department of Manpower and Immigration. Turning to page 286 of the blue book of estimates for the year ending March 31, 1968, that item, which I shall read in full, is as follows:

> 5. Administration, operation and maintenance, including the administration of the manpower mobility regulations and payments in respect of persons who are being afforded occupational training under the adult occupational training program in accordance with regulations approved by the governor in council.

The amount of money being asked for is $73,635,000. The point of interest is not the amount of money but the wording of the item.

Mr. Munro: Read on; read the details.

Mr. Knowles: The details? On what page?

Mr. Munro: On page 295, for vote 10, or page 291, for vote 5.

• (10:10 p.m.)

Mr. Knowles: It is just the same thing spelled out a little further, but I am prepared to read it if the parliamentary secretary wishes.

The point I wish to make is that the end of vote No. 5 which I read a moment ago, and the details over on pages 294 and 295 refer to the authority of the government to make payments in accordance with regulations approved by the governor in council. I submit the plain meaning of this language is that the government has authority to spend this money under these regulations after they have been passed. But they cannot be passed on the basis of the authority to pass them until that authority has been given by parliament. The contention that the government has this authority because we have voted one month's interim supply in connection with

that item does not stand up. It does not, I suggest, by the wildest stretch of the imagination give the government authority to go ahead and enact as regulations the very legislation under which it was to be given authority to pass them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles: If this is possible, if this set of regulations stands up, the government does not need to rush us into passing this bill tonight or before the session ends. It has the authority already under the regulations. But I suspect the government is afraid they will not stand up, and is in a hurry to correct the situation by getting this legislation through.

I welcome the presence across the way of the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) who is interested in legislation by items in the estimates. If this is accepted we can do away with ordinary statutes; we can bring in one appropriation act in the year, sprinkle it with dollar items and references to doing things by regulations approved by the governor in council, and then the cabinet can pass all the regulations it wants to pass.

I think it is expediency gone mad. The parliamentary secretary in my view admitted as much last night when he said at the end of his first answer to my questions that they had taken this course "in order that we might get it under way". "It" relates to the program. In other words; the parliamentary secretary admitted on behalf of the minister that the government wanted this legislation by April 1, that it wanted to get it under way; it did not have statutory authority for action and it found a solution.

If hon. members to my right will not take offence—and after all this is now ancient history—this is just what their government did in June, 1962. They had in mind a course of action which they felt they were bound to follow. They used all the arguments in the book. We did not think they had statutory authority for what they did, and the rulings later suggested they did not. But they took action on the basis of two statutes, the Customs Tariff and the Financial Administration Act and went ahead to pass an order in council. The prime minister of that day defied us to say there was anything wrong about what was done. It is the same story a speeding driver tells in court. He says to the judge: I know the speed limit was 30 miles an hour but I had to meet my wife at the hairdressers, and that is why I drove at 40. I had to get there.

[Mr. Knowles.]

Mr. Groos: Ninety days.

Mr. Knowles: At least we are hearing something other than 60 days from across the way. I think the hon. member for Victoria is pronouncing the kind of judgment.

In all this I am not commenting on the merits or demerits of this legislation; my hon. friends and others have already done that. But I do not think it is good enough to treat parliament in this way. I am saying this to hon. members across the way, who joined with me in sharp criticism of what was done in connection with the import control order of 1962. I suggest that here again we have a case of an order in council passed without, I would say, any statutory authority, or in any case passed certainly without clear statutory authority.

Read these regulations again and read the bill which is before us. The bill has a few other things in it about Unemployment Insurance Act amendments and so on, but as far as the adult retraining program is concerned the regulations are virtually the same as the bill. The government has admitted that because it did not get this bill through it achieved the same end by passing these regulations. Yet these are the regulations which would have been possible under the authority of the kind of wording which is in them, and which implies that they cannot be passed until authority has been given to the government by the passing of the bill which is now before us.

I like to see good programs get under way. I agree with those who have said this is an exceedingly important measure. In fact I agree with the hon. member for Prince (Mr. MacDonald) who suggested that this was probably the most important bill we have discussed so far this session. But for heaven's sake let us not forget the basic principles upon which government in this country is founded. One of those principles is that the executive does not have the right to legislate except when authority to do so has been specifically given to it by statutes of parliament. My contention is that the government has not got the authority for these regulations, and should not have acted in this way.

What governments do when they get into a position of this kind is to say: Who can stop us? They may not use that language always, though one hon. gentleman did; but in effect that is what they say. They do so because our system also works on the principle that if the government does something wrong all we can

do is throw the government out by defeating it on the floor of parliament, or by defeating it at the next election.

Far too often governments are tempted to act in an arbitrary way when they feel something needs to be done as a matter of urgency. Mr. Speaker, expediency still does not do away with the need for paying attention to the rule of law. The correct parliamentary way of doing things must not be set aside, no matter what the excuse may be.

• (10:20 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on the amendment. All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea?

Those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Lewis: Let the record show there were no yeas.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

I presume the minister is rising to close the debate. If he does speak now he will close the debate.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, after listening to five or six hours of debate, I begin to wonder what is probably related to good political tactics, what is perhaps related to the conclusion and what is related to the actual weaknesses of the bill now before the house.

Perhaps, like my good friend for Prince (Mr. MacDonald), when we have gained a little more experience, we can untangle all the aspects of the problems debated in this house.

What struck me, Mr. Speaker, in the comments made, is not so much the criticisms that were made and that were, in most cases, objective and related to real doubts in the minds of hon. members, as the fact that virtually no attention was given to one of the most basic and most revolutionary aspects of the bill under consideration.

In my opinion, and I say this without any partisanship whatsoever, I would be glad to have the House of Commons of Canada accept a principle of this kind, and I think it would justify my presence in Ottawa for the last year and a half, and perhaps for the rest of my life, if I put through, for the first time in Canada, legislation recognizing—and rightly so—that the worker having to retrain due to technological changes in industry is entitled to the maintenance of his income and that he has a right to something more than the small allowance to keep him from starving to death. It goes without saying that he is not guaranteed any income enabling him to spend his winters in Florida, but such income will nevertheless be sufficient for him to provide a living for his family, while recognizing that his activity in retraining is normal. That, in my opinion, is basic and I suggest it meets an urgent need of our modern industrial society.

If we had been blamed for not introducing a more perfect bill than the one under consideration, I would have understood, but let us say that the basic principle was a little neglected even by those are said to be in the vanguard. That might be good political tactics; that might be normal; but to me it is so important that I will at least point it out to the house, because it is a precedent that will undoubtedly be used as a basis for a truly human retaining system that will meet today's needs.

I was surprised also at the confusion that seemed to prevail in some minds. I had the impression sometimes that the bill had not been read and that some main points had escaped some hon. members.

Mr. Speaker, it is certain that this bill does not aim at settling once and for all the whole problem of education in Canada, whether it is basic academic training or technical training. Its objective is quite different. That bill does not replace the provincial institutions and does not take any responsibility away from the provinces; it is only determining what will happen on the labour market when the workers need to be retrained.

Obviously, the scope of the bill is much larger than before. Its value was cut down and it was suggested that it was very restrictive whereas in fact, it is quite general in scope.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to refer to some of the objections raised in the house but before I do, I should like to detail the basis or the motivation of the overall policy.

Mr. Speaker, until recently, we had agreements with the provinces through our jurisdiction over occupational training, enabling us to offer training or retraining courses to certain categories of workers. We also had agreements on capital expenditures for the establishment or construction of technical or occupational training schools.

There used to be a sort of dual jurisdiction in the field of occupational instruction. I have

no desire to criticize what has been done at the time and I believe that this legislation has been most useful to Canada. In fact, it was a starting point which enabled us to catch up in building schools and occupational institutions. Even though that act is out of date today, it has nevertheless proved quite useful to the whole country.

We wanted, first of all, to clarify the question of jurisdiction. In this connection, members of the political parties represented in this house will have to take their stand, because it must be determined whether or not the federal government has jurisdiction in the field of occupational training. It seems that our stand must be defined and that the federal government as such has no jurisdiction over educational institutions, over curriculums, even in the field of occupational training.

Under the previous scheme, the federal government could negotiate with the provinces, not only with regard to courses but also to the building standards of institutions. We put an end to that, and if the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) can read, he may be able to read it, because he took pleasure in mixing up everything, probably for a forthcoming television program. So, if he can read, he will find that we have withdrawn from that field. As for his reference to two architects arguing about the building of a school, that may have been possible in the past, but not any longer, because the province is now responsible for its own institutions. As a matter of fact, it is the province which will draw up the curriculums, hire the teachers, and plan the occupational training. It is quite clear that this comes under provincial jurisdiction.

• (10:30 p.m.)

Some hon. members suggest that this bill is a further intrusion of the federal government in the field of education, whereas it is clear that we have withdrawn from education proper. As a matter of fact, under this bill, we accept a responsibility with regard to employment and unemployment in Canada, and since we know that part of that unemployment is due to a lack of vocational training, we are providing those who are unemployed because of technological changes or automation, or simply because their skills are outdated, with the means of acquiring the vocational training they need through courses given by provincial institutions administered by the provinces.

[Mr. Marchand.]

Therefore, when the house is told—as if we understood nothing at all—that this is new and that we will be paying twice for the same services, I say that this is not so. It may have been possible in the past, but not now. Instead of two distinct services, there is the province which provides services in the field of education, and the federal government which assumes its responsibility with regard to employment and which sees to it that workers are able to benefit from the institutions and vocational training courses of the provinces.

Therefore, that point is quite clear, at least in my mind. One may disagree, even with the present intentions of the government, but one should at least recognize that, by comparison to the system which expired an April 1 or March 31, the present scheme certainly respects provincial autonomy to a greater degree.

Mr. Speaker, we have been blamed for not having consulted the provinces, for having proceeded autocratically, because the provinces complained. I know why they complained, and we could perhaps talk about that later on, but this matter of occupational training, as it appears in the bill under consideration, was discussed more than a year ago, at the first federal-provincial conference. It was then discussed in detail at the second federal-provincial conference last October, when the premiers as well as the provincial ministers of education and labour were informed of our intentions. The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) explained that new philosophy, after which the officials of the federal Department of Manpower and Immigration and those of the provincial departments met to discuss the terms and regulations. There were exchanges of opinions and, in short, it is after all those consultations, all those exchanges, that we came up with the legislation which is now submitted to the house.

Some people contend that we trampled over the provinces and proceeded in an autocratic way. I believe we should distinguish between the dissatisfaction of the provinces in seeing the old system come to an end and the dissatisfaction expressed under the pretence that we have proceeded too hastily and in an authoritative way, which is not true.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Marchand: Which is not true, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat it.

Therefore, one must take those facts into account.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) dealt with a technical point and I was somewhat impressed by his reasoning. Personally, I believe the way we have proceeded may not be the best, and without admitting that he is entirely right, strictly from the point of view of the rules and procedure, I would be inclined to say I am convinced that this is not the best procedure, and if we have proceeded in that way, it is because the agreements came into force on March 31 and our only alternative was to leave the workers without allowances and without help until the government decided to pass the new legislation.

Therefore, parliament was completely aware of what we intended to do and I have every reason to believe that the house did not vote those amounts so that we would not spend them. I think it passed them, so that we could spend them; otherwise, why pass them? And in so doing it gave us the authority to make regulations through the government and the governor in council.

And so, even though I do not like the procedure, that is strictly from a parliamentary and democratic point of view, the best thing we could do in a case such as this was to go ahead with a bill giving authority to the governor in council. Because of his experience with the labour movement, I feel the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will understand that we acted as we did, not to cheat the House of Commons, but rather because we were caught in a difficult situation and the workers would have otherwise suffered the consequences. Since the house know what we were undertaking, I feel that it would be wrong for the hon. member to make an issue of it today, as if we really, deliberately tried to cheat the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker, many objections have been made to the fact that some young people will lose under the new plan some of the rights they had under the former one. There again, let us not be misled, for the young people of 17 or 18, who have not attended school for a year, although not entitled to the allowances we have set, can still take the courses free of charge. And we are willing to do that. We are therefore not excluding them.

The case was presented in such a way as to give the impression that under the new plan all those young people will quit the occupational training centres because we have decided that they are not entitled to the allowances. On the contrary the vast majority of those young people will be entitled to free occupational training in provincial schools, and we will pay 100 per cent of the cost.

However, we were faced with the problem of deciding whether we could give them, at the same time, the same allowances as to adults who have family responsibilities and who are part of the labour force.

Let us try for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to consider the effect such an action could have on students if, after being out of school for only one year, they were allowed to go back to school and receive a $35 weekly allowance in addition to their tuition fees. Do you not think we would witness a mass exodus from the schools of young people who would see this as a way of obtaining a salary. In my opinion, this would create an intolerable situation in the schools, because you could have two students with exactly the same status in seats next to each other, and one would be getting $35 a week, and the other nothing. This means that those who continue their studies in high school or beyond would not be eligible for the allowance. They would have to leave school for a year in order to get the $35 a week.

That is not the aim of this legislation. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, its aim is to provide financial help for workers who are legitimately a part of the labour force but who are unemployed and whose professional qualifications are outdated and useless, to help them live during their retraining period.

This legislation is not designed to provide free education in all vocational schools in Canada. That might be a good thing, but it will be done through another legislation.

The object of this bill is especially to grapple with this great evil arising from modern industry, which causes workers to lose not only their trade but their skills. We must endeavour to train them not only once but two, three or four times during their lifetime. That is the object of this clause. Provincial governments are dealt with on an equal footing with everyone else.

Everybody gets the same treatment—women, men, young people—provided one has been connected with the labour market for three years.

Now, another problem raised was that of the childless widow who someday finds herself in need of income. Once again, when I heard about this, I personally felt that it made sense. But I do not feel that the problem is one to be solved through this kind of legislation. Let us take, for instance, the problem of

nursery schools. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that if Canada does not only accept, but also wishes that women work it will be necessary to create normal working conditions for them.

• (10:40 p.m.)

I agree with the idea, but this bill which has a very definite and particular purpose will not deal with all these problems. So I do not accept the objection in principle that was raised. I agree with the idea, but I think we must try to experiment with this bill, even if afterwards, either through cooperation with the provinces or otherwise, we have to extend its scope so as to cover injustices which shall continue to exist.

Mr. Speaker, according to the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr) the new program is really a step backward, compared with the previous one.

It is true that large capital expenditures were made to build vocational training schools, under the former program, but we have not stopped them. On the contrary, we have increased them to $800 for each child between the ages of 14 and 19 years old, which is giving a tremendous credit to the provinces. This program is sure to disappear eventually, but we are concerned with capital expenses, since we accept to pay not only the cost of the courses that are given by the institutions, but also a share of the amortization of the invested capital and of the equipment of the institutions.

We have increased expenses in two ways, while, under the former government, workers received their allowances, providing their unemployment insurance benefits were exhausted first during these courses, and then, they were given hardly anything. Moreover, this was divided between the province and the federal government. At the present time we are not touching the rights of workers under the Unemployment Insurance Act and we are paying 100 per cent, not 50 but 100 per cent of the cost of both, training and allowances.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, I am not blaming those who implemented the other plan for having done so—I think it was a great service rendered to Canada. However, I think it is stretching the truth somewhat to say that under the new system, we will be worse off than before. Not at all, we will be better off. We could probably be much better off but this program is surely a great progress compared to the program in force since 1960.

[Mr. Marchand.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to reply more in detail and in his own language to the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow). I was not in the house yesterday when he spoke. I read his speech and he might allow me to answer more in detail, since he has touched upon several points that were raised today in the house.

[*English*]

I should like to refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) because they contain what must be close to a record number of misconceptions and inaccuracies. I am sure the hon. member means well. Unfortunately he has swallowed whole the attitude of the conservatives of the educational establishment. It is perhaps natural, since he is normally supposed to be a radical, that he has had difficulty in digesting. The consequences were apparent in his speech.

First let me state the facts. The hon. member for Winnipeg North claimed that I have refused to talk to the Ontario minister of education. I do not know where he gets his information. It is simply not true. Such a meeting was never proposed formally. What was proposed was a third federal-provincial meeting. This is something quite different. I did not agree to that because the only matters proposed for discussion were points that had already been discussed at two meetings. The only possible effect of a third meeting would have been to delay the implementation of any federal training policy when the arrangements came to a legal end last March 31. I am as prepared as anyone to talk up to the point at which there is a deadline for action in the interests of the Canadian public. But I am not prepared to go on talking when it becomes a means of holding up necessary action.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North made an assertion about the attitudes of the provinces. He should identify whom he is talking about. Provincial governments, as represented by their premiers, have of course objected to the new federal fiscal policy as a whole on the grounds that they want more money. But very few if any provincial governments have expressed any view about our training policy as such. Apparently what some have done, and that is particularly true of Ontario, is to give a licence to officials of their education departments to engage in a public controversy on matters of policy.

Mr. Orlikow: Will the minister permit a question? He is saying that the provinces

have not objected. Why then has the government not agreed to table the correspondence between the provinces and the federal government for which I asked two or three weeks ago?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Fairweather) asked for the same thing. Right now we are collecting this correspondence, and we will be happy to table it as soon as this is done. Apart from the official correspondence between the federal government and the provinces, there has also been some correspondence between the regional offices and the provincial governments, and we want to collect all of this. I think that the question of the hon. member was not properly founded as far as we are concerned because he mentioned the withdrawal of the federal government from training courses, which is not true. We never withdrew from anything. The agreements expired on March 31, and we never withdrew from that field. We came back with a new proposal which is before the house right now.

To come back to what I was saying—the results are not very constructive. Of course, those officials have preferred thus to make the same sort of arrangement for the future as came to an end on March 31. The essence of the arrangements was that we gave very large subsidies to whatever program the provinces chose to operate.

The officials concerned were able to say to their treasury boards: "Approve this $100 million program and it will only cost you $25 million or $50 million. The federal government will reimburse you for the rest". Of course the officials like that system, and if a member of the federal government wishes to make himself the mouthpiece for that viewpoint, I suppose he has the right to do so. But as far as I am concerned, the issue at stake here is the interest of the people of Canada.

I think I have shown, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North was kind enough to recognize, that I am fully prepared to improve my policies in response to reasonable criticism. I may say that I have the fullest co-operation of my senior officials in that attitude. However, I am not prepared to change good policies because some people with special interests put on a campaign of bad arguments.

The most common argument advanced against this bill is that it makes a distinction between education and occupational training for adults. Bluntly speaking, this argument is nonsense. There has always been a distinction. It used to be that while municipalities and provinces provided free education up to a certain age, they made no provision whatever for adult training. Furthermore, we are not even involved in adult training. All we are doing is to give money to those workers who need retraining. We are not involved in adult education. That began to change when hon. gentlemen opposite were in government. At that time the government introduced the technical and vocational training program. It was a good program for its day. The provinces took advantage of it to build a lot of schools. We have undertaken to spend for that purpose in the future almost as much as has been spent in the past six years. But one of the features of the old program was that it most certainly distinguished between education and training. The assistance given for the operating costs of high schools was strictly limited to a total for the country of $3 million a year out of a program costing in total more than $200 million a year. That $3 million is what we are withdrawing; that is all.

• (10:50 p.m.)

Under the old program, as under the new, adult training was supported on quite a different formula and a much bigger scale. Nevertheless the provinces were slow to get into adult training on a large scale. That is the fact to which the Economic Council drew such forcible attention and which no one denies. It is the reason why we changed our policy to provide the whole cost of adult training instead of 50 per cent or 75 per cent depending on the people being trained.

It is true, of course, that educational and training programs should very largely be planned together, that to a considerable extent they use the same physical facilities, and so on. That is obvious. That is why we are not proposing to set up training centres or run training programs. We are going on doing what was done before, only we are doing it on a bigger scale. Instead of financing part of the cost of training for various defined categories of adults we are paying the whole cost for all adults who need training.

I want to make this quite clear. There are no exclusions. Anyone who has been out of school for a year and who was previously entitled to training under a federally supported program is now entitled to training with the whole cost paid by the federal government. The difference is in coverage. Before there were all kinds of exclusions, and now

there are not. That is one important difference between the old program and the new one.

The other main difference is a matter, not of training as such, but of manpower planning. Under the old system we identified a man as needing training and the province then accepted him when it could into one or other of the training courses in which they had a vacancy. There was no necessary relationship between the courses provided and the jobs that were going to be available. In taking 100 per cent financial responsibility we are changing that. We are saying that we will pay the whole cost of training in a course that equips the individual for a job he is likely to be able to get and do.

In the past the attitude tended to be to fill up the courses that were available. Now there will be a much more direct pressure to pattern the courses to meet the employment needs of the individual. That is the change that is disturbing some officials. But I do not think anyone would seriously advance it as an argument against our policy. That is the one difference we are making that affects the relationship between education and training and the structure of training courses.

Financially, from the point of view of the public, which is what matters, we are not creating a distinction between education and training. We are making them more alike. We are accepting the financial responsibility for seeing that free training is available to all adults when they need it, in the same way that free education is available to all children. Finally on this point of the alleged distinction between education and manpower training, let me repeat what I said in October to the federal-provincial conference:

> The distinction we do make is quite different. It is not between kinds of education. It is a distinction between the needs of people—between, on the one hand, students in the ordinary sense and, on the other hand, men and women who are or have been earning their livings but who need further training or retraining for productive employment.

That means, of course, that there is one financial distinction. In order to take training most adults need a replacement income. But no province, as far as I know, has proposed to pay an income to the children in its schools. Therefore there is a line to be drawn as to when people should get training allowances. Obviously, if we pay allowances to young people of 17 or so, we create an incentive for them to drop out of school early and take training later.

[Mr. Marchand.]

There was a reference in the debate to whether we had conducted research on this program. For example, we commissioned an independent research firm to investigate student attitudes toward staying in school for the next two years or dropping out to work for a year and then receiving an allowance to take training. The finding was that if the allowances were available after only one year, the drop-out rate in grades 9 and 10 might rise by 40 to 50 per cent. That is the reason for the three-year rule for young people without dependants. It is not because we want to deprive them of their right to be trained. We want them to be trained and we are ready even to pay for their courses, but we are not ready to create an incentive that will probably destroy many school systems in many provinces.

Of course, like most things, it is the lesser of two evils. We would be severely and rightly attacked if we paid allowances to a lot of young people who were thereby encouraged to drop out of school early. On the other hand, of course, there are certainly some young people who had no choice but to leave school and who will be compelled to work, not trained, during the first three years afterwards. But the number of those cases is certainly not the 7,000 that some official has given to the press in Ontario. That is a wild exaggeration. A realistic estimate of the potential trainees who will not be entitled to allowance would be 2,000 to 3,000, and of course by no means all of them will necessarily have to forgo training.

There have been other allegations of discrimination. One hon. member charged discrimination against women. I urge him to read the bill. He will find that a woman just as much as a man will be eligible for our training courses regardless of whether she is married or single or is 30 or 45 years of age or even 20. All that is required is that she be one year out of school, just like men, and for the same reason. She will receive a training allowance if she has dependants or has been working in just the same way as a man.

The same hon. member attempted yesterday to criticize my able parliamentary secretary by claiming yet another type of discrimination, against immigrants. This charge is equally invalid. The bill treats immigrants in the same way as Canadians. An immigrant will be eligible for our training courses if he has been out of school for one year. Indeed, an immigrant youngster of 16 or 17 years of age can be enrolled in our program the day

after he has landed in this country. He or she will receive a training allowance if he or she has been working for at least three years, and we do not make any distinction between working in Canada and working abroad. I am sure that no hon. member would suggest an improvement in these conditions; to do so would be to discriminate against Canadian workers. This applies equally to other special categories of people. We are treating them all exactly alike, on exactly the same principles.

I will turn now to a different issue. It has been alleged that we failed to consult adequately with the provinces. Allow me to state the facts. This is what I said in French: In October last, that is six months ago, this program was a main topic of the federal-provincial conference in Ottawa attended by provincial premiers and provincial ministers of education. This conference was followed a month later by another meeting in Ottawa with the provincial deputy ministers of education and labour at which the new provisions for training adults were discussed in detail. In January and February officials from departmental headquarters travelled to provincial capitals to join our regional officers in discussing the new program with provincial officials. Then and since our regional directors have been in continuing contact with their provincial colleagues.

• (11:00 p.m.)

The hon. member for Winnipeg North charged my department with rigidity. He claimed that we had not listened to the suggestions from the provinces, and that not one of the principles of the program enunciated earlier had been changed. May I say that by listening to provincial urging the federal treasury became lighter by some $300 million.

At the October conference, the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) accepted provincial representations which changed the phasing out formula for capital grants, giving the provinces an additional quarter of a billion dollars. At the subsequent November meeting, the federal government announced a change in the original proposal for the occupational training program for adults so that younger persons with less than three years experience would be included in the training. Under our first proposal they were not even entitled to their tuition fees, and we were not paying anything. We modified that provision, too. As the house will hear at a later stage, we are ready in committee to propose certain amendments to the bill as it stands now, to meet some small technical points on which the provinces have advanced good arguments.

It is true that despite this consultation, a great deal of misinformation about the program has appeared in the press, apparently on the authority of one or two provincial officers. I can only say that there are none so deaf as those who do not want to listen. It is quite true that under the new program we will not subsidize some things the provincial departments would like subsidized. We never can satisfy them. When we have refused, we have refused because, in our judgment, there are more important and more appropriate uses for the public funds for which we are responsible. This is a highly expansionist program which opens up the way for a vast improvement in the training available to Canadian workers. I hope it can be discussed and passed in that spirit.

[*Translation*]

I shall now conclude, Mr. Speaker. There are probably objections to which I have not replied, but I shall have an opportunity to do so when we debate the bill section by section. However, I recall the objection that training allowances could vary from one area to another. That was done precisely at the request of the provinces because, in view of the relatively high level of the allowances, it could happen that, in some areas, allowances are higher than the real wages, and it seemed reasonable, after discussion with the provinces, that we allow some flexibility in that respect.

Therefore, I would prefer, as many people do, that salaries be equal in Canada, from one area to another—I am sure it would be better that way. We have not worked such a miracle yet. Trade unions have not accomplished it and employers obviously do not wish it either. But, in any event, we are taking into account the situation as it is.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the bill before us now—I am not saying it is perfect, nor that we will not have to change it a year from now—is one that is in the forefront of legislation in that field and that the house, instead of delaying it, for the sake of delaying should hasten to put it into force so that the workers may take advantage of it as soon as possible, not only the workers, but the Canadian economy as a whole, even if we have to amend it later, for we will probably realize that there are defects, that from the administrative point of view, there might be difficulties and no doubt also that we will want to extend it.

But in regard to the principle of a bill such as this it would be hard to understand, Mr. Speaker, that the House of Commons would not agree to give it a fair trial.

[*English*]

Mr. Prittie: Before the minister concludes his remarks, I wonder if he is ready to say anything about ARDA? A number of us this evening asked if there had been any consultation between his department and ARDA in the field of retraining and education in certain areas.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I should point out to the house that the time allotted to the minister has expired. If he wishes to answer the question, it will have to be done by unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Marchand: We have been working in co-operation with ARDA all the time. The deputy minister of manpower and immigration is a member of the advisory board on rural development programs. We always work together and try to have an integrated program. These programs, therefore, are not applied separately without any connection between them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee, Mr. Batten in the chair.

On clause 2—*Definitions.*

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of minor amendments to make to the bill. One is to correct a technical oversight which would have required the governor in council to approve each loan individually, although the amount might be as small as $10,000. The second is to permit part time courses to last more than one year so that they can provide the same amount of instruction as one year, full time courses.

Since the first reading it has been brought to my attention that the bill does not set out the machinery for the close collaboration with the provinces which I emphasized on the resolution stage and which is so essential to the proper functioning of the program. There is no legal necessity to provide for this collaboration in the legislation, but it is vital to the practical success of the whole program. I therefore propose that we make the principles of collaboration more specific.

Explicitly, Mr. Chairman, I should like to suggest that we establish joint committees with the provinces to assist provincial manpower needs, and that we make it plain that these assessments will be used to the fullest extent possible for manpower purposes. In the same spirit we would make explicit provision in the bill for the eventual approval of courses which private schools provide and for consultation with provinces and firms that initiate courses for their employees. These amendments do not reflect a change in policy; they simply spell out how we intend to operate.

Similarly, Mr. Chairman, I think we should amend clause 12 to provide explicitly for consultation with the provinces on the level of allowances which will be paid to their residents. This consultation, I might add, has already taken place. Nevertheless I feel it is better that this collaboration should be specifically provided for in the bill.

Mr. Knowles: May I ask the minister whether he has any copies of these amendments to the various clauses so that we can look at them?

Mr. Marchand: Yes.

Mr. Knowles: While I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether I could ask for some intelligence from across the way in regard to what we are doing from here on. We have sat beyond ten on the understanding that we would not sit beyond midnight. There was to be some time set aside during this overtime period for private bills.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose that there will be any prolonged debate on the clauses of the bill and I was wondering whether we could see if we can make some fairly rapid progress with them and, if possible, dispose of them. If this is not possible, then perhaps we should consider rising for a while and dealing with the other matters that it was understood would be dealt with. I am saying this in the absence of the house leader who said that he might not be able to be here, and in that event asked me whether I would act on his behalf.

• (11:10 p.m.)

Mr. Prittie: Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask a question about paragraph (c) which reads in part as follows:

"occupational training" means any form of instruction, other than instruction designed for university credit—

Many community colleges will grow up in the future in the provinces. Not all those colleges will grant university degrees or their equivalents. Will this paragraph apply to courses, given in those colleges, which do not result in university credit?

Mr. Marchand: I do not know whether I should answer the hon. member's question before moving the amendment to clause 2 that I propose to move.

Answering the hon. member's question, provincial institutions are to give vocational training to workers. Those institutions which seem suitable will be used, but the courses they give must be for occupational training and not for academic credits. Provided the courses result in occupational training we do not mind which institutions are used. We do not intend to replace the federal government in its normal teaching tasks at primary or secondary level. We are ready to pay allowances so long as courses are restricted to occupational skills or to the imparting of basic knowledge to allow workers to become occupationally trained. Where a worker, to learn a skill, has to learn a language, science or mathematics, we shall pay the allowance. Other than that the payments will be strictly for occupational training.

Mr. Prittie: I have another, similar question. Does this mean that courses of institutions such as Ryerson or the Eastern Ontario Institute of Technology will be approved. Say, after an interview it is found that a person who is unemployed or in a low income job is capable of upgrading his skill, can be take a course under this program at institutions such as Ryerson?

Mr. Marchand: I have made clear in my statement that the purpose of this bill is to pay for training courses which are related to occupational training. That means that those courses will have to be limited normally to one year. The amendment I propose moving will allow a worker to take his instruction, should it be necessary, during 1,820 hours. It is known that some courses take longer to complete than others.

If the hon. member means, will the government pay for courses lasting three or four years in some technical school, the answer is that it is not the intention of the bill to do so. The bill intends to retrain or upgrade workers needing retraining or upgrading. This training must take either one year or 1,820 hours, and not more.

Perhaps the amendment could now be moved.

Mr. Pickersgill: I move:

That Bill C-278, An Act respecting the Occupational Training of Adults, be amended by deleting paragraph (d) of clause 2 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

"(d) "occupational training course" means a course of occupational training that provides not more than fifty-two weeks of full-time instruction or 1,820 hours of part-time instruction; and"

Mr. MacDonald (Prince): On looking at this clause I saw that the initial time limit, was 12 months. That limit has now been changed to a stranger figure—

Mr. Lewis: I am sorry to interrupt, but are we still on the amendment?

The Deputy Chairman: The hon. member is speaking on the amendment.

Mr. MacDonald (Prince): I believe the amendment introduced by the minister fails to overcome the difficulties inherent in the clause. It seems to me we need flexibility in terms of the variety of training programs we are able to offer people. It is hard to understand why we should limit ourselves in this way. By introducing this limit of 52 weeks or 1,820 hours it seems to me we are imposing a restriction. If the minister were willing to explain his amendment further we might be able to accept it, though I doubt this.

Mr. Marchand: It is part of the whole philosophy of this bill. The program is intended to retrain workers who are in the labour force, and do so quickly. It is not intended to give instruction they should have received at 16 or 18. We have to give them a new skill. That is the purpose of the program, otherwise we shall find workers starting a university course at the age of 45. This is not the intent of the bill.

I do not say this should not be done. Perhaps, some day we shall have to do this. But the purpose now is to provide a course of retraining. However, we did not wish to set a limit which would prevent men following a course which might be spread over two years, bearing in mind that possibly they might wish to work part time during that period. Thus we have prescribed the number of hours so that there might be more flexibility in the law.

Mr. MacDonald (Prince): The minister has indicated the difficulties which are involved. He has chosen a figure of 52 weeks. But

certain policies may require 60 weeks. The danger is that by fixing the period at 52 weeks we are binding ourselves in an arbitrary way. On the other hand we might be encouraging people to take longer periods of training than they really need. It would have been as logical to select a period of 40 weeks. Surely there must be a better way of defining an occupational training course than by placing a specified number of weeks in this bill.

Mr. Marchand: I might point out that the people to be trained will not themselves decide to follow this course, or that. They will be consulted but they cannot decide, for example, to take a course lasting 45 weeks as opposed to some other course because they would be receiving allowances during that period.

• (11:20 p.m.)

It is the manpower training centre which will decide what course is to be followed. This must be so, because we have to analyse the market to make sure as far as possible that the men, once trained, will have jobs in their new skills. The hon. member suggests that the present wording might encourage workers to take longer courses. I do not think this would happen, because the worker alone is not free to decide which course he should take.

Mr. Lewis: I think I understand the amendment and personally I welcome it. I presume it is on the basis of 35 hours a week for 52 weeks that the minister arrived at this figure of 1,820 hours. I would like to ask the minister how this would fit in with clause 5(2) where that includes apprenticeship, because frequently apprenticeships go beyond this length of time. Perhaps I fail to understand clause 5(2) correctly. This is what worried me about the one year as well as the part time training deficiency which is now being corrected by the minister's amendment. What also worried me is the provision for apprenticeship training which, in my experience, in most cases goes well beyond a year, well beyond 1,820 hours.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, by this scheme we do not want to cover all apprenticeships. We will have certain cases of apprentices who will seek help under the scheme for a short period. This is the intention. This is why we want to have this authority because in some circumstances you may have an apprentice who attended a course for two or three years and he cannot complete this course. It is not the intention to cover all the apprenticeship courses of workers.

Mr. Lewis: What the minister is saying is that so far as apprenticeship training is concerned it will also be limited to the 1,820 hours or one year—in other words, that part of their apprenticeship and no more. Perhaps the minister could explain to me why that should be the case. If you have an apprenticeship course obviously you have an occupational training which people have undertaken for relatively skilled jobs. I must say, Mr. Chairman, I am not persuaded that the length of the apprenticeship in some of the trades is justified by the needs of the trades.

I am quite sure that in some cases the period of apprenticeship is too long, but I cannot think of anything more genuinely an occupational training than apprenticeship, whether it is a welder, an electrician or a plumber. Whatever the case may be by definition, the person undertaking an apprenticeship is seeking occupational training. Perhaps the minister could explain why the assistance under this adult training scheme for apprenticeship should be limited to one year or 1,820 hours.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, French comes easier to me. Courses for apprentices usually last 52 weeks. We can easily have two or three 52-week periods, but part of the apprentices' time is devoted to actual work, because of the training on the job. Therefore I think that by combining both elements, that is by increasing the number of periods and taking into consideration the actual working time, we could give an almost complete coverage.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I understand that.

Clause 2 agreed to.

[*English*]

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, now that the amendment has been passed, I should like to say a few words on clause 2.

In my comments during the debate preceding the second reading, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out to the minister that this bill, like many

others which have been introduced in this house in recent years, will involve two sets of administrative expenses, one by the federal government and one by the provincial government. I also pointed out that both the federal and the provincial government would each send their own inspectors to check training facilities. The minister said that I was merely using an argument to try to deceive people again and to prepare a television program in order to mislead the public.

Mr. Marchand: It happens to be true.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I will use the minister's bill, signed by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration himself, to show that the one who is trying to mislead the public is not the little man from Lapointe, as stated by the minister, but the minister himself.

I will refer to section 4, because on section 2 I am allowed to express a general opinion. I will refute what the minister said earlier during the debate preceding second reading, when we were not allowed to answer him. I will refute him by discussing section 2 which allows me to speak on the bill in general.

And I will refer to section 4 to show that there will be a duplication of service expenditures under that new legislation. For instance, subsection 1 states:

> Where an adult who has not attended school on a regular basis for at least twelve months informs a manpower officer that he wishes to undertake occupational training, the manpower officer may, subject to subsection (2), arrange for the enrolment of that adult in any occupational training course that will, in the opinion of the manpower officer—

So, the federal manpower service will decide what would be the proper training to increase the earning capacity of the adult who wishes to follow those courses.

Consequently, that federal service which will decide what courses are suitable will cause federal expenditures, and the provincial government will also contribute another service which will establish appropriate courses for those who are interested in receiving vocational training. There will therefore be a duplication of operation costs. Let us now take shared-costs. The minister said that cost-sharing would no longer exist. He would withdraw section 20 of his Bill C-278 which states:

> The aggregate of the contributions payable by Canada to a province under an agreement entered into pursuant to this section shall not exceed
>
> (a) the lesser of seventy-five per cent.

Therefore, both levels of government will be paying for buildings and installations which may be used to provide vocational training. Two different levels of government will be paying, and when the federal pays, it uses its own inspectors and bureaucrats; the same goes for the provincial government; when they both pay, both use their respective inspectors and bureaucrats.

I wonder who is trying to mislead the public! It is the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. I say he is inconsistent with himself, with his own bill. He makes statements contrary to the content of Bill C-278. He may entangle himself as much as he pleases, but that is the case. Who is misleading the public?

It is not necessary to appear on television programs. The minister misleads the people here, in the house.

He claims there will be no dual administration, dual checking, dual inspection. Well then, if both are paying, which of the two will not check and inspect?

• (11:30 p.m.)

You are both paying, which of the two will not inspect?

The Minister of Manpower and Immigration may say that the Treasury Board and the comptroller will not check and inspect? Why do they pay?

Mr. Chairman, what does the Minister of Manpower and Immigration take us for? He knows very well that when monies are paid out, there will be a complete system of federal inspectors to look into what the federal government is paying for? Inspections will be made. These additional expenditures will be incurred, exactly as the provincial government will be inspecting and checking when the provincial government pays its share for the new facilities, as mentioned in clause 20.

The minister will now tell me that I am the one who is trying to mislead the people? How come then he is at variance with his own bill?

This afternoon, I put the following question to the minister: Do you endorse everything that was said yesterday by your parliamentary secretary when he introduced the bill? Well, this had been prepared by the office and his parliamentary secretary only read the statement in the minister's absence. The minister was absent because he was in the constituency of Lapointe urging the people not to re-elect the boy from Lapointe. Don Quixote wanting to crash through an open door. For a year now I have been saying

that I will not sit here. He was playing Don Quixote in the riding of Lapointe, while his parliamentary secretary was reading a communication prepared by the minister and his officials and approved by the minister. Here is what the parliamentary secretary read and I quote from page 15261, right hand column, of *Hansard* for April 24, 1967:

> For the individual Canadian this bill means that federal services will be available to help him decide what training course will benefit him most, to pay for the course; and to pay him an allowance to maintain an income while training.

If he pays the costs that means an administrative service and prerogatives and besides if the provincial government supplies the education it would mean a duplication in administrative and bureaucratic services. That will make two. It was further added, as reported on page 15262, second column:

> We propose therefore to co-operate with the provinces in paying for research—

But in paying for research, does the minister mean to say that those costs will be repaid without even conducting an investigation, without even knowing whether the province of Manitoba, for instance, has incurred expenses for research in occupational training? Will costs be repaid without investigation, without any control, whereas the provincial government, after having paid the first time, will have conducted its own investigations? The federal government will surely conduct a second investigation, a second check, a second inspection, and the minister has just denied it.

It is the speech made yesterday by his parliamentary secretary, while the minister was speaking about the horse and the fly in the riding of Lapointe. It would have been better for the minister to be in the house to see what was going on when such an important legislation was introduced. The parliamentary secretary repeated many times the following words: the funds that we will pay to the provinces for the training of adults will enable them to repay interest and principal. That means a new administration set-up. That means the federal controller would do exactly the same thing as did the provincial controller. That means that the federal treasury board will do exactly the same as the provincial treasury board woud have done before.

And it is like that everywhere. Double expenses. And that, Mr. Chairman, to be told what? To be told by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, who advocated not so long ago, as he was militating in the unions: Freedom of the unions. Such flabbergasting words one must hear from other people. The individuals are not the ones who will decide what course they will be taking, they will be consulted, I admit, but they will not be the ones to decide, the manpower official will do that, not the individual, no. Oh no. He may show natural dispositions or wish to work in such or such a field, or express his wish to the official if he wants to, but it will be up to the official to make the decision.

Mr. Chairman, what kind of freedom is that? Is that the way the minister always fought for the workers in the past? What will the workers say in the province of Quebec, when they will be told this: You want occupational training, very well, you will not decide about it, it will be up to the bureaucrat or to the official to make the decision.

Do say what you want to do but we shall decide. This is what the minister said hardly ten minutes ago: "Do not bother you workers, even though you may think of going somewhere to work, you have nothing to say about that". The decision shall be taken by an official of the department of manpower. In other words, the bureaucrat shall decide for the worker.

What does this mean, Mr. Chairman? In Russia, when they wish to take a decision in the name of a worker, this can be done; under the communist regime, someone decides where people will work. And let us note, Mr. Chairman, to what extent the minister's intention can be serious.

He was supporting the speech made by his parliamentary secretary (Mr. Munro) yesterday, and he said, as is recorded at pages 15259 and 15260 in the *Hansard* of April 24:

> Since 1949, for instance, over half a million farmers have left Canadian agriculture. Very few of them left with the skills that other industries needed. In our new economy the number of people who will have only one occupation during their lives is very small. But retraining people whose jobs are disappearing is only part of the task.

Whenever a farmer quits his farm, Mr. Chairman, he does not do so on account of incompetency, but because the federal government has not established adequate legislation which would allow him to live on the land.

Instead of preventing the farmer from living on his land and sending him out to take some vocational training to enable him to work in a factory, the government should begin by passing legislation that would enable the farmer to earn a livelihood on his farm.

Farmers abandon their farm and Canada imports always more food, eggs, butter, vegetables. Because farmers are not given the means to live on their farm, we must have imports. And then, it costs twice as much to rehabilitate them at 45 or 50 years of age, to send them to work in a manufacturing plant. They are given only a year's training, and we think they will turn into industrial workers, when they are only trained to work on their farms.

Would it not be more logical to tell them: we shall pass legislation that will enable you to live decently on your farms? Does not the minister think this a more reasonable proposal?

When a farmer has left his farm because he can no longer live on it, the minister will say: "It is not for you to decide where to work." It will be for the manpower official to decide what sort of occupational training course he will follow. Is this freedom?

Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of freedom we want to give the worker. It is all the sadder because it will be imposed upon him by an ex-union leader.

The minister says that reading newspapers is his hobby. I also read the newspapers sometimes. Yesterday, I was reading a statement by the president of the C.N.T.U., Mr. Pepin. I quote:

We have—

Mr. Chairman, this is quite according to the present situation, since the federal government is again going to encroach upon a field that is not his, I mean the field of education. The chairman of the C.N.T.U. said yesterday in Montreal, and I should like to know what the Minister of Manpower and Immigration did to cope with the present situation.

Mr. Pepin said:

We have unsuccessfully demanded complete bilingualism within the Canada Labour Relations Board.

These are not my words, they are the words of the president of the C.N.T.U. in Quebec.

The chairman has not have time to learn French and the new vice-chairman who was appointed also spoke English only. This is additional proof of the total lack of respect by those who administer the country.

Total lack of respect by those who administer the country. The Minister of Manpower and Immigration is among those. If he was still a member of the C.N.T.U., he would say exactly the same thing today. The other day, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Trudeau) said: I have not been minister long enough, I have not had time to change my views. As for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, he has been there long enough to change his views. He no longer speaks as he did before.

And Mr. Pepin added:

The government is satisfied with grand statements of principles without implementing them. It is not true that everybody's rights are equally respected.

• (11:40 p.m.)

What is the minister doing to straighten things out? Mr. Chairman, when the problems of the workers, or the people who need occupational training are being discussed, does the federal government try to slip in, as some newspapers said, like a Trojan horse? We know all about that. Like a Trojan horse, to impose ideas similar to the ones now being forced upon the C.L.R.B.

Mr. Chairman, I have nothing against that bill, against the fact itself; but I do object to the way in which it is being rammed down our throats, without giving the provinces the chance to set up their own system if they so wish, with a fiscal counterpart from Ottawa. Without that, Mr. Chairman, what are we heading for? For a duplication of administrative expenses; I have proved it with excerpts and sections from the self-same Bill No. C-278 which the minister introduced.

The cost of bureaucracy and services, will also be doubled, as well as auditing expenses. Money will be paid out twice. Taxes will be imposed by two governments. People will have to pay for the same thing twice: once to Ottawa and once to Quebec. We would be taxed by two governments, both doing exactly the same thing with our money.

That is where, Mr. Chairman, we are being led not only by this bill, but by this whole legislation which always tends to duplicate services instead of relying on a single department. Will the Minister of Manpower and Immigration not feel able and willing to take everything over so that the administrative and service costs should be paid only once. In Quebec, they could do that, if he cannot.

And since that is the responsibility of the provinces, the provincial governments should be allowed to do it since that comes under their jurisdiction. But no, when the minister runs short of arguments, he acts like a demagogue and here the words is well used.

As a true demagogue. And he leaves every argument unanswered. He keeps repeating as he did earlier: The hon. member is preparing

more television programs and tries to deceive everyone. A worthy argument, indeed. Here is another example of demagoguery: The minister said—I heard him on the television news: Some are saying that confederation is to blame if potatoes do not grow in winter. A blatant example of demagoguery. Will the minister deny that he said that? He certainly said it. I heard him. If the baby has a cold, confederation is to blame, according to the independentists. That is pure demagoguery.

The minister may well hold his head in his hands.

Mr. Béchard: Does the member allow me a question?

Mr. Grégoire: Yes.

Mr. Béchard: Speaking of potatoes, Mr. Chairman, could the hon. member, who was born, raised and is still living in Quebec city, on St-Jean street or elsewhere, even though he represents the riding of Lapointe, tell the house what he, being the city-slicker that he is, proposes in order to improve the lot of farmers?

Mr. Grégoire: Well, Mr. Chairman, I shall answer that question put to me, as you see, by a government member.

It is surely possible to help farmers. The best way to go about improving the lot of farmers, it to go and see them and discuss with them.

And I, Mr. Chairman, have at least taken the trouble to do that. I often meet the farmers in my riding and elsewhere. But when we ask: What reforms are to be made? We hear about marketing, about the setting up of a reasonable price—

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I think that the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Béchard) tried to lead the hon. member into speaking of agriculture. But if we no not want to grow potatoes, we should perhaps come back to manpower matters and restrict ourselves to the bill now under consideration, namely the Adult Occupational Training Act.

Mr. Grégoire: Very well, Mr. Chairman. I hope you will recognize that I have not gone beyond the scope of the bill on my own initiative but because of a question put to me by a colleague of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In order to help him extricate himself from his difficulties, some hon. members have tried to explain to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration the meaning of the word demagogy. That is exactly what the minister is practising. I gave an example, that of the little baby who has a cold on account of confederation. That is demagogy.

That was the answer given by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration during the debate on second reading of the bill. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, that was not an answer at all. The minister merely evaded the question, and said: that is a member who is trying to prepare a television program and to mislead the people.

Who is misleading the people? The bill is there, printed. And it flatly and categorically contradicts what the Minister of Manpower and Immigration said earlier. The minister has been categorically contradicted and misled by his own bill and by the declarations which were made yesterday by his parliamentary secretary and which, he said, he fully supports.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I say once again that while I am in favour of the proposed measures as a whole, I am against the method used. The federal government should hand over to the province of Quebec a fiscal equivalent and Quebec should manage to organize, perhaps according to the principles listed here, at least most of them, its own program of occupational training for adults.

Mr. Chairman, I say on the basis of the bill itself and of the statements made by the parliamentary secretary, which are endorsed by the minister, that if we proceeded thus, we would save large amounts which could be invested to further improve this bill on occupational training for adults, which would be implemented by the provincial governments instead of by the federal government.

There are, Mr. Chairman, a few questions which I should like to put to the minister more specifically about section 2. Does the minister intend—it is indicated in paragraph (c) that:

> —occupational training means any form of instruction other than instruction designed for university credit.

Does the minister intend to define a university credit, because that does not always have the same meaning according to the province and the educational system in force?

Could the minister say, in connection with section 2, what is the amount of his department estimates with respect to the total cost of this legislation, firstly as concerns tuition fees, secondly, allowances, thirdly, capital expenditure and, fourthly, loans.

I presume the minister foresees expenses for the implementation of the legislation he is introducing today. Could he tell us what are his expectations for the whole of Canada and he may also have a figure to quote as far as Quebec is concerned?

Could the minister tell us what these total costs will be and what they will be for Quebec especially? I would appreciate an answer from the minister on these two questions.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I think that this is only tittle-tattle, a kind of statement, and really a good example of a TV program. I think that if you will allow me I should like to answer tomorrow, for some statements are so false, not that I find this so important, but there are still people who take them seriously. So, I should like to take the time necessary to refute at least the fallacies that have been placed in *Hansard*.

[*English*]

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether I could move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again in order to carry out the undertakings that were given with respect to private bills.

Mr. Churchill: Is it the intention to drop this bill then?

Mr. Pickersgill: Oh no; we were just going to report progress, as I understood it.

Mr. Churchill: Well, Mr. Chairman, there was an all party agreement that this bill be passed. The intention was to pass it at eleven o'clock, but certainly it was to be passed tonight. This was allocation of time by agreement. Where are we now? Has the government failed to make arrangements with all those concerned? What is the purpose of having an agreement if it cannot be kept?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I gather that it takes two parties to make an agreement, and perhaps it takes two persons to make a party. One can only do what is humanly possible to do. It is quite evident now that we could not possibly pass the bill by eleven o'clock. Therefore I think my motion should stand.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: I had not understood that it had been agreed to pass the whole bill before eleven o'clock. I thought we were supposed to dispose of it this evening, and that the debate could be extended until one o'clock in the morning; so far as I am concerned, I would have been ready to continue sitting a while longer to make my remarks.

But if the minister needs the whole night to think of the errors mentioned in his statement, we are willing to let him take all the time he needs to find the answer he is not able to give us right now.

An hon. Member: Nonsense. Ridiculous.

[*English*]

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I should like to clear this point up. There is no question whatever of asking for the adjournment of the committee for any other purpose than to carry out certain other undertakings that were made. I did indicate at a time when the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre was temporarily out of the chamber that if we did not complete the bill by a quarter to twelve I would at the first convenient moment make this motion I have now offered to make, to rise and report progress, so that we could deal with a certain number of private bills with which there seems to be unanimous consent to deal.

As far as the government is concerned, Mr. Chairman, I am sure we would be willing to come back to the bill if there was a disposition to dispose of it, or otherwise take it as the first item tomorrow.

• (11:50 p.m.)

Mr. Knowles: We agreed also not to sit past midnight. Let us not sit much beyond midnight.

Mr. Pickersgill: The whole equation cannot be solved; I think I shall have to persist in my motion.

Progress reported.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I think, sir, there was an understanding that an order of the house should be made that the house proceed to the consideration of the following items of business listed as private bills on today's order paper: items Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 8. It is not expected that there will be another opportunity to proceed with private bills in this session. I wonder if that could be so ordered?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Is that so ordered?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order, please. Is it the pleasure of the house that private bills enumerated and listed for consideration in committee of the whole shall be

considered together, pursuant to the provisions of standing order 54(1)?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. S-28, to incorporate Anniversary Life Insurance Company—Mr. Fairweather.

Bill No. S-27, to incorporate Laurier Life Insurance Company—Mr. Cameron (High Park).

Bill No. S-41 respecting La Société des Artisans—Mr. Gendron.

COMMERCIAL SOLIDS PIPE LINE COMPANY

Mr. Ron Basford (Vancouver-Burrard) moved the second reading of Bill No. S-36, to incorporate Commercial Solids Pipe Line Company.

He said: I understand there was some agreement that since this bill, and others, will go to committee and will die at the end of this session in committee, they will be placed on the order paper next session without necessity for the payment of fees and advertising requirements.

Mr. Churchill: Agreed.

Mr. Peters: I understand there is an agreement that this be done but that this recommendation be made in the committee when the committee meets. There are two bills in this category and if they are reintroduced consideration will be given to waiving the advertising requirements and the fees in respect of them.

Mr. Pickersgill: In the absence of the house leader I think that whatever undertakings have been given, and which it is possible to carry out, will be carried out.

Mr. Basford: I take it the undertaking the minister speaks of is that the advertising and filing fees will not be required in the next session. This is, I take it, the undertaking which the leader of the house has made.

Mr. Churchill: Yes, but it is the committee which will decide that.

• 12:00 (midnight)

Mr. Pickersgill: I am not so conversant with the law that I can say that is an undertaking it is possible for me to give, or the

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret).]

house to give at this moment, but I will give my undertaking, on behalf of the house leader, that he will see whatever steps required to be taken, that the government can initiate, are taken to this end.

Mr. Basford: In view of the fact that this bill is going to die in committee I hardly see any point in making a speech on second reading although it is an important bill and means a great deal to the area from which I come.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and referred to the committee on transport and communications.

INTERPROVINCIAL PIPE LINE COMPANY

The house resumed, from June 28, 1966, consideration of the motion of Mr. Wahn for the second reading of Bill S-10, respecting Interprovincial Pipe Line Company.

And on the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Langlois (Mégantic), that the said bill be not now read a second time, but that it be read this day six months hence.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): The question is on the amendment.

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, as I recall it, the last time this amendment was under discussion I had the floor when the hour for private members discussion came to an end. I believe I had some six minutes of speaking time left. In order to expedite the business tonight I will not use those six minutes but allow the house to make a decision on the amendment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): All those in favour of the said amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): All those opposed to the said amendment will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Call in the members.

Mr. Pickersgill: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if there would be agreement to have the vote taken without the ringing of the bells.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, that is an interesting suggestion but there may be members who are waiting to vote one way or another on this bill, and they should be notified accordingly.

Mr. Pickersgill: Could we agree on a relatively limited time for the ringing of the bells?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Call in the members.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Langlois, Mégantic) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Barnett	Lewis
Gilbert	Peters
Howard	Prittie
Knowles	Saltsman—8.

NAYS

Messrs:

Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe)	Legault
Ballard	Lessard
Basford	MacEwan
Batten	Mackasey
Béchard	MacRae
Berger	McLean (Charlotte)
Blouin	McLelland
Boulanger	McWilliam
Cameron (High Park)	Marchand
Cantelon	Noble
Cantin	Olson
Chatterton	Orange
Chatwood	Patterson
Chrétien	Pickersgill
Churchill	Pilon
Clermont	Pugh
Comtois	Rapp
Côté (Nicolet-Yamaska)	Régimbal
Cowan	Reid
Crossman	Ricard
Davis	Rinfret
Deachman	Rochon
Duquet	Roxburgh
Forest	Skoreyko
Forrestall	Smallwood
Gendron	Stafford
Guay	Stanbury
Habel	Starr
Haidasz	Stefanson
Honey	Stewart
Hopkins	Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Horner (The Battlefords)	Tremblay
Hymmen	Trudeau
Keays	Wahn
Lambert	Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Laniel	Yanakis—73.
Leboe	

• (12:10 a.m.)

Mr. Tucker: Mr. Speaker, had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Division

Mr. Wahn: Mr. Speaker, I believe there is general agreement that this bill should be put through all the stages this evening. It has been before the standing committee on several occasions previously, and with the unanimous consent of the house I would ask that the bill be put through committee of the whole.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: By unanimous consent, notwithstanding the provisions of standing orders 102 and 105 I do now leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee of the whole to consider the said bill.

The house in committee on Bill No. S-10, respecting Interprovincial Pipe Line Company—Mr. Wahn—Mr. Batten in the chair.

On clause 1—*Subdivision of capital stock.*

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to make to clause 1. I move that:

Clause 1 of Bill S-10, an act respecting Interprovincial Pipe Line Company is deleted and the following clause substituted therein:

"1. Notwithstanding anything contained in section 3 of chapter 34 of the statutes of 1949 (1st session), as amended by chapter 66 of the statutes of 1952-53,

(a) the capitalization of the company is hereby reduced to one hundred million dollars by cancelling twenty million of its unissued shares, and

(b) each of the issued and remaining unissued shares of the capital stock of the company of the par value of five dollars is hereby subdivided into five shares of the par value of one dollar each, so that the capital stock of the company shall be one hundred million dollars divided into one hundred million shares of the par value of one dollar each."

The purpose of this amendment is to meet objections previously raised to the capitalization which appears in the first sentence of the explanatory notes of the bill, namely 40 million shares, and reduces that capitalization by half.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, in discussing this matter for some period of time and not being convinced that the idea and philosophy of stock splitting is advantageous, we are of the opinion that this company has made some concession in reducing the amount of its stock and establishing it now at 100 million shares of the par value of $1 each. I should like to point out, however, to those who have been interested in this company that an article which appeared on March 21 this year indicated that the company will spend in 1967 the sum of $76 million. So there really is little

relationship between the capitalization and the large amount of stock it has had, and the ability of the company to operate.

Therefore I think the company has been wise in considering the reduction of treasury stock, which it obviously was not going to put out under any circumstances. This company has been before us three times since it was chartered in 1949. I suggest that it and other companies would be well advised to find other methods of handling their rising costs. This company now has stock on the market at $100. I suggest that when this stock split takes place, by the end of next week the stock will probably have gained at least $5 or $6. This of course is not a bad thing for anybody who owns this stock. However, the increased value will be a result of what we are doing, so I feel that in the near future the matter of stock splits should be seriously considered. This practice has now spread to banks, which were considered solid institutions.

• (12:20 a.m.)

Of course this Interprovincial company certainly has an excellent position. I feel, however, the house is soon going to have to give consideration to why a company wants to split its stock, particularly when that stock will rise in value. We should consider why they are willing to go on the market to borrow $70 million in one year. We have now authorized the increase in the company's total capitalization to $100 million, three quarters of which they can borrow on the market in one year.

I know there has been a great deal of concern on the part of some people with regard to this particular bill. I agree with those who say, why pick on Interprovincial? It happens that Interprovincial is before parliament, and I believe that matters that come before parliament have to be considered carefully. The sponsor of the bill and the board of directors of the company have been able to remove what had become an unwieldy treasury issue of stock, with stock being issued but there being no intention of putting this stock out to raise money which the company may need for expansion. It seems to me that this has eliminated one of the things to which I took objection. I believe, however, the company would be poorly advised to come back within the next four or five years requesting an additional stock split because I think we might not be as lenient the next time.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

[Mr. Peters.]

Clause 2 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

RAINBOW PIPE LINE CORPORATION

Mr. R. J. Orange (Northwest Territories) moved the second reading of Bill S-52, to incorporate Rainbow Pipe Line Corporation.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): So far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, this bill is asking this house to grant an open hunting licence, as I would call it and as it has been called by others in the oil industry, since the company has not established any particular plan for any pipe line.

This bill presumably authorizes at some time or other the construction of a pipe line to connect with the provincial pipe line now under construction in the Rainbow Lake area of northwestern Alberta. However, under this proposal the pipe line could be extended into the Northwest Territories and would therefore come under the jurisdiction of this parliament and the National Energy Board.

Because of the complexities and peculiar nature of oil exploration and development in this particular area, there is great fear that once the pipe line was built by this corporation, which is actually owned by a consortium of major oil companies, any independents would be precluded from oil development in the Northwest Territories. This is something to which I do not think we should bar the door.

It is true that this extensive oil development in western Canada has resulted from the operations of the major oil companies. They have done by far the biggest development; but we should not shut out the independents. There is another independent pipe line company which could also reach into this area.

There is no evidence on record, as far as I can ascertain, that gives us sufficient information to consider this bill and accept it; therefore it must go to committee. I have sufficient doubt about this proposal at this time that I am not prepared to let the bill go through on the present basis without a clearer indication from the proposers of what they intend to do. This is almost the granting of a carte blanche to a company owned by major oil concerns under foreign ownership to operate into the Northwest Territories, and perhaps even into the Yukon.

In so far as their operations in the province of Alberta are concerned, the administration there has had long experience in the handling of oil exploration and development and can well take care of itself. But with regard to the Northwest Territories and the Yukon, Mr. Speaker, I think it behooves us to be very careful. Personally I can only accept second reading of this bill at this time, on division.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I am not in disagreement with what the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) has said, but this bill has been on the order paper for some time and it should go to committee. Because of other factors that entered into the matter the bill has only now been proceeded with.

There has been some suggestion that the bill be again introduced, if the sponsors of the bill so wish, in the hope that there will be agreement that the expenses of advertising and of introducing the bill be waived.

• (12:30 a.m.)

Mr. Orange: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the hon. member speaks now the debate will be closed.

Mr. Reg Cantelon (Kindersley): I wish to add my remarks to those of the hon. member for Edmonton West and other speakers who have spoken on this matter. It seems to me that the fair thing to do would be to treat this bill as we treated Bill No. S-36. I wish to add my voice to what has already been said.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): As a previous speaker said, it is only fair that this bill be dealt with as the previous bill was dealt with. We do not require that all that has taken place to bring the bill this far be repeated, yet there ought to be further consideration, and accordingly I concur with statements made by speakers on this side of the house.

An hon. Member: Question?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the house ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion for second reading?

Mr. Lambert: On division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the standing committee on transport and communications.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: This disposes of the private members business.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, as a participant in the late show may I suggest that that show be put off until another night?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Pennell: Mr. Speaker, perhaps hon. members would be interested in tomorrow's business—I beg your pardon, in today's business. We propose to resume debate on Bill No. C-278 respecting the occupational training of adults, following that with Bill C-280, second reading of the act to amend the Income Tax Act; then we would revert to motions to deal with the second report of the standing committee on procedure, and I would ask, by leave, that an order go to that effect. That would be followed by interim supply.

Mr. Knowles: The understanding was that interim supply would come earlier in the program, ahead of the motion for the adoption of the procedure committee's report.

Mr. Churchill: That was the arrangement at the meeting of the house leaders this morning. Interim supply should precede the discussion of the rules.

Mr. Pennell: If that was the understanding, I have no hesitation in accepting the proposal of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

On motion of Mr. Pickersgill the house adjourned at 12.35 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, April 26, 1967

The house met at 11 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF LEADER OF UNITED KINGDOM LIBERAL PARTY

Mr. Speaker: May I be permitted to bring to the attention of hon. members the presence in the Speaker's gallery of a distinguished visitor, Right Hon. Jeremy Thorpe, leader of the Liberal party in the United Kingdom.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Seventh report of standing committee on northern affairs and national resources—Mr. Badanai.

Ninth report of standing committee on industry, research and energy development—Mr. Cashin.

Twenty fifth and twenty sixth reports of standing committee on finance, trade and economic affairs—Mr. Laflamme.

Twelfth report of standing committee on broadcasting, films and assistance to the arts—Mr. Stanbury.

[*Translation*]

Sixth report of the standing committee on Indian affairs, human rights and citizenship and immigration—Mr. Duquet.

[*English*]

DRUGS

TABLING OF MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. H. C. Harley (Halton): Mr. Speaker, by leave of the house I wish to table the minutes of proceedings of the special committee on drug costs and prices referred to in the second and final report of the committee presented to the house on April 3.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member leave to table these documents?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

TRADE

RENEWAL OF MOST FAVOURED NATION AGREEMENT WITH BULGARIA

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the house that we have reached agreement with the People's Republic of Bulgaria to renew the most favoured nation trade agreement between our two countries. The appropriate documents will be signed later today.

Mr. Dimitar Kostov, chairman of the Bulgarian trade delegation, is in Ottawa to sign on behalf of his government the agreement which brings to a successful conclusion talks I opened with the Bulgarian trade minister, Mr. Budinov, in Sofia last September. The negotiations carried forward the friendly spirit of co-operation which has been a feature of our trade relations with Bulgaria in recent years.

Under the terms of the agreement Bulgaria has undertaken to purchase a minimum of 7.4 million bushels of wheat during the next three years with an option on a further 3.7 million bushels subject to the ability of the Canadian Wheat Board to supply. The basic quantity together with the additional option would represent about $24 million of trade at current prices. Purchases of wheat will be facilitated by the extension of credit arrangements under the Export Credits Insurance Act providing for payment over three years.

• (11:10 a.m.)

The exchange of letters concerning the expansion and diversification of trade between Canada and Bulgaria will express the interest of both contracting parties in further developing trade between our two countries. Bulgaria undertakes to give first consideration to Canada as a competitive source of supply for a number of goods other than wheat for which Canada has demonstrated export performance. The letter also indicates that within the framework of the laws and regulations it should be possible for Bulgaria to expand its exports to Canada.

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS, APPEAL COURT, ETC.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (for the Secretary of State) moved for leave to introduce Bill No.

S-59 (from the Senate) to amend the Canadian Citizenship Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

FEDERAL AID TO PROVINCES, 1945 AND 1965

Question No. 2,276—**Mr. Mather:**

1. What was the amount, in dollars, of federal aid to provinces, municipalities and cities in 1945 and in 1965?

2. How many federal departments and/or agencies administered such funds in 1945 and in 1965?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): 1. Federal aid to provinces, municipalities and cities in 1945-46 amounted to $164.2 million, and in 1965-66 to $1,721.5 million.

2. The federal departments and agencies administering such aid numbered 9 in 1945-46, and 17 in 1965-66.

FERRY SERVICE RATES, BORDEN-CAPE TORMENTINE

Question No. 2,434—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. Is it still the intention of the government that hearings be held by the Canadian Maritime Commission into the rates charged on the Borden-Cape Tormentine ferry service?

2. If so, when are such hearings to be commenced?

3. What groups or individuals have indicated a desire to appear before the commission?

4. Did the government of Prince Edward Island protest the increase in rates and, if so, on what date?

5. Has the government of Prince Edward Island proposed changes in the management and operation of the ferry service?

6. If so, when were such changes suggested?

7. Has the government of Prince Edward Island requested a withdrawal of the Canadian National Railways from the operation of the ferry service?

8. If such suggestions and requests were made, what is the date of the reply to same?

9. What is the nature of the reply given?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Yes.

2. Under discussion between federal and provincial government officials. Decision will be announced in due course.

3. Maritime Transportation Commission.

4. Yes, May 10, 1966.

5. Yes.

6. In letters from premier of Prince Edward Island to Prime Minister Sept. 6, Sept. 12, 1966.

7. Yes.

8. Sept. 22, 1966.

9. Matter referred to federal Ministers of Transport and Labour for consideration.

WRITTEN QUESTIONS AND MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Question No. 2,694—**Mr. Knowles:**

With reference to the answer to question No. 2,921, on pages 12882-12884 of *Hansard* for March 29, 1965, has the Department of the Secretary of State statistics to bring the information given at that time up to date, including the session of 1964-1965, the session of 1965, and the present session?

Mr. M. A. Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): The following brings the statistics up to date on questions and motions for the production of papers.

Year	Session No.	Parliament No.	No. of sittings	No. of written questions	Starred questions	No. of motions for papers
1964-65	2nd	26th	248	3,063	319	386
1965	3rd	26th	53	876	60	109

Insofar as the present session is concerned:

2,922 questions have appeared on the order paper and 2,802 have been answered.

232 starred questions have appeared on the order paper and 222 have been answered.

369 orders for returns have been passed and 352 have been tabled.

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO PROVINCIAL CENTENNIAL PROJECTS

Question No. 2,765—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. What is the total contribution of the government of Canada towards the construction of the centennial project of Prince Edward Island, namely, the provincial administrative building formerly designated as the Shaw centre?

2. What is the total contribution of the government to the construction of the New Brunswick centennial project, the provincial office building in Fredericton?

3. What has been the contribution of the dominion government towards similar centennial projects in each of the other provinces?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the centennial commission as follows: 1. Nil.

2. $2.5 million.

3. The centennial commission is contributing toward the construction of similar projects, i.e. confederation memorial projects, in the other provinces as follows: Newfoundland, $2.5 million; Prince Edward Island, $2.8 million; Nova Scotia, $2.5 million; Quebec, $2.8 million; Ontario, $2.5 million; Manitoba, $2.5 million; Saskatchewan, $2.5 million; Alberta, $2.5 million; British Columbia, $2.5 million; Yukon, $250,000; Northwest Territories, $250,000.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND FARM CREDIT LOANS, QUEBEC AND ONTARIO

Question No. 2,780—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. How many loans were granted by the industrial development bank in the province of Quebec and in the province of Ontario during the years 1963, 1964, 1965 and 1966?

2. How many applications for loans did the farm credit corporation receive from the provinces of Quebec and Ontario during the years 1964, 1965 and 1966?

3. How many of these applications for loans were granted by the corporation during those same years?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Departments of Finance and Agriculture as follows: 1. As indicated on page 12 of the annual report of the Industrial Development Bank, the following number of loans was made by the bank in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario in the fiscal years ended September 30, 1963, 1964, 1965 and 1966.

	1963	1964	1965	1966
Quebec	395	439	485	450
Ontario	676	675	684	752

2. Fiscal Year

	Quebec	Ontario
1964-65	1908	2591
1965-66	1636	2495
1966-67	1979	2280

3. Fiscal Year

	Quebec	Ontario
1964-65	1354	2131
1965-66	1140	2210
1966-67	1522	2042

Questions

EGG STABILIZATION PAYMENTS

Question No. 2,783—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. In the last five years, by provinces (a) how many egg producers received payments from the agricultural stabilization board (b) how much was paid to these egg producers?

2. In what year was the minimum shipment requirement of eggs established?

3. In each of the last five years, by provinces, how many egg producers shipped between (a) 500 and 4,000 dozen per year (b) 500 and 10,000 dozen per year (c) over 10,000 dozen per year?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): 1. (a) and (b) During the past five years deficiency payments were made to egg producers in the years ending September 30, 1962, 1964 and 1965. No payments were necessary in the years 1963 and 1966.

Listed below are tables outlining the number of producers and payments made, by provinces.

October 1, 1961 to September 30, 1962.

	No. producers	Payments
Nfld.	15	$ 579.70
P.E.I.	911	11,653.47
N.S.	253	5,976.38
N.B.	116	2,745.84
Que.	3,370	69,446.16
Ont.	18,020	375,056.17
Man.	4,409	60,322.97
Sask.	2,855	19,710.05
Alta.	5,644	59,417.04
B.C.	863	27,692.51
Canada	36,456	$632,600.29

October 1, 1963 to September 30, 1964.

	No. Producers	Payments
Nfld.	17	$ 1,246.64
P.E.I.	635	19,065.40
N.S.	176	10,228.16
N.B.	97	6,275.92
Que.	2,034	98,938.92
Ont.	12,383	563,786.18
Man.	3,098	102,710.54
Sask.	1,695	28,847.46
Alta.	3,483	84,721.64
B.C.	599	41,857.12
Canada	24,217	$957,677.98

October 1, 1964 to September 30, 1965.

	No. Producers	Payments
Nfld.	39	6,364.42
P.E.I.	682	45,131.78
N.S.	172	22,546.46
N.B.	154	20,804.27
Que.	2,296	247,385.61
Ont.	11,802	1,119,118.27
Man.	2,679	207,129.36
Sask.	1,158	50,254.98
Alta.	3,063	168,008.31
B.C.	538	83,311.47
Canada	22,583	$1,970,054.93

Questions

2. In 1965/66 when adjustments were made respecting minimum and maximum shipments eligible for deficiency payment.

3. Data about shipments by producers only available in years deficiency payments made. Since deficiency payments have not been made yet in years where eligibility extended to more than 4,000 dozen shipped, data are not available to segregate numbers of producers shipping in excess of 4,000 dozen but not in excess of 10,000 dozen.

The following data set out the number of producers receiving payment for shipments of (a) 500 to 3,999 dozen, and (b) 4,000 dozen or over, and (c) payments to producers in total for both categories.

Year ending September 30, 1962.

	500-3999 doz.	4,000 doz. & over	Total payment both categories
Nfld.	1	14	579.70
P.E.I.	634	49	11,026.40
N.S.	72	120	5,823.30
N.B.	40	48	2,686.24
Que.	1,754	936	67,680.44
Ont.	11,151	4,095	367,691.68
Man.	2,320	550	56,929.45
Sask.	983	105	16,497.76
Alta.	2,741	379	53,749.74
B.C.	212	586	27,513.87
Canada	19,908	6,882	$610,178.58

Year ending September 30, 1964.

Nfld.	2	15	1,246.64
P.E.I.	441	65	18,326.78
N.S.	41	108	10,092.84
N.B.	26	65	6,255.66
Que.	831	802	97,375.68
Ont.	7,436	3,415	555,178.42
Man.	1,512	633	98,098.34
Sask.	623	114	24,979.14
Alta.	1,724	352	77,814.02
B.C.	114	462	41,727.56
Canada	12,750	6,031	$931,095.08

Year ending September 30, 1965.

Nfld.	6	33	6,364.42
P.E.I.	481	66	43,601.42
N.S.	44	112	22,347.94
N.B.	52	93	20,717.67
Que.	1,000	963	243,611.27
Ont.	7,240	3,115	1,102,748.49
Man.	1,297	666	200,181.28
Sask.	439	121	45,199.18
Alta.	1,566	374	156,984.62
B.C.	76	442	83,077.44
Canada	12,201	5,985	$1,924,833.73

[Mr. Greene.]

C.B.C. NEWS REPORTS BY JOSEPH SCHLESINGER

Question No. 2,786—**Mr. Webb:**

1. Is Joseph Schlesinger a full time employee of the C.B.C.?

2. Reporting on the C.B.C. television news at 11 p.m. on February 16 on Prime Minister Wilson's return from Bonn, did Joseph Schlesinger report from London or Toronto?

3. Has the C.B.C. been putting on national newscasts featuring Mr. Schlesinger, purporting to be on the scene reports from Europe, actually delivered in Toronto and, if so, why are the viewers being misled into believing that he is abroad?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the C.B.C. as follows: 1. Yes.

2. Mr. Schlesinger reported from Toronto on February 16.

3. All reports made by Mr. Schlesinger on the national T.V. news have originated in Toronto. No attempt has been made to suggest overseas origination.

HIPPOLYTE LAFONTAINE TUNNEL—CANADIAN FLAG AT OPENING

Question No. 2,788—**Mr. Isabelle:**

Where was the Canadian flag placed during the ceremony for the opening of the Louis-Hippolyte Lafontaine tunnel?

[*Translation*]

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): This ceremony was not arranged by the government of Canada.

[*English*]

*APPLICATIONS FOR DISCHARGE, R.C.A.F. PILOT INSTRUCTORS

Question No. 2,793—**Mr. Pascoe:**

1. How many R.C.A.F. pilot instructors (a) at Moose Jaw (b) at Portage, have applied for discharge from the R.C.A.F. since January 1, 1967?

2. How many have received discharges since January 1, 1967?

3. In the case of those who have not received discharges, for what reasons have discharges been withheld?

4. Are R.C.A.F. personnel allowed discharge on application following six months' notice and, if not, what is the present policy and since when has it been in effect?

5. How many R.C.A.F. personnel of all ranks (a) at Moose Jaw (b) at Portage, have applied for discharge since January 1, 1967 and, how many have been granted and how many refused?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): The answer to part 1 (a) is 11, and to part 1 (b), three.

2. From CFB Moose Jaw, 4, from CFB Portage, nil.

3. Presuming this refers to those pilot instructors who have applied for discharge since January 1, 1967, a six month notice of intention for voluntary release is required in the absence of serious or compassionate reasons.

4. Yes, when the following obligations have been fulfilled: i. R.C.A.F. pilots holding a permanent commission must, by release date, have served for five years since attaining wings standard. This policy has been in effect since August 29, 1966.

ii. R.C.A.F. navigators holding a permanent commission must, by release date, have served for five years since attaining wings standard. This policy has been in effect since January 20, 1967.

iii. All R.C.A.F. officers must, by date of release, have fulfilled the various obligatory periods of service associated with subsidized undergraduate ROTP training or subsidized postgraduate training as provided for in existing orders and agreed to by contract previous to commencement of such training.

5. In addition to personnel listed in part 1, 6 men and 1 officer from CFB Moose Jaw and 2 men from CFB Portage have applied for release since January 1, 1967. All requests have been approved within the bounds of policy in part 4.

PAROLE BOARD REGIONAL OFFICE, NEWFOUNDLAND

Question No. 2,800—**Mr. Tucker:**

Has the government of Canada any plans to open a regional office of the National Parole Board of Canada in the province of Newfoundland and, if so, when and where?

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): The government of Canada plans to open a district office of the National Parole Board of Canada in St. John's, Newfoundland, on June 1, 1967.

The officer in charge of the district office will report to the regional representative of the National Parole Board, Halifax, N.S.

RELOCATION OF RAILWAY LINE, OTTAWA

Question No. 2,832—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

1. Has (a) the Minister of Public Works (b) the national capital commission, given study to the report of C. C. Parker and Associates Limited regarding the relocation of the C.N.R. Beachburg line in the national capital?

2. If so, what are their opinions with respect to the recommendations of the said report?

3. Has (a) the Minister of Public Works (b) the national capital commission, formulated any plan for the relocation of this railway line in a location which would avoid the disadvantages (i) of the existing location (ii) of the location proposed in the said report?

4. If so, what is such plan?

5. If not, what consideration is now being given to the problem and by whom?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): 1. (a) Yes; (b) yes.

2. While the report of C. C. Parker and Associates made no specific recommendation for an alternative to the Beachburg subdivision, it put forward for consideration an alternative route for the part of the Beachburg subdivision between Wass and Hurdman. The commission believes that the alternative route probably would produce some of the same objections as those arising from the present location.

3. No.

4. See answer to part 3.

5. The report of the Beachburg subdivision by C. C. Parker and Associates Limited was prepared for the city of Ottawa, with 50 per cent of the cost being borne by the N.C.C. Recently the N.C.C. agreed to assist the city in a further study of an alternative mentioned in the Parker report. It is expected that the N.C.C. will be advised by the city if the city decides to adopt this alternative route.

GUEST HOUSE FOR FOREIGN VISITORS, OTTAWA

Question No. 2,845—**Mr. Rapp:**

1. Under what authority was the guest house for distinguished foreign citizens visiting Ottawa purchased?

2. Was there an order in council passed and, if so, when?

3. What is the cost to date of said house and, in particular what was (a) the purchase price thereof (b) the cost of repairs and additions made since purchase (c) the cost of furniture, equipment and other furnishings?

4. What salary and allowances are paid to the manager of this house, and what public and private positions has this person held in the past ten years?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Department of Public Works, the Prime Minister's and Privy Council offices as follows: 1. Treasury Board minute 652668 of March 24, 1966.

2. No.

3. (a) $152,000; (b) $92,544.72; (c) $90,594.76.

4. The operational management of the guest house has been added to the duties of the director of administration Privy Council office who has occupied this position since 1 June, 1964. Immediately prior to joining the Privy Council office staff this officer held the position of administrative attaché and consul at the Canadian Embassy, Washington, and has occupied a number of similar positions with the Department of External Affairs at home and abroad since August 1946.

REFUSAL OF ENTRY TO CZECH WIFE OF CANADIAN

Question No. 2,853—**Mr. MacEwan:**

1. Has the Minister of Manpower and Immigration refused entry into Canada of Mrs. John Clarke (nee Vlasta Malenkova) who was recently married to a Canadian in Czechoslovakia?

2. If so, on what grounds?

3. Is an investigation taking place into the circumstances of the marriage and the part played in bringing about the marriage by one Eric Knapp of Toronto?

Mr. J. C. Munro (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. Yes.

2. Mrs. Clarke's admission was refused on the grounds that the marriage had been contracted strictly for the purpose of circumventing Canadian immigration regulations in order to gain entry into Canada.

3. An examination of all the circumstances is being made.

TESTS OF HOVERCRAFT

Question No. 2,865—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. Did the Department of Transport recently carry out tests with a Bell SK-5 Hovercraft?

2. If so, where were the tests held, and during what period of time?

3. What was the evaluation of the tests in these areas (a) simulated ship-to-shore cargo and personnel movements (b) search and rescue tasks (c) marine firefighting (d) patrol and surveillance of marine traffic (e) other functions routine to the coast guard?

4. What was the cost of the tests for (a) rental of a Hovercraft (b) fuel (c) other?

5. Is it proposed to use Hovercraft in the Canadian coast guard operations?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Yes.

2. In the eastern end of lake Ontario, the bay of Quinte, the St. Lawrence river to Prescott. Between 24th October and 20th November.

[Miss LaMarsh.]

3. (a) Not evaluated in the role of a ship-borne tender for ship to shore movement. (b) Very good potential due to ability to reach scene of rescue at high speed and seaworthiness on water. (c) Satisfactory capability to carry equipment with the advantage of being able to reach scene of fires quickly. (d) Good capability for same reason as (b) above. (e) Useful capability for servicing and support of aids to navigation. Trials limited by configuration of test craft which was designed for passenger rather than load carrying.

4. (a) Craft chartered for an inclusive sum of U.S. $18,000 covering fuel, stores, spares, crew and maintenance, as well as use of craft. (b) N.A. (c) U.S. $1,975 to modify side decks to suit search and rescue operations.

5. Decision awaiting completion of operating and maintenance cost studies.

PENSION COMMISSION SURVEY OF DIEPPE RAID SURVIVORS

Question No. 2,867—**Mr. Lambert:**

1. Has any consideration been given by the Department of Veterans Affairs to a survey at any early date of the present physical condition of Canadian W.W. II ex-servicemen who were prisoners of war following the Dieppe raid, so as to ascertain as was done recently in the case of Canadian Hong Kong prisoners of war, whether the treatment received and privation during detention has aggravated or accelerated physical ailments or infirmities?

2. If so, what action is to be taken and when?

3. Will similar consideration be given to all remaining Canadian prisoners of war of World War II?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): 1. Yes, such consideration has been given by the Canadian Pension Commission.

2. It was decided not to conduct such a survey because no unusual difficulty has been experienced in the award of appropriate disability pensions to these men.

3. This question has already been considered, but no action to conduct a survey similar to that undertaken in the case of Hong Kong veterans is contemplated for the same reason as mentioned in part 2.

MAIL CONTRACT, R.R. 4, MONCTON, N.B.

Question No. 2,878—**Mr. Fairweather:**

Will a mail carrier contract for Moncton rural route No. 4, New Brunswick, be advertised for tender in view of the fact that Irishtown post office is to be closed and its patrons and those of Irishtown rural route No. 2 are to be served by an extension of Moncton rural route No. 4?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Postmaster General): No, the contractor on Moncton rural route No. 4 will have his payment increased pro rata in accordance with the terms of his contract to serve the additional mileage and boxholders.

CONSULTATIONS RESPECTING PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD RULES AND REGULATIONS

Question No. 2,880—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

1. Were any discussions or consultations held by the public service staff relations board with staff associations or other representatives of the employees in the public service before the promulgation of the P.S.S.R.B. regulations and rules of procedure?

2. If so (a) with whom were such discussions or consultations held (b) what, in detail, was the nature of the discussions or consultations?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the public service staff relations board as follows:

1. Yes.

2. (a) Consultations took place with representatives of the staff associations and labour bodies which appeared before the special joint committee. With respect to the consultations concerning the regulations appearing in the *Canada Gazette* of April 12, 1967, no record was kept of the persons who attended a meeting with the chairman and vice chairman of the board, but at a subsequent meeting such a list was kept. Representatives of substantially the same organizations attended both meetings. The organizations represented at the second meeting are as follows: Association of Postal Officers; Canadian Air Traffic Controllers Association; Canadian Labour Congress; Canadian Merchant Service Guild; Canadian Postmasters Association; Canadian Union of Postal Workers; Canadian Union of Public Employees; Confederation of National Trade Unions; Council of Union Employees, Canadian Government Printing Bureau; International Association of Machinists; International Printing Pressmen and Assistants Union of North America; International Typographical Union; Letter Carriers Union of Canada; Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada; Public Service Alliance of Canada.

(b) The procedure followed was as follows. The draft regulations referred to in (a), in English as well as in French, were forwarded either by messenger or by mail to those staff associations and labour bodies which had appeared before the special joint committee. The organizations were then asked to meet with the chairman and vice chairman. At the end of the meeting organizations were asked to submit any further views they had in writing. None did so. The chairman reported to the board on the consultations and subsequently the board approved the regulations.

PURCHASE OF CALGARY AIRPORT

Question No. 2,882—**Mr. Nugent:**

1. What was the price paid by the federal government to the city of Calgary for the purchase of Calgary airport?

2. What were the terms of the purchase?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. $2,407,000.

2. Unconditional for cash including the acquisition of lands, buildings, structures, chattels and benefit of all leases, licences and agreements granted by the city. Employees of the city who are qualified were offered employment with the department at substantially the same salary or wages as they received from the city.

LIST OF TITLE "CANADIAN FORCES"

Question No. 2,888—**Mr. McCleave:**

Has the Department of National Defence issued regulations and other documents incorporating in the titles to such the words "Canadian Forces" in place of "Royal Canadian Navy", "Canadian Army", "Royal Canadian Air Force" in (a) 1966 (b) 1967 (c) recent years prior to 1966?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Associate Minister of National Defence): The National Defence Act, as enacted in 1950 and still in effect, provides in section 15 that "the Canadian Forces are the naval, army and air forces of Her Majesty raised by Canada and consist of three services, namely the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force." Accordingly, when it has been desired to refer to the three services collectively the description authorized by section 15 of the National Defence Act, i.e. "the Canadian Forces" has been employed.

FEDERAL PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF PROVINCIAL TAXES

Question No. 2,893—**Mr. Grégoire:**

1. What amounts were paid to each province in lieu of provincial taxes under section 5 of the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Revision Act, 1964, chapter 26, statutes of Canada, 1964-65?

2. When were those amounts paid?

Questions

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): 1. Newfoundland, $398,690; Ontario, $1,156,697; Prince Edward Island, $2,618; Manitoba, $2,535; Nova Scotia, $194,032; Saskatchewan, $9,654; New Brunswick, $15,412; Alberta, $10,727; Quebec, $1,657,799; British Columbia, $356,564.

2. February 10, 1965.

*BREAKWATER CONSTRUCTION, PORT McNEILL, B.C.

Question No. 2,898—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

Will the government give reconsideration to its decision not to proceed this year with construction of a much needed and overdue breakwater at Port McNeill, British Columbia?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): The answer is that this matter is under consideration at the present time.

QUEBEC—PROCEDURE FOR DEALING WITH OTHER GOVERNMENTS

Question No. 2,904—**Mr. Goyer:**

To the knowledge of the government, has the legislature of the province of Quebec established an administrative procedure for dealing with other governments and, if so, what is the policy of the government toward it?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): The government is aware that Bill 33 entitled "An act to amend the federal-provincial affairs department act and certain related acts" was adopted by the Quebec legislature on April 13, 1967. In answer to questions raised in this house at the time when that bill was read for the first time in the Quebec legislature, I stated on behalf of the government, that to the extent that this legislation purported to set up the administrative machinery which the Quebec government felt it required for the performance of the functions assigned to its competence, this was a matter for the Quebec government to decide.

Since then, however, the government has had occasion to see the legislation in question, and to follow the debates on it in the Quebec legislature. Due note has been taken of statements made on that occasion that the sole purpose of this legislation was to effect an internal transfer and reorganization of existing administrative functions and responsibilities. However, a certain ambiguity of wording in parts of the legislation has resulted in interpretations by the press and elsewhere as possibly having the effect of entrusting this new department with responsibilities in the external field such as for relations between Quebec and foreign countries, and for the negotiation of agreements with foreign governments or bodies.

There should be no ground for any such misunderstanding.

The constitutional position in Canada with respect to the division of powers as between the federal and provincial governments clearly gives the federal government exclusive responsibility for the conduct of the country's external affairs. This cannot be altered by legislation adopted by a provincial legislature. Quebec legislation cannot confer upon the government of Quebec any of the powers which are now assigned exclusively by the constitution to the federal government for the conduct of Canada's relations with foreign countries and for the negotiation and conclusion of agreements with these countries in all fields. The government of Quebec is of course aware of these constitutional requirements in the field of external affairs and there is no reason to believe that the manner in which the new Quebec department will carry out the functions assigned to it by this bill will not be fully consistent with the constitutional position in Canada.

With regard to Quebec provincial agents abroad, whose responsibility is assigned by this new legislation to the department of intergovernmental affairs, it is a well known fact that provincial agencies abroad—which have existed for many years—do not form part of the Canadian diplomatic and consular establishment in foreign countries. Thus they are not empowered to exercise abroad any of the functions which, within our constitutional framework and in accordance with international practice, it is the exclusive responsibility of Canadian diplomatic and consular missions abroad to perform on behalf of all of Canada. Consequently the role of these agencies does not consist in transacting with foreign governmental authorities official business affecting Canada or any part thereof in any field unless agreement has been reached beforehand through diplomatic channels between the Canadian government and the foreign government concerned on the matters to be transacted with provincial authorities and the manner in which this is to be done.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

WHARF EXTENSION, BEACH POINT, P.E.I.

Question No. 2,908—**Mr. McQuaid:**

1. Was a contract awarded in 1966 for the construction of an extension to the wharf at Beach Point in King's county, Prince Edward Island?

2. If so, to whom was the contract awarded?

3. Was the contrat for this work later cancelled and, if so, for what reason?

4. Is it proposed to call for another contract in the immediate future?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): 1. Yes.

2. Norman N. MacLean, Murray River, P.E.I.

3. No.

4. No.

NEW BRUNSWICK SECTION, NORTHUMBERLAND CAUSEWAY

Question No. 2,920—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. On what date did tenders close for the New Brunswick causeway section of the Northumberland crossing?

2. What firms or individuals submitted tenders and what was the amount of each tender?

3. Why has a contract not been awarded?

4. When is it intended to award a contract?

5. What is the anticipated completion date of the Northumberland crossing?

6. Has the delay in awarding this contract necessitated a change in the anticipated completion date and, if so, what is the extent of such delay?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): 1. March 30, 1967.

2. Inspiration Limited, Dumex (Canada) Limitée Société Dumex, Simard-Beaudry Inc. $42,980,000.00; Kiewit-Northern-Mannix, $43,391,060.00; The Foundation Company of Canada Limited and Miron Company Limited, $50,952,896.85; Causeway Constructors, $53,035,700.00.

3. As reported on April 21, 1967, at page 15179 of *House of Commons Debates*, the tenders are being studied and analysed and this has not been completed.

4. Decisions cannot be made or anticipated prior to the completion of the study and analysis.

5. No attempt to state a completion date is being made. As has been previously stated in the house, on a project of this size and complexity, at this stage it is impractical to forecast a completion date.

6. There has been no delay. As stated on April 21, 1967, it may well be that when the analysis and study have been completed some adjustments or modifications may prove desirable. The rate of construction might be influenced by such adjustments or modifications, but this cannot be anticipated now.

[*Translation*]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call notices of motions Nos. 223 and 229?

I ask, sir, that the remaining notices of motions be allowed to stand.

[*English*]

FEDERAL WITHDRAWAL FROM VOCATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAM

Motion No. 223—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this house a copy of all correspondence between the provincial governments and the federal government in respect to the decision of the federal government to withdraw from the technical vocational training program.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to accept the question in its present form since we have never withdrawn from occupational training as implied by the question. The agreements came to an end, normally, on March 31 last without any withdrawal on the part of the government, and we are studying, at the present time, a new bill concerning occupational education.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Is the motion dropped or transferred for debate?

Mr. Orlikow: I wonder if the minister would agree to table the correspondence which has taken place as a result of the decision? I know the province of Manitoba is going to agree to the tabling in its area.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the motion dropped?

Mr. Orlikow: No.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants to redraft the motion and not imply that we have withdrawn from vocational training, I will agree to it.

Mr. Orlikow: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

Inquiries of the Ministry

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAIT CROSSING

Motion No. 229—**Mr. MacDonald (Prince):**

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this house copies of all charts, maps, plans, specifications, diagrams and surveys produced by Northumberland consultants for the Department of Public Works in connection with the construction of the Northumberland strait crossing and an analysis of same by the department as well as regulations, tenders and contracts issued by the department and all communications exchanged between the government of Canada and its departments and the government of Prince Edward Island and its departments relative to the proposed construction of the Northumberland strait crossing.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, it will be seen that this motion asks for the production of all charts, maps, plans, specifications, diagrams and surveys produced by Northumberland consultants for the Department of Public Works in connection with the construction of the Northumberland strait crossing, and for analyses of the same by the department. Then it asks for regulations, tenders and contracts issued by the department. Third, it asks for communications exchanged between the government of Canada and the government of Prince Edward Island.

The materials produced by Northumberland consultants for the department and the studies and analyses of the same by the department are departmental papers which it has not been the custom to produce, and they are privileged. However, the pre-tender information and the tender documents issued by the department can be produced. Similarly the communications exchanged between the government of Canada and its departments and the government of Prince Edward Island and its departments relative to the proposed crossing can be produced subject, of course, to having the consent of the province—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In the absence of the hon. member this motion will be allowed to stand.

Motion stands.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

INQUIRY AS TO APPOINTMENTS TO FILL VACANCIES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of the many months that have elapsed and the uncertainty and uneasiness which have been caused, will the Prime Minister soon name a president of the C.B.C. to replace Mr. Ouimet, who has announced his desire to retire?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, one reason for the delay has been the delay in getting the legislation before parliament and through parliament. There is a relationship between these two things but I do hope to be in a position to make an appointment before long. If the legislation has not been passed then the appointment will be to the existing Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, but naturally in the eyes of those being approached for an appointment of this kind there is a relationship between that appointment and what happens if and when the legislation gets through parliament.

Mr. Starr: As a supplementary question I want to ask the Prime Minister whether he will take action to fill the other top administrative posts that are now unoccupied in the administration of the corporation and which are causing serious dislocation.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend will bring to my attention some specific details of administrative posts which are vacant I shall be glad to look into the matter. Perhaps he himself might qualify for one of them.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—SUGGESTED PROTEST AGAINST ESCALATION OF WAR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister. The other day I asked the Prime Minister whether the government had protested or expressed regret concerning the dangerous escalation of the war in Viet Nam by United States bombing inside the territory of Haiphong. The right hon. gentleman at that time said the government had not made any protest and that he would not think of doing so without more information.

I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he is now prepared to protest to the government of the United States against the extremely dangerous escalation of the war in Viet Nam which continues on an increasing scale.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, not at this moment, and certainly not before I have had an opportunity to consult with the Secretary of State for External Affairs who is in New York today and who, as my hon. friend knows, has been on a mission to London, Paris and Bonn where all these questions were discussed with representatives of the foreign governments.

Mr. Lewis: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I know how anxious the right hon. the Prime Minister and everyone else are about this matter. May I be permitted to ask whether he can assure the house that the moment the Secretary of State for External Affairs returns the government will express itself on this very dangerous situation?

Mr. Pearson: Of course we have already expressed our very definite concern about anything in the nature of escalation of the war in Viet Nam, whether there is escalation on one side or the other.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN CENTENNIAL

PRESENTATION OF CERTIFICATES TO CITIZENS 100 YEARS OLD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Could he tell us whether he intends to ask His Excellency the Governor General to sign as soon as possible honour certificates for Canadians who are 100 years old, whose names have been added recently to the incomplete list held by the centennial commission?

[*English*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I certainly will be glad to look into this. I had not heard of it before.

FINANCE

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND MEETING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Could the minister give the house any information as to the progress to date and Canada's position at the meetings of the directors of the International Monetary Fund at present being held in Washington?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have not yet had a report from my officials, but when I have I will be very happy to make a statement if there is anything of sufficient importance to report to the house.

TRADE

INQUIRY AS TO NEGOTIATIONS WITH COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In view of the minister's announcement this morning concerning the granting of most favoured nation treatment to Bulgaria, will the minister inform the house how many communist nations still do not have most favoured nation treatment and whether negotiations are being carried on with these nations on this matter?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not think this is a question which should be asked at this time.

GRAIN

REPORTED INTENTION TO REDUCE SHIPMENTS THROUGH CHURCHILL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked a question of the Minister of Trade and Commerce through his parliamentary secretary in relation to reports that shipments of grain through the port of Churchill possibly would be decreased this year, and asked the minister or his parliamentary secretary to give the reason for this. I wonder whether the minister has this information now.

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can give the reason for something which I do not believe will take place. The Canadian Wheat Board at present are negotiating shipments of wheat from Churchill for this season. They are doing everything they can to encourage a high level of shipments, and we believe there again will be a good level of exports through the port of Churchill this year.

Mr. Simpson: I should like to ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In a recent letter from the chairman of the National Harbours Board it was stated to me that shipments of grain through Churchill this year are not expected to exceed the level of

other years. Therefore I should like to ask the minister whether he would look into this.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Oxford.

EXPO '67

REPORTED INTENTION OF U.S. GROUP TO CAUSE DISTURBANCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of reports this morning to the effect that a group of United States citizens is planning to come to Canada today or tomorrow to cause a disturbance at Expo '67, is the minister taking appropriate steps to see that these persons do not enter Canada?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of this proposed visit but I will check into it immediately to see what can be done in this regard.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REQUEST FOR EARLY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF ESTIMATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. In view of the great importance for future Canadian defence plans of the possible deployment of an a.b.m. system by the United States, can the minister say whether he will make arrangements to have his estimates referred to committee at an early date during the next session so that this vitally important subject may be thoroughly explored?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me this question should be asked during the next session.

PRESENTATION OF BELLS FROM DECOMMISSIONED SHIP "NEW WATERFORD"

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Will he correct the error made in presenting the bells of the decommissioned ship *New Waterford* to the wrong town, and recognize at least this one tradition by presenting these bells to the town of New Waterford, Nova Scotia, after which the ship was named?

[Mr. Simpson.]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has made a representation which I assume the hon. minister will take into consideration.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Will the minister do me the courtesy of correcting that situation?

[*Later:*]

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege, having received further information with regard to the previous question I asked which indicates that I probably owe the Minister of National Defence an apology. However, having referred to the breaking of traditions in this country, I examined the situation and found that the ship to which I made reference, the *New Waterfo*rd, has been named after a town in Nova Scotia, so it appears that our traditions have not been broken at all but are being divided. The minister has indicated—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I wonder whether the hon. member does suggest that this is a question of privilege. He will realize that according to the rules a question of privilege concerns a situation affecting an hon. member's personal privileges as a member of the House of Commons. I have some doubt whether the question he now raises meets that requirement.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): It affects the honour of a town I represent, which provided to this country—

Mr. Speaker: Order. It may do so, but that does not make it a question of privilege.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Then I rise on a point of order. The town of New Waterford provided to this country more volunteers per capita than any other town in Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): The minister is now being egotistical and arrogant—

Mr. Speaker: Order. There must be order in the House of Commons.

HOUSING

REQUEST FOR MEASURES TO STIMULATE SPRING STARTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the

Minister of Labour, who reports to the house for Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Now that he has had ample time to study the results of his cross country symposiums with the provinces regarding the housing crisis, can the minister tell us whether he is now seriously considering further measures to stimulate housing starts for this spring season?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to what I have already said on this subject. The hon. member has been told repeatedly that the government has received suggestions; has been studying them, and that if and when we intend to recommend or make changes they will be announced in due course.

[*Translation*]

AIRPORTS

MONTREAL—REQUEST FOR REMOVAL OF BAGGAGE CHARGES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Transport.

In view of the fact that the Montreal airport is the only one in North America where the sum of 25 cents is charged for every piece of luggage handled by porters, and in view of the fact that this gives a very bad impression of Quebec hospitality to the people who come to visit Expo, is the minister in a position to tell us whether the officials of his department propose to eliminate this charge of 25 cents on every piece of luggage handled?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize the importance of this question, in view of the fact that many visitors will land at the airport as soon as Expo opens tomorrow and that this would be an appropriate measure to be taken by the minister.

[*English*]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am not at all sure whether the hon. gentleman's conception of the facts is in accord with the actual facts. I will have to inform myself in this regard. If I find that his suggestion is accurate I will attempt to do whatever is necessary to make sure that a truly Canadian welcome is given to all those who arrive at that airport.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the Minister of Transport for his interest in this. May I ask, since this is urgent due to the opening of Expo tomorrow, whether he could try to obtain the information today so as to settle the problem?

[*English*]

TRADE

CONSIDERATION OF IMPORTS OF SHOES AND CHILDREN'S JACKETS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address my question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In view of the fact that the importation of shoes into Canada from Asia and Czechoslovakia is reaching the alarming proportion of one third of Canadian sales, and in view of the fact that employment in the industry is steadily falling off, what steps does the minister propose to take to restrain this large importation?

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, this is a question which has been asked previously. I have answered it on other occasions. While importations have gone up, domestic production has also gone up substantially. If the hon. member knows of any instances in which imports are being made in breach of our rules and regulations I shall be very glad to look into them.

Mr. W. M. Howe (Wellington-Huron): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce regarding the importation of children's jackets. According to a news report this morning from London, Ontario, the fire department has discovered that these jackets are highly inflammable. What steps is the government taking to see that regulations are drawn up to assure that this type of thing will not be repeated in Canada?

Mr. Winters: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member would be kind enough to give me some specific instances and examples, and I would be very happy to look into them.

Mr. Howe (Wellington-Huron): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The specific instances should not be given at this time.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

INQUIRY RESPECTING "GEROVITAL" VITAMIN COMPOUND

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the

Inquiries of the Ministry

Minister of National Health and Welfare. Has the minister been informed of a new vitamin compound known as gerovital, presently produced in Roumania, said to prolong life? The report even suggested that persons could serve effectively in public life to 100 years of age, and this might even apply to members of parliament. If so, is his department making inquiries concerning this vitamin compound?

COAL

NOVA SCOTIA—COAL BOARD PURCHASE OF MINING EQUIPMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources but in his absence perhaps I could direct it to his parliamentary secretary. This matter is of importance because the Prime Minister announced in the last few days that legislation in respect of the Nova Scotia coal mines would come forward at the next session.

In view of the announcement made a few days ago by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources that the Dominion Coal Board would purchase mining equipment in the amount of $2 million for the Cape Breton mines, I would ask the minister whether he has received a telegram from local 8672 of the United Mine Workers of Thorburn, Nova Scotia, asking that some of these funds be allotted in the interim period to the McBain mine which employs some 400 men.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is not in order to ask whether a telegram has been received.

[*Later:*]

Mr. MacEwan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order which relates to the question I asked during the question period. On several occasions during the years I have been here questions have been asked about telegrams, and so on, which have not been ruled out of order. I did not realize who was Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, but in view of the fact that his grandfather came from my constituency I would ask him to look into this matter concerning the McBain mine.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member will realize that the question whether a telegram has been received, by itself and without further explanation, is not acceptable.

[Mr. Herridge.]

Mr. MacEwan: Then, Mr. Speaker, I will ask what reply has been received.

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid it is too late, because the question period has expired.

[*Translation*]

BANKRUPTCY

REQUEST FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF AMENDING LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Registrar General of Canada. At the present time, is he drafting a bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act which bill would be studied by a parliamentary committee immediately after the opening of the next session?

Mr. Speaker: I would suggest to the hon. member that he should raise that question during the coming session.

[*English*]

GRAIN

REQUEST FOR ADVICE ON SPRING PLANTING ON PRAIRIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce based on his announcement this morning that an agreement will be signed with Bulgaria and that one of the clauses of the agreement, if I got it right, was that it was conditioned on the ability of the wheat board to supply. In view of this type of clause being necessary at this stage of the game prior to seeding, would the minister be prepared to advise the farmers to increase their wheat acreage for this year, or is he just going to leave it to chance?

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to say last week that the farmers, in their own good judgment, had decided this year to plant the highest acreage in wheat in the history of Canada, and I think that is a very good sign.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

INCOME TAX

USE OF FACSIMILE FORM IN WHISKY ADVERTISEMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Revenue but in his

absence I would ask the parliamentary secretary whether he is aware that an exact facsimile of an official, federal government form, namely an income tax form, is being used in the newspapers for advertising Scotch whisky. I wonder whether the company has received permission to do this. Will the minister's department look into the matter to see whether there is any impropriety in the company so doing?

FINANCE

REGULATIONS UNDER DEPOSIT INSURANCE LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. It is one I posed during his absence on Tuesday of last week, asking when he would recommend to the house that bylaw No. 1 passed as order in council No. 1967-579, dealing with regulations under the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, be referred to the committee on finance, trade and economic affairs, as undertaken by the minister to the committee.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I answered this question yesterday. I, of course, have no objection whatever to recommending that this order be referred to the committee, but I thought we might be winding up this session today and that it would be better to wait until the beginning of the new session. I will so recommend as soon as we get into the new session.

Mr. Lambert: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister at the same time consider the referral to the committee of the regulations that will be made with regard to the disclosure of cost of borrowing under the Bank Act?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Those regulations have not been promulgated, but when they are I will be very happy to do so.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GREECE—INQUIRY AS TO RECOGNITION OF NEW RÉGIME

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. On Monday last the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam asked the Prime Minister a question about the Canadian government's recognition of the new régime in Greece and diplomatic relations with that country. Has the Prime Minister any further report to make, now that several days have elapsed?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, after the examination that has been made by experts in this field it appears that no special recognition is required of this government, in view of the circumstances of the change. I understand this is the position being taken by other friendly governments.

WINTER WORKS

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PERIOD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. R. Keays (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, in view of the objections which were raised early this morning to holding the adjournment debate, in respect of which I was quite willing to forgo the opportunity to speak, and because of the urgency of this matter and the timing involved, the deadline being the end of April, I wonder whether I could put a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration and ask whether he has reconsidered allowing those municipalities which have winter works under way to continue beyond April 30.

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I have nothing new to add.

AIR TRANSPORT

INQUIRY AS TO BOARD HEARINGS ON REGIONAL POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Has the meeting on prairie regional air policy scheduled for Regina on May 1 been postponed? If so, what is the new date to be? I trust this meeting will be held soon so that TransAir might provide adequate service to meet the special demands of centennial year.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt very much whether the question can be asked at this time.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Regina City was allowed to ask this question two days ago, and I took it as notice. In view of the date perhaps I might be permitted to say that I am advised the hearings were postponed because TransAir had largely

changed the nature of its application and the respondents felt they could not possibly deal with the new proposition between now and May 1.

Indeed, for this reason the board is not yet in a position to set a definite date. However, the service that TransAir is now giving is being continued. With respect to the introduction of the DC-9 service about which the hon. member also asked, he was quite right in his surmise that the only delay in this service is connected with the availability of aircraft.

[*Later:*]

Mr. K. H. More (Regina City): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Transport whether he can clarify the answer he gave a short while ago. Do I take it that owing to the shortage of DC-9 aircraft the service to Regina city will not commence on May 1? If that is so, can he tell us when it will commence?

Mr. Pickersgill: Unfortunately I did not bring a document which I thought I had with me concerning that matter, and I think it would have been better if I refreshed my memory before giving an answer.

While I am on my feet perhaps I can answer the hon. member for Lisgar who asked me the other day about the direct Air Canada service to Winnipeg. It is to continue.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEES TO SIT DURING HOUSE RECESS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Public Works in his capacity as government house leader. In view of the difficulty we had last summer with respect to certain committees of the house meeting during the period of adjournment, will the minister consider before the day is over asking the house to make the necessary order so that any committees that need to sit between now and next Wednesday in order to finalize their reports might be able to do so?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to consider that matter.

Mr. Knowles: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, but may I direct it to the Prime Minister. Will the government, when preparing the speech from the throne for the next session, consider the recommendations in the reports which various committees have made and which have not yet been considered by the house?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Of course, Mr. Speaker, if we get them in time.

Mr. Knowles: What about those that are already in, such as the one on birth control, and so on?

Mr. Pearson: If the hon. gentleman will wait until the speech from the throne is delivered he will be astonished by the things in it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knowles: I doubt it.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

BRIEF OF POLICE CHIEFS TO CORRECTIONS ASSOCIATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice, because I was astonished this morning by a brief prepared by the association of chiefs of police. I wonder whether the minister will find out and advise the house if this brief of the chiefs of police to the Canadian Corrections Association, advocating among other things the continuation of flogging, the abolition of the necessity of obtaining search warrants, and the ending of the priest and citizen and solicitor and client communication privilege, was prepared in 1767, 1867 or 1967.

Hon. P.-E. Trudeau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to look into this matter.

IMMIGRATION

INQUIRY AS TO ENTRY OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Is it the intention of the government to supplement our labour force with people from Jamaica during the harvesting period of our vegetable, fruit and tobacco crops?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think the question is of sufficient urgency to be asked at this time.

Mr. Noble: Mr. Speaker, this is an urgent matter because these arrangements must be made a long time ahead. We need 2,000 of these people in our area alone.

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to have the same type of agreement we had last year with the government of Jamaica concerning seasonal workers.

STORMS

HURON AND PERTH COUNTIES, ONTARIO—ASSISTANCE FOLLOWING TORNADO

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron): Mr. Speaker, this is further to a question I asked the Prime Minister last Friday regarding the disaster in the counties of Huron and Perth caused by the tornado. At that time the Prime Minister said he would refer it to the agriculture department. I would now like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he has received word from the provincial department, and what decisions will be forthcoming from the federal government.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, we received a communication from the provincial department of agriculture requesting support for the people who suffered as a result of the tornado. That communication has been referred to the appropriate section of the Department of Finance where these matters are considered.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

REQUEST FOR PAYMENT TO CANADIAN WORKERS IN U.S.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Jean Berger (Montmagny-L'Islet): Mr. Speaker, owing to the fact that, with God's blessing and undoubtedly a very rare all-party spirit of co-operation, this session will soon come to an end, may I repeat the important question I asked yesterday of the Minister of Labour, who I see is back in his seat today, regarding the possibility of all Canadian woodworkers employed in the state of Maine benefiting in the near future from the Unemployment Insurance Act?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, all I can say at this time is that, together with the chief commissioner and the other two members of the unemployment insurance commission, I did meet last Friday with the Governor of the State of Maine and the commission of that state. The fact that Maine is the only border state which has not some reciprocal agreement with Canada on unemployment insurance was discussed at length. The discussions were useful and a task force is being set up to study it. I cannot say anything further at this time.

SHIPPING

HALIFAX—REQUEST FOR RESTORATION OF SAMBRO LIGHTSHIP

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Can he now report on the gist of the findings of his department into the *Cape Bonnie* tragedy, and specifically as to the suggestion that the Sambro light ship be restored to service at the approaches to Halifax harbour?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): A statement on that matter will be made some time today, I think, and as soon as it is available I will send the hon. gentleman a copy.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REQUEST FOR ANSWER TO QUESTION ON ORDER PAPER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Would the minister undertake by next Wednesday, when it is expected that this session may prorogue, to answer question No. 2,804? This question has been on the order paper for over a month. I am sure the material could be supplied within half an hour. It is quite urgent to people concerned that the question be answered. This information is necessary to resolve certain conservation problems in my part of the country as it involves a number of projects.

Hon. John N. Turner (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): I will bring it to the minister's attention.

GRAIN

STATEMENT ON PROTEST AGAINST SLOW MOVEMENT FROM LAKEHEAD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Ed. Schreyer (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of

Inquiries of the Ministry

Transport. Two or three days ago he undertook to look into the presumably stalemated negotiations between the wheat board and the great lakes shippers. I should like to ask whether he is now in a position to say anything more on this matter.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): In the hon. gentleman's absence yesterday I answered that question, which was also raised, as he will recall, by the hon. member for Port Arthur. I said this matter has been settled, the shipments are now going on, and we are all very pleased about it.

HOUSING

NOVA SCOTIA—REQUEST FOR INCREASED SUBSIDY ON PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING LOSSES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. O. Bower (Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare): I have a question for the Minister of Labour. My question, sir, has to do with the subsidy paid by the federal government in respect of annual operating losses in public housing constructed under the 90 per cent-10 per cent capital cost arrangements between the province of Nova Scotia and the government of Canada. I should like to ask the minister whether he has received representations from the government of Nova Scotia asking the federal government to consider increasing the subsidy on operating losses to 75 per cent from the present 50 per cent in cases to which the 50 per cent now applies. If so, in view of the fact that it is becoming increasingly apparent—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This question is much too involved. I suggest the hon. member ask it again in the new session, when I will suggest that he put it on the order paper.

[*Translation*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

PROTEST BY PRISONER RESPECTING COMMUTATION OF DEATH SENTENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

I have received a protest from a state pensioner. As a matter of fact, this concerns a citizen of my area who pleaded guilty to three murders two years ago and was sentenced to death.

Last year, this man wrote to the Minister of Justice—

[Mr. Schreyer.]

Mr. Speaker: Order. Would the hon. member please put his question?

Mr. Godin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege.

I would like to point out to Your Honour that the question period is a period of information and that hon. members on this side of the house have the same rights as those on the other side. The hon. member for Portneuf is asking his second question which, moreover, is quite out of order, and I have a very interesting question to ask.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Godin: Mr. Speaker, in any case, in his letter this citizen insisted on being hanged. Therefore, could the Minister of Justice tell us if he intends to have a look at that prisoner's record and take his request into consideration?

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR INCREASED PAYMENTS UNDER DAIRY POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I was rather hanging on the words of the hon. member for Portneuf, but I am pleased that you have allowed me to put my question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Since the federal contribution to the new dairy program represents an increase of $30 million for 1967-68, is the minister considering the possibility of meeting in the near future the provincial Ministers of Agriculture, in order to convince them that they should make up the difference which could satisfy the demands of dairy producers as well as those of the C.F.U.?

Mr.. Speaker: Order. Unless I am mistaken, the hon. member is repeating his previous question.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not put that question previously. In fact, the purpose of my question is to ask the minister to bring pressure to bear on the provincial authorities.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

INQUIRY AS TO RESUMPTION AFTER RECESS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. J. Enns (Portage-Neepawa): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to ask the house

leader when the house will reassemble next week. My concern arises out of the fact that a good number of the members of this house and of the other place have agreed to be present at the national prayer breakfast, and if we should not be assembled on May 3 plans for that morning would be materially affected.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): In view of what was said I will confirm our plans later today.

[*Translation*]

PRIVILEGE

MR. GRÉGOIRE—DELAY IN DELIVERY OF FRENCH EDITION OF "HANSARD"

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, something I have not been able to do before.

I notice that we received yesterday's official report in English only and that we have not yet received the French version. I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have the privilege to ask that the French edition be delivered at the same time as the English. I wish to point out this fact to the authorities concerned so that we may receive both editions at the same time in the future. And this is all the more serious, Mr. Speaker—and this is a second question of privilege—that the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) said yesterday that he would wait till he had read—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I heard the hon. member's representations, and I am certain they were noted.

[*English*]

OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING

PROVISION FOR PAYMENT OF COSTS, AGREEMENTS WITH THE PROVINCES, ETC.

The house resumed, from Tuesday, April 25, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-278, respecting the occupational training of adults—Mr. Marchand—Mr. Batten in the chair.

The Chairman: When the committee rose last evening clause 2 as amended was under discussion.

On clause 2—*Definitions*

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I want to answer certain statements which have been made in this house, as well as some objections which were put forward yesterday.

The hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) suggested in a strong outburst yesterday, that we were proposing to interfere with the workers' freedom.

In my answer to the hon. member for Prince (Mr. MacDonald) I mentioned that workers would not be free to pick one course in preference to another because the fear expressed by the hon. member for Prince was that, at a given moment, the worker might choose a longer course simply because he would get more allowances from the federal government. I mentioned to him that the manpower centre would then have the authority to refuse if there was abuse.

The member for Lapointe obviously said he was scandalized, claiming that we infringed upon the freedom of the workers.

The workers are just as free as any other citizens but no more. This means that, for instance, everybody is not being admitted to university at this time, for there are conditions to be met, not only educational qualifications but also available space. The same thing has to apply in the field of manpower too, that is to say, if a worker wants occupational training which is not worthwhile and which will not increase his future income and his opportunities for employment, the manpower centre will certainly not agree to pay allowances in such a case. The worker remains free to follow such courses if he wishes, but we will be free to pay because if there is unemployment in a specific trade or in a specific town, it certainly would not be sensible for the manpower centre to train new people for this trade or profession.

There is a conditioning to freedom which must not only be explained but also motivated.

Therefore, I suggest it is exaggerated to object that this manpower centre was to force a trade or a profession upon somebody and, if that can have some effect in certain quarters, I think that here, in this house, there should be no misunderstanding about the scope of such charges.

In theory, of course, should there be openings in several professions—

[*English*]

Mr. Lewis: Would the minister permit a question at this point?

Mr. Marchand: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: I entirely appreciate and agree with the explanation the minister has given, but obviously whether the bill will work well depends on whether the minister will have the personnel with the experience, training and knowledge to advise and direct people into the right occupational training.

While the minister is answering this question, would he give the committee an idea what steps are being taken to recruit and train personnel who will have very considerable powers under the act, powers which can easily be abused by people who do not have some human understanding and appreciation of the problem?

Mr. Marchand: This is a very important question, Mr. Chairman. We are aware of this problem, and during the last 12 months I think we have recruited about 500 university graduates. This does not mean that these people are ready to operate overnight, but we are trying to upgrade our own staff. The staff has very important responsibilities, and this program can be a success if we do have good men in the right places; I entirely agree with the hon. member there.

• (12 noon)

We must upgrade those who work for the department. We must do that, because we have no way out. I think that is very important.

[*Translation*]

Therefore, in closing, I will deal with the objections raised by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire). In short, if a demand exists in a trade or two and if a worker indicates a preference and is qualified, there is no doubt that we would then take his preference into account. But if he is not qualified or if the trade is congested or no longer exists, of course the manpower centre will not accept to pay an allowance to that worker who will want, for instance, to learn the trade of piano tuner in a village where there is not a single piano.

That has nothing to do with restricting freedom, it is simply being realistic and trying to orient manpower properly.

Of course, the desire and that freedom are conditioned also by the individual's qualifications. For instance, if someone who wants to become an airplane pilot is blind in one eye, it is not interfering with his freedom to tell him that he cannot take the course.

[Mr. Lewis.]

At any rate, let us say that there is an abuse of the word "freedom" simply to make trouble.

The second serious objection, or apparently serious, which was raised by the hon. member for Lapointe had to do with overlapping of services and double taxation, I took the trouble yesterday to explain to him precisely how that situation could occur previously and how, under the new system, there was really no division between the two functions, that of education which is entirely provincial and that of the federal government which is to help financially the workers who need to be retrained.

If tomorrow the province would assume the federal responsibility, it would have to hire the same people who are working for us at the present time. Therefore, there is no double taxation, no overlapping of services. The province pays for the education, the province manages its institutions and it has inspectors for those institutions. Of course, we shall have accountants to audit the expenditures.

However, if that jurisdiction were left with the province, tomorrow morning it would have to hire people to perform that task.

[*English*]

There is no double taxation, no duplication of services. It is very clearly defined. There is double taxation and duplication of services when two governments are trying to cover the same field at the same time. This can occur, for instance, in loan insurance cases. If the provincial and federal governments are both insuring the same loans and levying from the taxpayers a tax for that purpose, there is really double taxation there, since the same service is being taxed twice.

And I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the best example of double taxation is, no doubt, the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire), who was elected to represent his constituents in the field of federal jurisdiction, but is simply coming here in order to discuss problems coming under provincial jurisdiction. Now, there is already a provincial member in Quebec. And this means that the Lapointe people are being taxed double for the same service.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Chairman, before the minister ventures further into other subjects, I should like to ask him a question on the point he brought up concerning the program and the guidance of those people who take special training courses. I am willing to believe the minister is right and I accept his explanation to the effect that if there is unemployment in one sector of our economy people should not be encouraged to take up the same trade and thus contribute to increasing unemployment.

Still, here is my question: as we are venturing into the field of guidance, will this plan allow for the participation of existing technical schools in the various provinces, in such a way that guidance and organization will remain in the hands of the principals of the technical schools who can then guide their students into taking up certain trades, so that there can be an over-all plan for the whole endeavour?

[*English*]

Mr. Dinsdale: Before the minister replies I wish to ask some specific questions. I can ask those now or I can wait until after the minister has replied, whichever the minister prefers.

Mr. Marchand: I shall answer some questions that were asked last night. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would wait until I have done so, as what I say may cover some of the points he wishes to raise.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member for Mégantic (Mr. Langlois), I must say that provincial institution and directors of technical schools still have all their powers and we do not intend to interfere. They can refuse the students we send them or give them some guidance or try to direct them elsewhere.

Now, the bill provides for the establishment of an advisory committee. Besides, the provincial representation has always been provided for and will consist in technical schools directors and professional people. Therefore, the workers will not be guided at random. We shall take into consideration the needs of the market and the qualifications of the workers.

I believe that conciliation procedures will be possible within this advisory committee provided for under the legislation.

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank the minister for his information. I did not imply that the bill or the minister wanted to run the existing technical schools. All I wanted to know, since we already have technical schools with vocational guidance officers in the area of trades—the teachers also give some guidance particularly in the cases of 7 or 8 graders who drop out to learn a trade—is whether this advisory committee which will be set up will work in co-operation with the technical schools not specifically within this program as it will be set up to train workers, unemployed or others who seek to improve their trade, but also help those who are taking up a new trade and establish an over-all plan for ten or fifteen years to come under which the school principal, fully aware of a manpower surplus in such trades will warn his pupils accordingly, so that they may take an immediate decision and possibly select another trade when others are overcrowded. I should like to know whether this advisory committee will co-operate with the technical schools instead of going about its own way, so that we will miss the boat for lack of consultation.

[*English*]

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I shall now answer some questions that were not answered last night. The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond asked whether the courses given in community colleges will be eligible under this program. The answer of course is that they will be. Courses of occupational training are acceptable from various institutions, with no distinction being drawn between them.

Answering the question of the hon. member for Simcoe East, occupational training includes up to one year or 1,820 hours of basic education if needed as a preliminary to specific occupational training in a further course of up to one year. That means that if a man needs to learn mathematics, a language, or science to upgrade his skill he will be entitled to one year's tuition before the one year course concerning his occupational training is undertaken.

I urge, Mr. Chairman, that before leaving the general discussion on clause 2 we deal with the point raised by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond which lies behind many complaints about lack of consultation. The hon. member said he had checked with leading training persons in several metropolitan areas who were not consulted and ought to have been consulted. I should like to make clear that in addition to the formal federal-provincial meetings in October and November, in December deputy

ministers of education were informed in writing, in quite unprecedented detail of our intended legislation and regulations. In fact my fear was that I would be criticized in this house because my officials were going so far in their desire for full discussion in advance with the provinces. However, I cannot take responsibility in connection with the consultations which took place within the educational establishments of provinces. We gave full information to the senior officials. Surely no hon. member would suggest we could properly do more than that.

• (12:10 p.m.)

The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond also asked whether we had enough money. In various items of our estimates the total financial provision for operating the program is $110 million. This is apart from capital expenditure. The increase compared with last year's spending is 24 per cent. I have made it plain that there will be much expansion in the future, and I assure the committee that I will ask for more this year if more is needed.

The hon. member for Lapointe wanted to know what would be the expenditure in Quebec. Estimates are that we shall spend roughly $30 million, but during the phase-out of capital grants Quebec will be entitled to a total of $245 million. I do not have sufficient detail as to current rates of provincial construction to enable me to say how much will be spent this year or how much Quebec may request in loans under the new program.

The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond asked about research. There is total provision in the estimates for several million dollars worth of research most of which would have to be done by outside experts. The hon. member was also concerned about the balance of youth and experience on our staff. As I mentioned a few minutes ago, I am proud to say we have recruited 511 new university graduates who begin work in the next few months. Since the department was formed we have obtained 1,000 extra field staff made up, for the most part, of more experienced people with suitable backgrounds in teaching and personnel work.

I would add that our staff may not be perfect, but in my opinion they have done and are doing a remarkable job considering how few of them there are in relation to the needs. The new staff will of course, benefit from their experience, and for both old and new we have begun a massive training program of our own.

[Mr. Marchand.]

The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond was also concerned about regional variations in selection and training. The criteria will be the same everywhere. We shall take account of regional variations in needs while showing as much consistency in individual cases as possible.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Régimbal: Mr. Chairman, may I put a question to the hon. minister?

Mr. Marchand: Certainly, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Régimbal: I should like to return for a moment to the question of this manpower centre and comment on the case mentioned by the minister concerning a locality where five tradesmen might be unemployed. This would be sufficient reason for refusing to accept a sixth worker in the same training course.

However, this same tradesman might be urgently needed in another area provided he were ready to move over there.

Therefore, I should like to bring up again a question which I raised in the course of my comments and which was not answered. It concerns the type of research which may have been undertaken before the bill was introduced, or perhaps even before it was drawn up, in order to find out where opportunities exist, how people feel about the conditions they would have to fulfil to go to these places and whether they would agree to take part in a relocation program if there were one. I received no answer on this subject, and I would very much like to know what sort of research was undertaken, what information sources were used, in short what sort of coordination there was between the research centres in the different departments?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, to answer the first question, it may well happen—evidently these things cannot be decided in the abstract—that if there is unemployment in a given trade, in a given city, there may be a labour shortage in another city. In such a case, the manpower centre might well accept that a man should take a course in the overcrowded trade, provided he agrees to be moved elsewhere afterwards.

Those are not decisions that can be taken here, but they can be made under the terms of the act. This is matter of judgment and appreciation, and officials in our manpower centres will benefit by the advice of the advisory committee, wherever it is created.

Now, with regard to the analysis of the situation, I must say that I read the excellent speech made by the hon. member on the bill, and that this is not a thing we can do once and for all.

We have in the department a research service which we are trying to upgrade as much as possible, so that it can appreciate as soon as possible the condition of the labour market, the existing problems, the manpower requirements and the number of people available in our labour force.

This is a continuing work. We cannot do some research and then cut it off there. In other words, we cannot be content with research made last year in that field, and apply the results to the situation prevailing this year, because in all likelihood the data would not be valid any more.

We are trying to upgrade a departmental service so as to secure as soon as possible the best information concerning the labour market, the skills available and the manpower requirements in Canada. That is not something exceptional, because we want it to be a permanent service and we shall not be able to have a labour policy if we do not have that tool which allows us to know the real facts.

Therefore, the only answer I can give is that there is no special investigation going on at this time; there is a permanent body which is called the research branch of the department of manpower and it is that body which must give to all our manpower centres the information they require to give a sound judgment in every case.

[*English*]

Mr. Dinsdale: The minister has assured the house that there has been close consultation with the provinces in the development of this new program. Nevertheless I have no doubt he is aware that we are still getting static back from the provinces, indicating that they feel no satisfactory guide lines have been laid down. In particular there is uncertainty as to how much of the programs now operating in the respective provinces will be covered under the new arrangements.

The minister is aware that all the provinces have set up elaborate vocational and technical training programs. This was done hurriedly, I suggest, because Ottawa was late coming to an awareness of its responsibility in this field. As a matter of fact it was only in the late fifties that we began to feel the federal government had responsibility in this area. On the basis of policies then laid down the provinces moved rapidly to adopt what can only be described as a crash program made necessary because of the long years of delay and neglect on Ottawa's part.

As I read this bill it establishes new principles. Uncertainty is caused by a feeling—and I know this applies in Manitoba—that the elaborate training program already established there will not be covered adequately by this new approach by the federal government which concentrates its emphasis on adult education and withdraws entirely from secondary and post-secondary levels. I think it was under parts 5 and 6 of the old schedule that Manitoba established a pretty elaborate adult retraining program to meet the demands of our changing technological society.

• (12:20 p.m.)

With these background remarks I would now like to ask the minister some specific questions. The basis of the capital grant program is changed, but the minister indicates that there is going to be a phasing out period. I presume that phasing out period is not restricted to any number of years. As I understand the bill, the program is going to be available to the provinces until such time as each province is able to claim its equitable share.

Some special training programs come to mind, and questions with respect to them should be answered before the house passes this bill. Other hon. members have referred to them in a general way. With respect to special training programs for juvenile delinquents, reference has been made to the House of Concord, and I understand the minister has said this will be covered under new legislation. But uncertainty arises because this bill specifically says the program only applies to cases where a trainee has been out of school for one year. Obviously this does not apply to these special schools which provide particular skills to young people who have come into trouble with the law. I presume this will be covered under the apprenticeship programs. Otherwise I cannot see how it would be possible.

Mr. Marchand: The rehabilitation act.

Mr. Dinsdale: It would be covered under the rehabilitation act?

Mr. Marchand: If you are referring to the school run by the Salvation Army.

Mr. Dinsdale: It would be covered by the rehabilitation act under much the same terms as it operates at present?

Mr. Marchand: We pay 50 per cent.

Mr. Dinsdale: Another problem that comes to mind is the continuing shortage of teachers. Any educational or training program that has operated over the past few years has been handicapped by the chronic shortage of accredited teachers. I know that where a trainee is prepared to teach in a school directly involved with occupational training he is covered by this bill. I would presume that most of the technical schools will require qualified teachers. Teachers preparing to instruct in a technical school have to take academic courses in order to become accredited teachers. Would this type of trainee be covered under the terms of this legislation? I am thinking particularly of married women who want to get into the teaching profession but who have family obligations. I am thinking of widows, and others who have been abandoned by their spouses. Even under the old program they were not able to take training as teachers because no allowances were provided for their families during the training period. Could the minister be specific on this point?

Another problem that has been referred to is co-ordination between manpower needs in various regions across the country and the new Canada manpower centres. Will the new centres attempt to gear the flow of trainees into technical programs to meet the job demands of local areas? At present there is a shortage of manpower in certain parts of western Canada which could be aggravated in the initial adjustment period. There is going to be a big backlog as a result of the neglect in this area, because trainees are going to be steered into technical programs and this will aggravate the labour supply shortage. As has been indicated, this problem can only be solved by people who are especially trained to view labour needs in the proper perspective.

I presume private commercial colleges will be covered by this legislation if they are recommended by provincial governments. In certain parts of western Canada such colleges play an important part in providing the secretarial skills which are in increasing demand in the type of economy in which we are operating.

A final question relates to the provision of skills to our Indian population. Under schedule 5 of the old program the government in Manitoba set up an excellent Indian retraining program centred at Pembina House at Ninette. It is a comprehensive approach to the problem of providing our Indian citizens not only with technical skills but also with the social skills that are required in order for them to be able to compete adequately in the workaday world. If a province would recommend such a training program to the minister as coming within the terms of the adult occupational retraining program it should meet the terms of this legislation, but I would like to have the minister's assurance on this point.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member has accurately explained what is going to happen the capital grants program for the building of new schools. This program will be phased out, and there is no time limit. The basis for the grants was $480 per youngster between the ages of 15 and 19 years in each province, according to the 1961 census. As the hon. member knows, we have increased this amount to $800 per youngster, and after this fund is exhausted that will be the end of this special program.

As I mentioned, under our rehabilitation program we can continue to help the Salvation Army school.

Mr. Dinsdale: The House of Concord.

Mr. Marchand: Yes. I spoke on that last night. With respect to teachers, we can use this new program in order to train teachers who will be directed to training schools. If we need teachers in order to upgrade or retrain workers we can use this program to get those teachers.

Mr. Dinsdale: Would it cover teachers taking a training program in a teacher's training college?

Mr. Marchand: No.

Mr. Dinsdale: If they are preparing to teach in a technical school?

• (12:30 p.m.)

Mr. Marchand: Last evening I attempted to make clear that this program is designed to retrain or upgrade adults, and therefore anything which can be done in order to attain this goal will come within this legislation. If teachers are required in order to retrain workers, those teachers can be trained under the program. We will not, however, train teachers for universities or colleges under this scheme.

Mr. Dinsdale: Perhaps the minister would permit a question. It is indicated by this new legislation that it will be necessary for those

teachers who wish to qualify for teaching positions in the schools which will be operated by the provincial governments to obtain their certification at a teacher training college. If they are specifically prepared to teach in this adult occupational retraining program, would it be possible for them to be regarded as trainees under the terms of this legislation?

Mr. Marchand: If the purpose of their retraining is to teach workers who come under this program, then I believe the answer is yes.

Mr. Dinsdale: Even if they should be taking the course in a teachers training college in order to qualify as teachers?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, it is quite difficult to answer a general question of this nature, because it will be necessary to look at the course to see whether it is a course which is aimed at preparing these teachers for the type of teaching position I mentioned: If it is not, then it is not covered. If a technical school, for example, is certified by the provincial government to give certain courses to adult workers, then of course it will be normal to prepare teachers for that purpose and we would agree to pay for the training of these teachers. This training, however, must be training which comes within the terms of the legislation.

I cannot answer the question in general terms because it would be necessary to know what courses will be handled by these teachers so we would know whether these courses were related to the purpose of the legislation. I believe the intention is that new teachers can be trained if the training is related to courses which come under this legislation.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Chairman, would the minister permit a question. I should like to ask the minister whether people who are being trained in industrial plants because the training is not available in the schools will be permitted to move from one province to another for the purpose of this training.

Mr. Marchand: Are you referring to the teachers or the workers?

Mr. McCleave: The workers.

Mr. Marchand: You wish to know whether they would be entitled to move from one province to another in order to attend courses?

Mr. McCleave: So that they may receive this training in plants.

Mr. Marchand: As you know, the courses which will be given in industry will have to be approved by the province concerned. If such a course should not be available in one province, we will authorize the worker to move to another province in order to attend the course.

Mr. McCleave: This is a technical matter and perhaps the minister would like to consider it over the luncheon break. I am wondering whether he might consider an amendment desirable to clause 3(a) so the word "ordinarily" might be inserted before the word "resides", because the word "adult" is given special meaning in the definition. It seems to me that the drafting by the minister's advisers would not enable a person to qualify for help if he should move across a provincial boundary. By doing so he might remove himself from the special meaning of the word "adult" which is given in this clause. I could move such an amendment later on, or perhaps the minister might wish to do so, but I believe I should extend to him the courtesy of an opportunity to consult with his legal advisers on this point.

Mr. Marchand: I will take advantage of the opportunity to determine whether a change is necessary in order to clarify the meaning of this clause.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Régimbal: I am sorry to bring up again the matter of research, but I do so because I have the impression that during the drafting of this bill, the research was not adequate and I should like nothing better than be convinced of the contrary.

The minister said earlier, for instance, that his department had a research centre which could be on the look out and could be kept informed about any change which might come up or about a special demand which would be created through those manpower centres, as a result of which it could train someone.

Moreover, on Monday evening I believe, the parliamentary secretary told us that there was no reason not to forecast that within a very few years 350,000 persons would be affected by this program.

I cannot help wondering where this figure comes from, how one reaches this particular figure, and whether it is correct. The important thing now is much more to deal with evils which are strictly of a local nature.

There is quite a sociological change now in progress. So this immediately means we must

find out what people's motivations are, and what arguments are strong enough to make them relocate.

What do they want? Is there a tendency to relocate? Is something being done to prepare the ladies to that displacement or transfer?

I am under the impression that such research has not been made and if so, I think considerable difficulties and disappointments can be expected in the implementation of such legislation.

As I have already said, I am ready to let myself be persuaded that this is not true.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I am trying to understand exactly what concerns the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes.

We have information—you know that the federal government has maintained an employment service for 25 years—on manpower, unemployment, employment, occupational qualifications.

So, the department has a load of information in hand and has found—like everybody else, we were not discoverers in that field, for the Economic Council of Canada came to the same conclusions—that there were, as we have mentioned, extremely important sociological changes, and all we can do in that field is to make projections on the basis of facts we have in hand. Besides, this legislation is based on that, because we are more and more aware that the workers need retraining. This is not empty information; we have had employment services for 25 years and we find that some trades disappear and that some people have to be retrained two or three times during their lifetime.

Now, as far as the figures are concerned, they are surely projections and I cannot say exactly whether it will be 300,000 or 325,000. However, the official in research gave figures based on the available facts and the changes that have occurred during the last fifteen or twenty years. I cannot see what type of survey could be done today or tomorrow to secure data different from what we now have on hand.

[*English*]

The Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Wellington-Huron.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I have a few more answers which perhaps I should give at this time.

[Mr. Régimbal.]

Mr. Howe (Wellington-Huron): Mr. Chairman, the minister might include the answer to my question in the answers he will be giving. It has to do with the gap which has been mentioned so many times in this particular piece of legislation. As the hon. member for Brandon-Souris has mentioned, in respect of the person who must be out of school for one year a difficulty arises. These young people have been to school but have not acquired the knowledge or ability to enter the professions. Most of them are in a position to obtain employment as labourers either on farms or in the cities and towns. They can obtain work, if they want work, which will pay more than the $35 a week which the minister says is to be the allowance for a person without dependants.

• (12:40 p.m.)

In this regard I think there is a gap in the legislation. This is an area in which these young people could be trained because they are young and can readily adapt to new circumstances. The minister attempted to answer this question during his reply on second reading by suggesting that if we paid this allowance to these young people there would be a mass exodus from schools. I do not think that would be the case. I think this is the time to provide training facilities in order that these young people may become skilled.

I am sure many of these young people live with their parents who feel they should get out and go to work. If they do that they may find work for one year and then take advantage of this training. That simply means a loss of one year. If they were given an allowance and encouraged to take these courses this would fill that gap. Some consideration should be given in this way, because these boys and young women are able to do the work we usually associate with adults. Young boys can join the army at 18 and are allowed to do many other things usually confined to adults. I think the minister should reconsider this situation and take steps to make it possible for these young people to take advantage of these training courses immediately.

It is not our contention that some individuals will not drop out of school in order to take advantage of the allowance of $35 per week, but in this case we do not feel one apple will spoil the barrel. Surely it would be up to the manpower organization to weed out these individuals when they make application or after they have been taking a course for a short period of time.

There certainly is a shortage of skilled workers in a number of metropolitan areas. One need only read the *Globe and Mail* to appreciate the great demand there is for skilled young men and women in the clothing business and the needle trades. It would be advantageous to train these young people coming out of school in these specialized skills. Many of the provincial vocational training programs do not have the required facilities.

I cannot accept the minister's suggestion that there would be a mass exodus from the schools if the $35 per week allowance was made available to these young people. In this regard I feel this legislation is insufficient. Our welfare workers are worried about these youngsters wandering around at the age of 17 or 18 going from one job to another, because a pattern is created which in many instances they follow for the rest of their lives. These people need help.

Before this legislation is passed I hope the minister will give some consideration to this suggestion regarding this element of our population. Youngsters leaving school can obtain work at $50 or $60 per week. During the first year before they become eligible for an allowance they very often get married and continue in that sort of employment. As a result they live at a low standard of living for the rest of their lives. Surely this is an area in which special consideration should be given. This legislation should be amended to make it possible for these particular youngsters to participate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the minister would prefer that we put all our questions now, so that he can answer them all together as he has done for the hon. member who has just spoken or whether he would prefer to answer each question separately? If not, I could possibly ask him my questions and he could answer once and for all. Would the minister prefer this?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, I think I would like to deal with the few questions there are. Otherwise, I might forget them. If the hon. member insists, I have no objection to this procedure.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I will not insist, because I realize the minister has not too good a memory. I will see to it that his memory is refreshed with his own past contradictions.

[*English*]

Mr. Marchand: It is very difficult to refute with certainty the suggestion that there will not be many dropouts if we make the allowance available immediately to these youngsters. Perhaps you are right and I am wrong when I suggest that there will be many dropouts. We have made inquiries, and the best information available is that most probably a great percentage of young people will drop out in order to obtain this allowance. You suggest that will not be the case, but surely the provision of such an allowance would be a great inducement to many youngsters to drop out and come back after one year in order to obtain the $35 per week. If that happened it would create a terrible situation in our school systems. As I said last night, we would be paying $35 per week to one student and nothing to another.

We are concerned about these youngsters and we are ready to provide training courses free of charge. However, at this stage we do not think we should pay them the $35 per week allowance. In some cases if these individuals have dependants we feel they should be treated as adults and paid this allowance.

I cannot prove conclusively that what I suggest is what will happen, but knowing human nature I believe this allowance would be a strong inducement to these youngsters to drop out of school. If that happened it would disrupt our whole school system in Canada. You will agree, I am sure, that that is not the purpose of this bill.

Mr. Bigg: Is there any provision in this bill to assist youngsters who do not have families, such as those from industrial schools or orphanages? Is there a provision in the bill to cover them?

Mr. Marchand: No. The only exception is the youngster who has left school for a year and has a dependant such as a mother or grandmother, or someone else. That individual is to be considered an adult and will be entitled not only to the free training but the weekly allowance. I can envisage some problems in this regard, but those problems should be solved by other legislation. After all this is not a social security scheme. I hope I have not forgotten the suggestions put forward by other hon. members. We will utilize private institutions with the consent of the provinces. We will do so when the provinces cannot provide the types of courses required. We have allowed the provincial governments

control in this regard for a very important reason. The provincial governments were afraid that we might bypass their institutions and send all these trainees to private institutions, thereby creating unfair competition. That is not the intent of this bill. We recognize provincial jurisdiction in this regard, and we intend to use private institutions only when the required course cannot be otherwise provided. The provincial governments must recognize the acceptable institutions which meet the standards they set. It is up to those governments to select the private institutions to which we may refer the trainees.

In regard to Indian children, let me repeat that it is not the intention of this bill to solve all the problems which exist in Canada in the educational or social fields. There is a problem in respect of Indian children in the field of education, but this problem likely exists because of the school system. The Indian people will be treated exactly the same as others, and will be entitled to the same privileges enjoyed by other Canadians. Because there is a particular place where some young Indians cannot attend school, for example, we do not believe we should use this law to correct the situation. There is a provincial responsibility in that field and I think we should not intervene. If we ever do intervene we will do so with a special measure and, of course, with the agreement of the provinces.

• (12:50 p.m.)

I understand the problem. As far as Indians are concerned we are ready to take into consideration their special status, because we know that sometimes they work only six months of the year. We are ready to consider them as part of the labour force even if they work for only six months of the year, because this is the very nature of their environment. We are ready to do that, but we are not ready to rebuild the school system for Indians under this scheme.

As far as shortage of labour is concerned, again this bill does not deal with all aspects of manpower policies. We have a mobility program. I hope it will work. We have tried to remove a few of the obstacles to the relocation of workers that have existed in the past. Perhaps we can solve part of that problem with the mobility program. I do not know whether the hon. member had anything particular in mind in this regard. I did not really understand what he had in mind. Is the hon. member afraid that we will create a more serious shortage of labour in certain parts of Canada under this program? There are always shortages of labour in certain trades. If the hon. member would be a little more explicit I will make a better effort to understand his point.

Mr. Dinsdale: On the first point, Mr. Chairman, before we come to the labour shortage problem, I take it from the minister's remarks that this bill will not be as comprehensive as the arrangements under the technical and vocational training assistance program in dealing with specific problems such as the retraining of our first Canadians, the Indians, a chronic area of unskilled labour. I think this is why the provinces are concerned. They have established programs which are operating successfully within the framework of the existing legislation, and suddenly they are faced with this new principle with regard to which there are no specific guide lines. It will mean an adjustment of considerable proportions if they are to carry on a good many of the programs which are already established.

With reference to the special training centre—and it is an adult retraining centre in the most constructive, creative and comprehensive form—Pembina House, it seems to me that it should qualify under the legislation because it concerns mostly adults and is not necessarily restricted to our Indian population. Because this is the chronic area of unskilled manpower in many parts of Canada, it seems to me that a training centre of this kind should be covered.

Perhaps I was dealing in the realm of the hypothetical with respect to the other problem I mentioned. When a new program of this kind is launched there is a cumulative backlog of problems and it could be that in the first enthusiastic blush of implementing the program, areas of labour shortage could be aggravated by sending potential labour into the training schools rather than onto the labour market. As I understand it, the manpower offices in the various parts of Canada will have the absolute right and authority to indicate who is eligible to enter the retraining programs. It is not based on whether they are employed or unemployed, and people already employed could be shifted into a training school rather than onto the labour market, thereby aggravating an existing labour shortage.

Perhaps the problem is hypothetical, but the minister knows from our discussions in the immigration committee that in certain parts of Canada we are faced with a real

problem of labour shortage. I hope it will not be aggravated by this program. It seems to me it would depend entirely on the capacity of the men in the manpower centres to analyse the situation and make their decisions accordingly.

Mr. Marchand: Yes. The purpose of this bill is to retrain workers, or upgrade them when they are unemployed, likely to be unemployed or underemployed. The hon. member tries to define a situation in which there is full employment and at the same time a need to retrain employees in order to upgrade them. I do not understand how this could happen. If there is a shortage of labour it means that workers work and they do not need to be retrained because they have jobs, except in a few cases. I do not understand the situation put forward by the hon. member. In order to answer his question I have to understand it better than I do.

Mr. Dinsdale: Let us wait and see how the situation develops.

Mr. Marchand: Yes, I think that would be preferable. I think I made quite a serious mistake a few minutes ago when I spoke about schools for Indians. Those schools are definitely under federal jurisdiction and not provincial jurisdiction. Of course we have a responsibility, but it is not under this scheme that the problem should be dealt with. With regard to the other question raised by the hon. member, I do not have enough personal knowledge of this institution, and if he will allow me I will get some information and answer the question later.

Mr. Dinsdale: Thank you.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I am a little hesitant to enter the debate because when referring to my previous contribution the minister suggested that my speech contained close to a record number of misconceptions and inaccuracies. However, I am not too concerned about things that are said about me in debate because I suppose there will come a time when I will be just as critical of the minister as he was of me.

As I said when I spoke several days ago, if the minister's parliamentary secretary had been as specific as the minister was yesterday and has been today in answering the questions and criticisms on the proposed program, a good deal of the debate we have had probably would not have taken place. The minister suggested that most of us, myself included, had relied almost entirely on charges and criticisms made by various provinces which were not true. They may not be entirely true, but I think some of the charges made were and are true.

I refer the minister to an article which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of Saturday last in which it is said that Freeman Stewart, executive secretary of the Canadian Education Association, acting on the instructions of the provincial ministers of education wrote to the Prime Minister asking for a meeting, and the meeting was not held. Later in this article it is said that the minister of education for Ontario, Mr. Davis, wrote to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration outlining difficulties, and again no meeting was held.

• (1:00 p.m.)

The minister says there was no point in holding a meeting because nothing would have been accomplished. I come back to what I said the other day: In my opinion consultation between the federal government and the provinces does not mean that when there is disagreement one government, in this case the federal government, says to the provinces, "This is what we are going to do; take it or leave it." I do not consider that to be consultation. I have heard from several sources in Ontario that several thousand people now receiving living allowances under the old agreement may very well lose those allowances under the new regulations.

The minister said yesterday—I have not been able to read his speech word for word —that the number was in the neighbourhood of 2,000 or 3,000. Even so this means that a fairly substantial number of people will be affected. I cannot see any reason why, in the discussions between the federal government and the provinces, the exact number of people who would be affected by the change could not have been worked out so that we would know how serious the problem really is. The minister said there was a good deal of consultation. In fact I think he suggested this morning in replying to my colleague, the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond, that there may have been too much consultation with people in the retraining centres. I do not know how much consultation there was. Reference was made to it, although not in as much detail as I intend to give now, in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of Saturday, April 22, where the following was said:

> In Toronto, a system of computerized cheque distribution developed over two years' co-operation with the Ontario treasury, is being scrapped under the new regulations, which permit no "third

party" to distribute cheques. In some cases, manpower officials are writing them out in the classrooms.

I was told yesterday that under the system which was followed previously in the city of Toronto the 6,000 people getting living allowances had their cheques processed by a computer so that the entire 6,000 cheques could be made out in half an hour, and it was an easy matter to distribute them. I am told that after the new plan went into effect last week six officials of the federal department spent 55 minutes working out the payments for 13 people. I hope the minister is listening to this because it is a pretty serious allegation. Mr. Chairman, is there an agreement to adjourn for an hour?

Mr. Knowles: I was trying to negotiate it.

Mr. Orlikow: Before we do so I should like to put this on the record, and I would ask the minister to listen to it so that he can check whether this allegation is true because it is a serious one. I will repeat what I said. I was told yesterday that last week or some time this month after the new plan went into effect it took six officials of the minister's department in the city of Toronto 55 minutes to work out the payments for 13 people, and that this was done while the people were actually in the classrooms during the training period. It may be that regard should be given to the fact that this plan is new and that it takes time to make the first assessment, but one can see that if there are 6,000 people in the city of Toronto alone receiving living allowances and it takes six people that much time to calculate how much 13 shall get, the department will be engulfed and buried in red tape. I hope the minister will take a look at this very serious question which has been raised by people in the department.

Are we going to suspend our sitting for lunch, Mr. Chairman? If not, there is one more matter I should like to raise.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, may I confirm the suggestion made by my colleague that we might like to rise now until 2 p.m. It is true the minister must be hungry.

Mr. Marchand: Of course I am.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, yesterday we agreed to an allocation of time but it was not kept. If we cannot work out an allocation of time by agreement then of course the big stick has to be applied and the result is closure. Here we are requesting an interval for lunch. At this point this bill should have been completed. I do not know how much longer it will take. The delay was occasioned by a personal altercation between the minister and the hon. member for Lapointe.

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, that statement is incorrect.

Mr. Knowles: We might as well eat.

Mr. Churchill: Let me finish. I was going to say that never in my life have I seen such incredible folly as that of the minister, who wishes to put a bill through the house, in going to a member's constituency and making a violent attack upon him. The result is that the hon. member for Lapointe is within his rights in wishing to say a few things today. I should like to see the lunch hour spent by the minister and the hon. member for Lapointe in a spirited discussion, and I will stay here and listen to them.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall I rise, report progress and request leave to sit later today?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Progress reported.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): We shall now suspend the sitting until two o'clock. However, before doing so we will resume in committee of the whole.

OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING

PROVISION FOR PAYMENT OF COSTS, AGREEMENTS WITH THE PROVINCES, ETC.

The house resumed consideration in committee of Bill No. C-278, respecting the occupational training of adults—Mr. Marchand—Mr. Rinfret in the chair.

On clause 2—*Definitions.*

SITTING SUSPENDED

SITTING RESUMED

The committee resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose I was dealing with some of the difficulties which I see still existing in the implementation of this bill. I was dealing with one of the major objections the minister had to my earlier comments, and I suppose to the comments of every hon. member who has spoken, namely, that we were repeating as if they were completely true the questions that have been raised by the provincial governments, mainly, the minister suggested, by the province of Ontario.

I now want to deal with another matter which was dealt with by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris and several other hon. members, namely, the problems which will arise in the implementation of this bill as it relates to the training of a particular group, Indians.

It is true that the minister has expressed some very fine sentiments to the effect that Indians would not be treated any differently from other people in the community. That sounds very good except for the fact that Indians are different from other people in the community. They are different for two reasons. First of all, under our constitution Indians are the responsibility of the federal government. So we have a greater responsibility for them than for any other people in Canada. They are also different because the level of education of the Indian is vastly below the level of education of the population of Canada as a whole. It is for that reason that the clauses of the bill spelling out that the provisions of the program will not be applicable to those people who are at least one year older than the regular school leaving age and the provision with respect to being three years in the work force will, I suggest to the minister, have a catastrophic effect upon the training of Indians.

I suggest to the minister that he stop thinking about what is implicit in everything he has said since the debate began, namely, that the criticisms being made by members on this side of the house are to a large extent of a political nature. Of course all of us here are politicians, and those of us in the opposition like to be able to criticize the government. However, I suggest to the minister that he pay very close attention to a submission which apparently was sent to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development by the Indian-Eskimo Association. He should pay particular attention to it not only because the association is a very responsible one but because the letter was signed by the executive director, Ernest McEwen, and the vice president, Mr. Martin P. O'Connell, of the Indian-Eskimo Association.

The minister is a relative newcomer to politics and may not know who Martin P. O'Connell is. Therefore I should like to take a few seconds to tell him that Martin O'Connell is one of the very bright people the former minister of finance brought to Ottawa to help him prepare that notorious budget which got the former minister into such trouble. Martin O'Connell was a Liberal candidate in the last election for the constituency of Greenwood where he ran against my deskmate and colleague. So no one can accuse Mr. O'Connell, when he writes a letter about the possible effects of this bill on the Indian population, of being politically antagonistic to this government.

I should like to refer to a short article which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of yesterday's date. The heading is "Group Fears Indians Deprived Under Job Law" and the article reads:

> The Indian-Eskimo Association of Canada is worried that Canada's new manpower training law will deprive thousands of unemployed and under-employed Indians of job training.
>
> Martin P. O'Connell, vice-president, and Ernest McEwen, executive director of the association, said yesterday that a letter is going to Indian Affairs and Northern Development Minister Arthur Laing asking for information.
>
> They said the letter was prompted by these facts: New regulations specify that single persons must be out of school for at least 12 months and must be at least 17 before they can take training. Single trainees must have been substantially in the labour force for three years before they can receive training allowances of $35 a week. Trainees who have dependants may draw training allowances if they are 17 and out of school for 12 months.
>
> • (2:10 p.m.)
>
> More than one-third of Indians are unemployed and many never enter the labor force. A recent survey showed that 61 per cent of a large sample group of breadwinners work less than six months a year.
>
> Large numbers of Indian children drop out of school before the age of 16.

These facts are correct. I suggest that those who have dropped out of school before reaching the age of 16 are precisely those who ought to be encouraged to take courses so they may do useful and productive work.

When one visits the slum area of any Canadian city one notices the large numbers of such people living on welfare, idling, drinking and becoming entangled with the law. These people and others like them are excluded from the program by its rigidity. I urge the minister to heed the editorial in today's *Globe and Mail* and not to throw out the baby with the bath water. The minister ought to be less rigid and more accommodating in meeting the legitimate suggestions, criticisms and desires which have been expressed by all provinces.

Constitutional difficulties lead to a division of manpower training and general education, but for our population to benefit most the division ought to be abolished. Winnipeg inaugurated last year a most imaginative program whereby adults who during their school days dropped out of high school before completing their education may return to school to

finish their high school training. It is difficult, as the minister knows, for anyone without a sound education to get a good job. The people of Winnipeg were surprised that the enrolment in the adult school was more than double that anticipated for any one year.

The minister alleges that education is a provincial responsibility, but I suggest that the minister's program is the most suitable vehicle for upgrading people's educational qualifications to the point where they can get better jobs. Instead of saying that the federal government will not participate in such provincial matters the minister ought to consult with the provinces to encourage the kind of educational program I spoke of. And Winnipeg is not the only city with problems. I am informed that out of a population of approximately 260,000 in the Ottawa area, 90,000 adults have not been educated beyond grade 5. One third of Ottawa's adults are poorly educated.

The minister has been in the labour movement long enough to know that it is almost impossible for a poorly educated man to find a good job. The provinces and municipalities ought to be induced to do something to improve people's education and prepare them to take the courses outlined in the program. The federal government ought to encourage such thinking. The division which has been created between education and manpower training is not only impractical but will lead to disaster for this country. I hope that in future the minister and the government will reconsider some of the principles which have been enunciated.

Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the minister a question about the levels of training allowances. There are great differences between the levels of wages paid in different parts of the country, and I want to ask whether these differences will be recognized in the administration of the act and the regulations when the bill is made effective. I draw the minister's attention to the tremendous differences in wage rates paid in different parts of the country. I know that the bill sets a minimum payment of $35 to those retraining under this program while the maximum is $90.

On looking at the latest statistics from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics for January, 1967, I find that there is a 35 per cent swing between wage rates in the Atlantic provinces and those on the west coast. For example, I note that the average weekly rate in British Columbia was $117 in January and that in Prince Edward Island it was $69. The Canadian average is about $100. Ontario's average is about $106 and Quebec's about $97. How much you are paid depends on where you live because going rates of pay differ in different parts of the country. If $90 is the ceiling obviously many people will have to weigh the alternatives of continuing to work in their present jobs or taking time off to retrain. I ask the minister whether, in the administration of the legislation, the different pay rates in the various areas in which applicants live will be considered. Going pay rates differ not only between province and province but between one area and another within an individual province.

Mr. Marchand: There is some flexibility, but the minimum rate must be $35 and the maximum must be $90. Each province may possibly have a scale for each of its different regions. I know that Quebec is divided into nine regions and different scales might apply to each of those regions, but each scale must be within the minimum and maximum.

• (2:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, yesterday I put certain questions to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) concerning this bill, but unfortunately I realize that he did not deem it useful to answer any one of those questions.

Among other things, I had asked him if he would make sure that clause 2 would include a definition of a university credit, since the meaning of the word, as I mentioned, could vary a little from province to province and according to the educational systems.

The minister—and I have been listening to him since this morning—did not provide an answer. I am convinced that his department must have made inquiries in this regard, and I had also asked him what will be the total cost of that program in the first year: first, the cost of the tuition fees; second, the cost of the allowances; third, the cost of the investments; fourth, the cost of the loans—for the whole of Canada as well as for the province of Quebec.

I notice that the minister has not replied. I think that just the same he must have figures, that his department certainly did not just go ahead with that legislation without getting beforehand at least some figures, an estimate.

Therefore, I wonder why the minister does not want to answer those questions. They are

simple but the minister does not seem willing to answer.

When this will add up to millions of dollars—

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I answered this morning when the hon. member was away. He should have been in the house, that is all. He can read my answer tomorrow in *Hansard*.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, here are the facts: this morning, except for approximately five minutes when a newspaper man requested information for television, precisely as the Minister of Manpower and Immigration said, I stayed here all morning and if the minister claims to have answered, he must then have given the figures for each of the items of cost for allowances to people who will follow these courses. Has the minister given the figures this morning?

Mr. Marchand: I do not understand the question, Mr. Chairman, so I cannot answer.

Mr. Grégoire: It is very simple, Mr. Chairman, I was asking how much it would cost and what is the department estimate of the cost of tuition during the first year? In other words, what will the department have to pay to the provinces in tuition fees.

Second, what will it cost to the department for allowances to people who follow these courses?

Third, I was asking what the minister expects to spend as capital expenditures for the institutions which will give this occupational training?

Four, I would ask the minister what amounts he expects will be loaned to the provinces to build institutions for adult occupational training.

Did the minister answer those four questions this morning?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I did not reply to those four questions because some cannot be answered.

For instance, no one knows to what extent the provinces will be interested in borrowing from the federal government to build training schools. It is therefore impossible to give figures in that case.

This morning, I indicated that the program would cost the federal government approximately $110 million in the first year. I also mentioned, while the hon. member was absent from the house this morning, that we expected it would cost us $30 million for Quebec. We have further established that Quebec has a credit of $245 million for the construction of occupational training schools, under the previous agreement.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, the minister has just said that it will cost $30 million for Quebec. As he pointed out, he gave that information while I was just outside the house. I also know that the minister took the opportunity to give answers while I was here. He even saw fit to say in my presence that I represented double taxation for my constituents, since I was working both at the federal and the provincial levels. On the contrary, I feel that I render two types of service to my constituents, instead of one. I can also tell the minister that the taxes paid by my constituents for only one salary are perhaps the equivalent of those paid for other salaries, probably less deserved in many cases.

I know the minister prefers hon. members who never say a word, who never bother him when he introduces legislation, but he must realize that others want some explanations or details on certain matters.

Could the minister tell us—and this is what I want to know—how much of the $30 million that will be spent in the province of Quebec, according to the estimates of his department, will be expended on tuition fees and allowances to be paid to those who will take occupational training courses? Does the minister have detailed figures in this regard? What are the estimates of his department?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, the figures I gave are the only ones I have at the moment. I could try to get some details, if possible, before we finish studying this bill.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, there is a point I should like to mention. I see that it is sometimes good to drive the minister into a corner. I did this yesterday, and as a result he is now making slightly different statements concerning the freedom of choice of the individual who will take these occupational training courses.

This is what the minister said yesterday, as recorded in *Hansard* of April 25, on page 15348:

> I might point out that the people to be trained will not themselves decide to follow this course, or that.

That was quite clear and explicit, Mr. Chairman. The minister asserted that the people to be trained will not choose their courses themselves.

The minister added:

> They will be consulted but they cannot decide, for example, to take a course lasting 45 weeks as opposed to some other course because they will be receiving allowances during that period. It is the manpower training centre which will decide what course is to be followed.

• (2:30 p.m.)

There, then, is the categorical statement the minister made yesterday. The person taking the training course will have no decision to make; he may express preferences but the official of the Department of Manpower, that is the official at the training centre, will be the one to decide what courses he will take. When the minister was confronted with his statements—which to my mind are contrary to freedom—naturally, he was annoyed. He may have thought about it as buzzing around, but the minister was annoyed by that fly. He had to go back on some of the statements he made yesterday. He said: Yes, but it is not a matter of forcing an individual to take such a course; if he is not satisfied, he is free not to take the course.

In the past, he left a little more freedom to the worker who wanted to take occupational training courses; the worker was left free to take the course determined by the department or not to take any, in which case he kept on eking out a living on unemployment insurance. Such is the freedom, the change, the improvement now brought on by the minister.

The minister replied—and I agree with him on this—that there may be some fields where the labour force is too large and, in such a case, it would not be necessary nor useful to provide courses to an individual in a specific field where the demand for labour is not too high.

Of course, with his examples which are always exaggerated, the minister mentioned the case of a piano tuner in a village without a single piano. He thought he had then all the arguments needed to say: If there is not one piano in a village, it is useless to allow someone under the occupational training program to learn to tune pianos in that village.

Mr. Chairman, we recognize that, of course, but there is a difference between the statement made yesterday by the minister and the example he gives us now to try to prove that he is right when he will not let people who live in villages where there are no pianos train to become piano tuners.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

Mr. Chairman, to give such an example is actually trying to break down an open door, or still acting quixotically, as the minister did last Sunday in the riding of Lapointe and at Kénogami, in front of a handful of persons.

Mr. Chairman, there must nevertheless be a point in all this. First of all, the minister's decision to force a course on an individual, while telling him at the same time: Since there is little demand for the trade you wish to learn, you will not be repaid the costs of the course and you will not get any allowance.

Would it not be more reasonable for the department to draw up a list of courses available or those interested? For instance, in a given area, they could be told: Since jobs are available for plumbers, electricians, masons and carpenters, these are the courses provided. You are free to make your choice from that list. Would it not give more freedom to the individual instead of requiring him to take some courses forced upon him by officials of the department of manpower?

True, the minister had to qualify, this morning, the grave words or statements he uttered yesterday. Is there not finally some means to leave more freedom to the individual while maintaining the principle laid down by the minister?

The principle is that training can only be given for trades in which there is a shortage of manpower. I feel that instead of requiring the interested parties to take specific training, we should suggest a list of subjects and let them pick among those subjects the one they prefer, instead of allowing the federal official to force the party involved to take a specific trade.

If the department assumes the rights and privileges mentioned by the minister, that is the end of individual freedom. The official will decide and say: This is the type of training you will take; you are free to take it or go back home without any training.

That is what the minister says. Would it not be better for the department to draw up a list of subjects in which occupational training can be given? Then, the official could tell the person concerned: Here is the list of subjects you can choose from. The man could then choose from this whole list the course he wants to take or which he prefers.

Will the minister not agree that, in this way, the individual would have at least freedom of choice? This is not what the minister told us yesterday, Mr. Chairman, and I quote

his words which are recorded in *Hansard*, on page 15348:

> I might point out that the people to be trained will not themselves decide to follow this course or that.

I object to this categorical statement. Even though the minister tells us this morning that the workers will have freedom of choice because they will be free to choose not to take the courses picked for them, to my mind that is not freedom but dictatorship.

We cannot allow the minister, even though he is heading a new department, to become a dictator in the field of manpower. We will accept a minister, but not a dictator who tells us that civil servants will make decisions for the individual.

Why could we not allow instead freedom of choice, letting the official draw up a list of subjects and the individual concerned choose a course among them? This would allow the worker to choose freely, while at the same time show that the government is not about to pay people to take courses which will not help them find a job, for example a course in piano tuning in villages where there are no pianos, in spite of whatever the minister would have us believe with regard to the usefulness of such a course, to use an example given by the minister.

Whatever the method used, the worker must have freedom of choice.

Yesterday, the minister said clearly and explicitly: It is the manpower training centre which will decide what course is to be followed. Notice the words used: it is the manpower training centre which will decide what course is to be followed. That is coercion, Mr. Chairman, and those are dictatorial methods.

I admit today that having pressed the minister to his last positions, he was a bit harassed, and he was shown how illogical his position was yesterday, so that he had to reconsider his position a little and he said: Well, the individual will be free to follow that course or not to follow any at all.

Now, we would like the minister to make an even greater effort with respect to the freedom of workers and agree that instead of having a course assigned by an official, a list of subjects should be drawn, so that the individual concerned might choose among those subjects suggested by the manpower training center. Give him a choice, at least.

So our intervention yesterday was not in vain, since the minister has already started to draw in his horns. If, instead of acting quixotically in the riding of Lapointe, he had devoted the day Monday for consideration of his own bill, he might have made the proper statements at the outset.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to refer to another point. In that connection, I wonder whether the minister, perhaps unintentionally, or perhaps he had the right information, has not tried to mislead the house somewhat in making two conflicting statements.

If hon. members will recall, this morning the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) presented a motion for the tabling of documents, motion No. 223 in today's order paper, asking:

> That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all correspondence between the provincial governments and the federal government in respect to the decision of the federal government to withdraw from the technical vocational training program.

The minister refused to table the documents as long as the federal government has not withdrawn from the technical and vocational training assistance program.

Now yesterday, I asked the minister, while speaking of the duplication in funds and administration, why there should be two administrative set-ups. And the minister answered, as can be seen on page 15340 of the official report, that the government has withdrawn from that joint program and from the technical and vocational training program.

He said one thing yesterday; today, so as to avoid tabling documents, he says something else. I would like to ask the minister which one of his two statements is right. The statement he made yesterday that the government had withdrawn from the technical and vocational training program or the statement he made this morning to the hon. member for Winnipeg North that the governent had not withdrawn. Those are two completely contradictory statements.

I have *Hansard* and the statement he made yesterday, and we all heard his statement this morning when he refused to table some papers. These are two contradictory statements within two days.

• (2:40 p.m.)

So I would like to ask the minister which of the two is the right one? We should finally like to know whether or not the minister is still interested in the vocational and technical training. Yesterday, he said no. Today, he says yes. Could the minister secure information

from his officials and tel us whether or not the federal government has withdrawn? I must say, Mr. Chariman, that we are completely confused in view of these contradictory statements.

I will not say that the minister deliberately misled the house. No. I would not go that far. Let us say that it might have escaped him just like that, on the spur of the moment, due to overwork and too many trips. He is slightly confused. That is why I say that it was not deliberate.

The minister also said that, under the new program, there will not be duplication of services nor double taxation. And he adds, and this is where I find him fantastically candid and naive: there will not be duplication of funds and the federal and the provincial governments will not both be spending money for the same thing. In the same sentence, or in the same paragraph, he adds—and I noted his very words:

> Naturally, we will have our accountants to check.

The minister therefore admits that there will be a whole series of federal accountants to check what the provincial accountants have already checked. For me, this is a manpower problem. To hire two sets of accountants, two sets of inspectors, two sets of bureaucrats. If the minister says so himself, if he admits that the federal government, and I respect what he said this morning:

> Naturally, we will have our accountants to check.

The minister admits it. But is he going to tell us that the provincial government, after having done all its work, will not have its accountants check also, and make exactly the same checks as the federal government accountants will be called upon to make?

Mr. Chairman, I merely took down that sentence. If I knew the exact words spoken by the minister, I could take up other sentences showing without any doubt that administration costs will be doubled. And, in spite of everything, the minister tells us: There will not be any duplication. And he added: Naturally, we will have our accountants to check.

If accountants, secretaries, stationery are doubled, all the red tape will be doubled. Checked by Quebec and checked by Ottawa. Quebec will check everything, will send the figures to Ottawa and the Department of Manpower and Immigration will affix the stamp "checked" after a thorough scrutiny by its accountants.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

Mr. Chairman, does this not double the costs of administration? The minister will answer no. It seems to me that the minister should be less naive, less candid, or at least, imagine that we may not be as candid as he is. The minister will have to correct his range, because his statements are no longer understood.

So, Mr. Chairman, it might be well to get some explanations on those points. It might be well for the minister to make the necessary amendments to indicate the double use of the funds.

Can you imagine that, Mr. Chairman? The minister thought it worthwhile to spend five minutes this morning to say that I perform two jobs and pursue provincial interests and federal interests at the same time.

I take the applause as a compliment. If some people fail to do their job, I cannot be blamed for having to do it in their stead. So I do it in two places.

The minister spent five minutes to say that I perform two jobs. Could he not spend some time in trying to prevent the spending of public funds, whether levied by Ottawa or Quebec, to pay double administration, double expense, when we could pay but once. Could the minister not take some time also to make sure to avoid that public funds, whether they are collected by Ottawa or by Quebec, will not be used twice, to pay two different administrations, to pay twice what could be paid only once?

Admittedly, this would take a few hours of the minister's time. All he has to do is to cancel a little trip to the constituency of Lapointe, and this would give him the time required. The hon. member for, I do not know which constituency, if he has anything to say, should simply rise and make his views known. That is an example of the type of members the minister likes, Mr. Chairman, those who never say a word except to bawl once in a while, from the back rows, sitting comfortably in their seats. That is the type of "caille" members that the Minister of Manpower and Immigration wants the province of Quebec to elect. That is what he likes, bawlers, and he has a few of them behind him.

Mr. Chairman, I would therefore ask the minister at least to suggest to us a procedure to avoid duplication, to avoid useless spending of the funds of Canadian taxpayers. At the

moment, unfortunately, this happens too often under our system, and I believe that the minister should see to it that it does not happen again, at least in his department.

Therefore, I would like some information from the minister about the points I have just raised.

[*English*]

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, this morning the hon. member for Brandon-Souris talked about an institution called Pembina House. This is a multi-purpose institution. It seems that everything that was provided before in the way of federal support can be provided now. The difference is that it will be provided in part under this legislation, in which case the support is greater than before, and partly under the rehabilitation program.

In respect of Indians, I am sure this program is wider than the former program. Under program five only the unemployed were entitled to allowances. Under this new program not only the unemployed but also the under-employed and even employed workers will have an opportunity to upgrade and improve their situation by retraining. Therefore it is a wider program and one which I believe will benefit the Indians more than the previous program did. It must be remembered that under the old agreement which expired on March 31 we were paying usually about 50 per cent of the cost to the provinces and, of course, the provinces had to pay 50 per cent of the cost of the training under program five, for example. Under this new program the province will not pay anything. We pay 100 per cent of the cost.

The provinces will be saving money in this field and I believe they should use this money to enable them to occupy more extensively the field which is under their jurisdiction. This is the reason I do not think we are worse off than before. We are better off, and I believe the provinces should take their share. The whole retraining program will be much more up to date than it was in the past.

So far as the cheques are concerned, this seems to be a big problem. It has been mentioned that an experiment was made on the spot in Toronto. This, however, was only an experiment. I think we have as good computers here in Ottawa to write cheques as they have in Ontario. I believe my hon. friend should forget about what he called a very serious situation. I think it is very temporary and experimental.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the minister to clarify his answer concerning Concord House which is the rehabilitation centre of the Salvation Army. He told the hon. member for Brandon-Souris that the rehabilitation legislation would apply. Would he tell us whether it applies with regard to the retraining and the allowance or just to the allowance?

Mr. Marchand: This is an institution for delinquent boys. This is a social problem for which the province is responsible, but I informed the Salvation Army of what the province must have known in any event, that if the province supports the home we, under our rehabilitation program, can and will share 50-50 the cost of operating the home and providing training allowances to the boys.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this subject but having listened to much of the argument I now feel I should. I assumed the minister would take advantage of past experience in respect of this legislation and would have improved it. This, however, never seems to be the Liberal approach. They always decide to start over again. They do not take advantage of the experience of the past. Rather than take advantage of the previous legislation they have left out, so far as I am concerned, one of its major parts. I refer mainly to the drop-outs. I live in an area where a good many of the young people who require training have a very low educational standard. The people who train are those who have been in the high school system and have found no occupational advantage from the education they received there.

• (2:50 p.m.)

I am experienced in this field in my own area. Many young people there were unable to obtain employment, took vocational retraining and obtained jobs and have been very successful. This bill will eliminate this opportunity. Many young people will have to bum around in their own areas for a year before being eligible for retraining or will hang around the street corners in Toronto for a year. Obviously their school education has not equipped them with the ability to hold down jobs in fields in which they wish to make a career.

It is my belief that the minister has proposed this bill which will eliminate this opportunity because of pressure from the provincial governments. While there have been

abuses in respect of other educational programs, I suggest that the over-all results have been better than the disadvantages which will be created by the adoption of this measure.

Many provinces, particularly Ontario, are making a mistake by requiring children at the grade 9 level to make firm decisions as to the fields they wish to enter. Once they have made a decision they cannot change their minds but must continue along a specific line of education. Very often they find they are not equipped to continue successfully in these fields of endeavour. These individuals are not able at that time to take advantage of the vocational training program in order to obtain those skills in which they might excel.

Many individuals who have taken advantage of vocational training programs have increased their standard of living by increasing their incomes from $2,000 to $3,000 per annum to $7,000 per annum. I know personally of one individual who increased his income from $300 per month to $800 per month. Surely this is an indication of the advantage of training programs for the unemployed.

It seems to me that if these young people remain unemployed for a year they are not able to get jobs or do not want to work. Surely we will create another generation of individuals dependent upon welfare. It seems to me also that the minister has decided to relate immigration to specific manpower shortages. In other words, when we need men skilled in a particular field we will allow immigration of individuals skilled in that field. Surely such a practice will result in a decrease in immigration.

This measure will have a discriminatory effect so far as widows between the age of 40 and 60 are concerned. Many of them married before entering the working force and have no training which would allow them to enter the work force now. At that age it is not easy for these women to learn new skills. This will create a class of women who will find themselves in serious difficulty because of the three year period before which they will be entitled to benefit. In this regard the minister seems to be taking a backward step. He is destroying the advantages of the old programs. Instead of renewing those programs and increasing benefits he is eliminating them and substituting new ones of less value.

It is my belief that the minister has been influenced by the provincial governments which were afraid that the federal government would confine provincial programs to the supplementary high school educational field. Many provincial programs are inadequate because they are designed to place people in certain limited vocations. Much of the assistance provincial governments give is provided to individuals in high school who intend to continue their training at university. For one reason or another many of these people find they are not able to continue through university. As a result they drop out and are unable to find jobs because of lack of training of an industrial or commercial nature.

Personally I favour sacrificing the advantages inherent in this legislation in terms of dollars and cents for those available under other programs. It seems to me the assistance we are now to provide to those who need it is the type of assistance which has been provided to the same kind of people through other programs. I can understand the attitude which I am sure the province of Quebec will take in respect of this kind of assistance, because it involves an area under provincial jurisdiction.

It is understandable that many people who are subject to high municipal taxes will not object to the federal government assuming the entire cost of high school education. Most people will agree that there have been abuses in respect of this kind of assistance, probably because many families have been unable financially to provide for higher education. Surely we are victims of circumstances which occur as a result of pressures from provincial governments. I do not think the federal government should enter educational fields which are under provincial jurisdiction, regardless of the pressures. The federal government has a role to play in the field of education but that role should be confined to the training of individuals for industrial and commercial jobs.

Let us not attempt to reduce training to a common denominator. Let us provide an opportunity in co-operation with provincial governments for the unemployed to retrain and acquire skills which will allow them to enjoy a decent standard of living. By doing so we will recover from these people sufficient amounts through income tax to provide similar training for others. I venture to suggest that for every individual we train in this way we will be able to retrain two others through the money recovered in income tax.

• (3:00 p.m.)

I realize that the minister wants to develop a relationship between the requirements for skilled employees, retraining and immigration. I suggest to the minister that this is a

very short-range program and one that will be changed in the next four or five years. I suggest it is a program that will be highly detrimental to Canada. A very large section of this nation believes that we should try through immigration to double our population in the next 10 years. I suggest that the miserable methods that have been used in the past and expressed in recent days as our immigration policy will not enable us to double our population but will limit immigration to people from countries which have educational standards for which we are not willing to pay.

It is all very well to say that we will bring people in and put them into a retraining program. I suggest there are better ways of doing this and that experience in the past has proven that if we worry about opportunities for education and jobs for the second generation the first generation will take care of itself. I come from and have worked in an area many of whose citizens came to this country having received absolutely no education in the country of their birth and have not acquired any here. It is true of some of our colleagues in the house that their parents came to Canada with none of the educational qualifications we would have liked them to have. However, they came to this country and made their contribution, and the second generation has taken advantage of the opportunities that have been afforded them. Despite their parents' lack of education and job opportunities, things have not turned out very badly for them or this country.

I suggest we are going backwards in this program. We are again allowing the provinces to wag the federal dog. I think it is time we decided what we are going to do federally. We are going to offer this opportunity to the provincial governments. If they do not want to take advantage of it, that is their business. I do not object to their staying out of the program on a voluntary basis, but I am violently opposed to the idea of reducing everything to the lowest common denominator and saying that if some provinces do not want to take advantage of the program, none will. The present program has shown that young people leaving school are able to take advantage of the courses provided. I do not think the program is so bad that we should drop the major portion, because program five has been very beneficial.

We in this country must pay attention to the basic principle involved in this question and not be misled by the statement that each and every one of those who participate in the program will have a better standard of living because of the payments the federal government is willing to make. I suggest it is drawing a red herring across the path of this program to say to some provinces: Now that the federal government will pay all the cost, everything is O.K. I believe many of the provinces were satisfied with the 50-50 arrangement in this field and most of them do not want to enter into this program of immigration and manpower. In my opinion the program as previously carried out has produced very good results.

Many things in the bill are advantageous to this country and the minister is to be congratulated for them. However, some of the basic tenets that were the backbone of the previous legislation have been scrapped without anything being substituted for them. I can foresee great discrimination in the program in that a large number of people in my area who have been helped under the previous legislation will not be helped under this measure. Many people will remain idle for a year while they look for a job that is obviously not there. Unless they go to Toronto and get into the stream of uneducated labour, untrained people, the bottom rung of the employment ladder, they will not have a job and will seek this type of training only after a period of idleness. That is not what this program was designed for.

The arguments to which I have listened have considerable merit. There have been two sides to the arguments presented, but I believe the whole discussion gives an indication of the thinking of the nation and I think the program should not be introduced on a national basis with respect to either manpower or immigration.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Chairman, I shall intervene very briefly in this debate in the hope that the hon. member for Lapointe will be able to catch his breath in time to continue his tête-à-tête with the minister before clause 2 is passed. Because I intend to be somewhat brief in my remarks I first want to say all I can in praise of the minister. I am glad to see that he has in fact grasped this nettle. I said this at the resolution stage. I think it is high time the federal government exercised its undoubted authority in this field.

I do not think there is any question about the jurisdiction of the federal government. I believe that when in 1940 the provinces agreed to the constitutional amendment as a result of which unemployment insurance

became a federal matter it was inevitable that the next step would be the establishment of a national employment service. From the national employment service has stemmed, first, a program which the previous government introduced and which has been an excellent one—I do not need to say that because it is accepted; I do not think anyone in the house would deny that it has been a good program—and, second, this program which is an attempt to implement those things for which the national employment service and the unemployment insurance program were set up. I do not think there is any question that the federal government has this right.

I believe that recent developments point up the unrealistic position the government has taken. Questions asked of the Prime Minister by the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi and the hon. member for York South invited the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice to make these constitutional issues public rather than having a few alleged experts nesting in a dark corner trying to produce something and then in their good time bringing it out for the benefit of parliament and the public. I think the details of this argument should be brought to the attention of the public. The light of day should be shed upon them. The heat of sunlight should be cast upon them. I do not think there is any question that the great majority of the people of this country believe in a program of this kind. The question of the occupational training of those people who are part of the labour force should be a matter of national consequence and should be within the unchallenged jurisdiction of the federal government.

When we come to another clause of the bill there is the question to be raised, what is occupational training? What is the difference between adult training for these purposes and ordinary education as envisaged in the British North America Act? These are the kind of things that should be discussed in public. There should be a national debate on them. They should be discussed in this house, the other place and in the provincial legislatures. For the life of me I cannot see why the Prime Minister and the government refuse to make these and similar matters the subject of national debate and discussion. The very fact that we are now engaged in this discussion establishes the validity of that point. However, that is a matter for argument another day.

I congratulate the minister on this program but I cannot congratulate him and the government for the way in which it has been introduced. In this respect I subscribe entirely to the views of the hon. member for Prince and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre who made this point last night. Unfortunately I was not able to be here. I read the reply of the minister and I must say I think it was a very superficial reply to a real remonstrance on the part of members of this house.

• (3:10 p.m.)

The Secretary of State attempted to say the same thing with respect to the item on educational television in last year's estimates. It is simply not good enough for the minister to say, "Well, we had to do it. This is the only way." This does not cure the impropriety at least, if not the illegality, and the way in which the government has proceeded is absolutely improper. Age cannot wither nor custom stale the infinite variety of means by which this government seeks to evade its constitutional responsibility and get around the right of parliament to deal with financial matters.

I think we must also consider this matter in the light of the admonishment of the Prime Minister and the way in which he chided us in the house last Thursday when he trotted out the large program of legislation and said, "This is what we have to do. This is what lies ahead. We must have an allocation of time rule. We must change our rules." I go along with the Prime Minister and the government in many of these measures. I have made it quite clear where I stand on the matter of the reform of the procedures. But that does not excuse the government from doing what it has done here. Are we to take it that the government simply wishes the rules changed so it can proceed on its way unchecked and unchallenged, so it can proceed in violation of all proper constitutional parliamentary practice to pay out money prior to an estimate being passed and to enact regulations prior to legislation being passed?

I heard what the parliamentary secretary said and I think he made the most of a very bad case. It is true we passed interim supply on March 22 last and that the passing of interim supply, which included one twelfth of the amount of vote 10 in the 1967-68 estimates of the Department of Manpower and Immigration, meant that the vote became a resolution of this house which was subsequently incorporated in an Appropriation Act and became an act of parliament. However, we must take that in the light of what the Minister of National Revenue said, namely,

that the passage of interim supply is without prejudice to later complaints and does not in any way invalidate or prevent proper criticism on the part of hon. members. It does not prevent us at any time from charging the government with impropriety or illegality in respect of any of the items which may have been included in interim supply or the way in which they have been passed or the means which have been used to take advantage of them.

The government alone is seized with the responsibility of arranging the business of the house. The government may say that we took too long on the unification bill. I am one of those who have said that we spent too much time on the wrong parts of the bill. But that is beside the point. The government knew precisely what the situation was going to be. It was made quite plain that there were members of the house who took a very strong position on the issue of unification, and the government was aware there would be very determined and effective opposition to it. In the light of that fact the government had a choice when we resumed the session after the Easter recess or even before then. It should have been the first item of business to be placed before the house, and the failure of the government to exercise its undoubted prerogative to so arrange the business that it would have been the first item to be considered is evidence of complete irresponsibility.

The Prime Minister said: "We want the power to do this and that; we want more authority." We are rapidly approaching a situation where the government will be nothing more than an a monolithic monstrosity unless we check this trend. And so we have to think of what the government have done in respect of matters of this kind when they ask us to change the rules of the game, to change the procedures so as to invest them with more power and authority. I suggest that the action of the government in proceeding in this way is absolutely indefensible, and I think it is a shame that this is so because this bill is the start of a very useful program which I particularly favour.

These are things which the members of this committee must keep in mind, and the Prime Minister and other members of the government who are proposing changes in the rules must themselves abide by them. This is not a mere technical violation. It is a very fundamental and basic principle involving the right of parliament to vote supply to the government, to tell it what money it can have and how it can spend it. Until that right has been exercised the government has no right to spend it. I want to make that quite plain because I think it is a criticism which can be levelled against this government frequently and effectively. I hesitate to have to do it because the bill before us is a good bill and I am in favour of it. I wish this kind of criticism did not have to be levelled at the minister and the government.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, first I should like to comment on the proposal made this morning by the hon. member for Halifax who suggested the addition of the word "ordinarily" before the word "resides" in clause 3. I am told by my legal advisers that this would not change the meaning at all and that to do so would be useless. A person's eligibility will always be judged by reference to the school leaving age applicable in his home province.

I must emphasize again that we are taking nothing away under this scheme. Under the old plan it was possible for a drop-out aged 17 to take a training course one year after he left school. This is still possible. We have not taken away anything. In fact the requirements are even less stringent because under the old program he had to be unemployed while under the new scheme this is not necessary. I do not know why so much emphasis has been put on this because we are not taking away anything from these young people and in fact they will be better off under the new program than they were under the old.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I am not rising to make a lengthy speech, and I am sure the minister and the members of the committee will be glad to hear this. I want to make a very brief comment on the point raised by my colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and by the hon. member for Peace River, followed by a suggestion to the minister on another point.

I was as disturbed as were other hon. members about the way in which these regulations were brought in, not merely because they were brought in in a way somewhat different from the usual and orthodox manner. I must say that I would not be very disturbed merely because the manner was different. However, I think that the evil of that manner is illustrated by what has happened in this case. The fact that the bill now before us was enacted by regulation—this is what happened and let

there be no confusion about it—meant that across the country there was misunderstanding about the meaning of the bill on some of the points about which the minister has already spoken. If one looks at the regulations and at the bill, one finds that the regulations enact the bill. If there had been a debate in the house and an exchange of views on this floor and if the minister had listened to suggestions, as I am sure he would have done, then not only would the bill have been better but a great deal of the present misunderstanding, the present negative attitude, and the present misgivings in various parts of the country would have been removed either by explanations and undertakings of the minister or by changes in the bill.

As was said by the hon. member for Peace River, the rule that regulations should not be established without statutory power is not merely a procedural rule but a rule grounded in logic. It is a rule grounded in the simple premise that until you have dicussed and decided the framework within which the regulations are to fit you ought not to draft any regulations because they would be produced in the abstract with consequent misunderstanding and difficulty.

• (3:20 p.m.)

I entirely agree with the hon. member for Peace River that there is no reason that this bill could not have been brought before the house a long time ago. The minister knew there was a deadline of March 31, and so did the Prime Minister and government house leader. We spent a great deal of time discussing important bills that had no deadline. We spent a great deal of time giving priority to a bill whose deadline was extended and is now 15 months away.

The minister and the government should have brought this bill before the house prior to March 31 instead of resorting to passing an act of parliament by regulations, and they did not merely pass regulations. This is what I object to. It is not only improper and its legality questionable but in its practical effect it is an evil thing to do. It creates doubts, misunderstandings, difficulties, misgivings, divisions and conflicts where none would have been had the government and the minister acted in accordance with their duty to parliament and the people of Canada in this regard.

The specific point I raise with the minister is this. He said in a statement published in the press and he also said on the floor of the house that the three years in the labour force which the next clause requires is not three years service in the Canadian labour force necessarily but could be three years in the labour force of some other country from which an immigrant has come. With the greatest respect, that is an interpretation of law that is a little strange to me. I assumed from the language of the bill that, unless specifically said to be otherwise, the situations we were talking about applied to this country. We understood, and I think everybody understood, that when the minister talked about three years in the labour force he was talking about the labour force in Canada.

If the minister intends it to be otherwise, may I suggest to him that he consider including in clause 2 a definition of labour force. This could easily be done simply by stating that labour force or service in a labour force, whichever language his advisers choose to use, means not only service in a labour force in Canada but in a labour force in any other country from which an immigrant to Canada has come. If he does that I think he will allay a great deal of the fear that some of his manpower officers may interpret this legislation in a narrow way.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, as I stated, this is surely what is intended. I have no objection to making this change if it can be made, so I will make a note of it and see whether the bill can be amended along these lines.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of covering again the ground covered by the hon. member for York South and others but I should like to address a specific question to the minister relating to the application of the bill. If I heard him correctly, on second reading the minister said there were no occupational exclusions under this plan. On the other hand, in his remarks when giving specific illustrations and also in much of the discussion we have had concerning welders and other trade occupations, there did seem to me to be exclusions.

In order to test the application of this bill I should like to put a question relating to a specific situation which has recently come to my attention. It has to do with a young man 23 years of age who is married and has two children. He has had some difficulty in securing the kind of work he would like to do. For a time he lived in my constituency, and this is the reason he telephoned me.

On exploring his educational qualifications and so on it appeared that he was really

interested in a teaching career and specifically a teaching career in northern Canada. I suggested that he go to the manpower office and make inquiries about this, which he did. He was referred to someone in the education section of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, where he was told that he should take a teacher training course or normal school course in the province of Ontario and come back and see them again. Without going into the question whether this legislation is already in effect by regulation, I point out that this example is of recent date.

Therefore I address my question to the minister in the form of this specific example in the hope that he will make clearer than he has so far done what he means when he says that there are no occupational exclusions under this plan. If this man is personally suited to this kind of occupation, would he qualify for a course of not more than 12 months' duration, which I understand is now the length of the normal teacher training course in the province of Ontario?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, so far as the example given is concerned I think I told the hon. member for Brandon-Souris this morning that if a person wants to teach a trade which falls under the definition of this law he is entitled to allowances and to all the benefits of this legislation. But if he wants to teach a discipline or a science which is outside the scope of this law he is not entitled to the benefits of the legislation.

If the hon. member wants a definition of occupational training, it is defined in clause 2 in terms of time. An occupational training course originally meant a course of occupational training not more than 12 months in duration. That has now been amended to read as follows:

(d) "occupational training course" means a course of occupational training that provides not more than fifty-two weeks of full-time instruction or 1,820 hours of part-time instruction;

That is the amendment that was proposed. We have added the number of hours, that is all.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, as I understand the bill the minister still has not clarified the situation. He states that if this man wants to teach in a discipline which comes within the scope of the bill he can take advantage of its provisions. I have referred to clause 2 where "occupational training" specifically excludes instruction designed for university credit. Where is occupational training otherwise defined in the bill? I may have overlooked it. I have looked at clause 12 where I see that the governor general in council has authority to make regulations defining certain expressions, including instruction designed for university credit. But my understanding is that a normal teacher training course does not give one entitlement to university credit.

Suppose a man wants to go to northern Canada as a teacher under the northern education program to teach mathematics or English or history or languages. Is he disqualified under this plan whereas if he was going to teach metal work or drafting or something of that kind he would not be?

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, the definition is negative, but it is the only one I know. Universities are excluded and the regular school system is excluded because it falls under provincial jurisdiction. Outside that all occupations are covered provided the training takes not more than one year. That is all.

Mr. Barnett: That is the way I read the bill. If the man in the example I quoted wishes to teach certain subjects he may qualify. Is that correct? I speak of a man who says, "I am married, with two children and I cannot afford to take one year in normal school." Yet this man is a graduate of high school with one year at university behind him. That qualifies him for normal school. Will the manpower officer be able to say to this man who wants to teach: "Yes, if your lack of training in this field is stopping you from getting a job teaching in the north we can pay you a training allowance while you go to normal school for ten months?"

Mr. Marchand: Perhaps I have not made myself clear. I said that there is no occupational restriction. I do not think there are any. The only limitation is that we do not cover university training or training exceeding one year. That is all. Outside that everything is covered in the bill.

Mr. Barnett: Can the minister not tell me whether the person I referred to could take a ten month course under this plan at normal school?

Mr. Marchand: I think the hon. gentleman will agree that I cannot comment on the particular case he has in mind. That must be decided elsewhere. I defined the law and the

reliance that is entitled to be placed on the act but, with respect, what the hon. gentleman asks is not part of my job.

Mr. Barnett: I hope the minister does not misunderstand me. I am not asking about this specific individual so much as about individuals like him. Assuming he has the necessary abilities and talents, would he be allowed to go to a teacher training school for ten months rather than attending a ten month course in welding or sheet metal work?

Mr. Marchand: Provided the course takes less than 12 months or 1,820 hours he can take any course he wishes to take to upgrade his skill and he will be covered by the act.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Allard: Mr. Chairman, I have only one question to put to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand).

Yesterday, during the debate, I reminded him that, about a month ago, officials from the Quebec government came to Ottawa—I do not know whether they met the minister, but probably his officials—to discuss this federal legislation and probably also to explain the intention of the Quebec government to legislate or occupy completely or partially this field of occupational training.

That quick visit took place about a month ago and editorialists even talked about the eventuality of a crisis—but I would not subscribe to that because I am in favour of eliminating all crises—but I would like the minister to tell us whether himself or his officials agreed with the Quebec government on the characteristics of the federal act and the role or intentions of the provincial government in the field of occupational training of adults.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I have not discussed nor to my knowledge has anyone in my department discussed the intentions of the provincial government. The only thing is that the Quebec government, like that of other provinces, was aware in a general way of what we were planning to do. Negotiations, agreements, suggestions followed. I am not saying that the provincial government is willing to accept the bill now under consideration but only that all the necessary steps have been taken. Now, as far as the intentions of the provincial government are concerned, the hon. member would be well advised to contact the authorities concerned.

[*English*]

The Chairman: Shall clause 2 carry?

[Mr. Marchand.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, just a question to the minister.

When the time comes for the interested party to select the course he wants to take, will the official decides about the cost or will he be able to prepare a list and let the interested party choose among various courses?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I have already answered all these questions, and whatever I say, my words will always be twisted. I think the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) knows the answer and I have nothing to add.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, this is arrogance on the part of the minister, twisted or not, because I read his exact words. I did not read just anything. I repeated his own words, and I will quote him again:

> I might point out that the people to be trained will not themselves decide to follow this course or that.

I am not twisting the minister's words, Mr. Chairman. They are taken from *Hansard*. Perhaps the minister would like to blame those who edit *Hansard*. I quoted the minister's words as recorded in *Hansard*.

The minister may be sorry. That is why I am giving him a second chance and asking him a simple question concerning one of his statements.

This morning—I do not have the whole text of *Hansard*, for it has not been printed yet—I asked him a specific question. I put it to him politely and calmly, and I do not understand why the minister took the bit between his teeth, why he suddenly became arrogant. I was merely asking him whether the individual will be allowed to choose from a list of subjects or courses, or whether he will be told by an official either to take a specific course or none at all. It seems to me that the minister could answer that question. Will the individual concerned be allowed to choose one of several subjects, or will he have to take the course picked for him by an official? That is what I should like the minister to tell me.

[*English*]

The Chairman: Shall clause 2 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: As I have not received an answer, Mr. Chairman, I have to accept it as such. I think that the minister does not want to answer, and what does that conceal, I do not know. Does the minister have something

in mind. I do not know. I think that the Canadian people, at least those who will benefit from these courses, would like to know whether they will have a choice between a series of courses, or whether one course will be imposed. That is the only thing I want to know, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, if ever I want to acquaint Canadians with the scope of this legislation and the meaning of the words, I will not go through the hon. member for Lapointe.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, it is not acting through the member for Lapointe; on the contrary, it is acting through the whole House of Commons, and I think it is a proper medium to acquaint the Canadian people with the scope of this legislation. It is not up to the member for Lapointe to make publicity for the minister. By replying to my question, he does not reply necessarily to the hon. member for Lapointe but to the Canadian people who want to know what this is all about.

The minister might want to remain secretive about it, which seems strange to me. What I cannot accept is that the minister takes devious measures in order to avoid an answer, saying that he does not want to go through me while he would go through the House of Commons. It is not to me that he gives the answer, Mr. Chairman, because he does not have the right to address me. He has to address you and when I talk to him I do it through you. Therefore, let the minister be intelligent enough to understand that and let him answer me through you, Mr. Chairman. Then, it will be to the whole Canadian people that he will reply.

• (3:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Marchand: I am told it is not necessary to amend this or to try to find a new definition of "labour force". The lawyers say that the wording as it is covers the labour force anywhere in the world so this proposal would not add anything. In any case, this is what we intend to do and I am ready to make a statement to this effect.

Mr. Lewis: I do not know whether I agree with the minister's legal advice, but if the minister indicates to the people of Canada that this is what he has in mind, this is how he will carry on, and an immigrant to Canada will be able to rely on work he has already done, I suppose that is as far as I can get. I know from my own experience that when I come up against a lawyer who has enough authority to make his opinions stick I had better not waste time in argument.

Clause as amended agreed to.

On clause 3—*Definitions. "Adult."*

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, if it were not for the program we have before us today I would be tempted to make a longer speech on this subject. As it is, I wish to move an amendment to this clause and explain to the minister with all the non-partisanship I can muster the reason for this amendment. If he could tell me that it is not necessary the situation would be different.

Other members of the party to which I have the honour to belong have stressed our unhappiness at the introduction into this legislation of the Trudeau-Marchand-Pearson interpretation of the Canadian constitutional scene. The sudden refusal by the government last fall to accept a proposition upon which it had previously acted, namely, that there is a province in this country which occupies a particular place because of its function as the headquarters of French Canadian culture, has led the government to adopt policies which necessarily mean the eventual erosion of the influence of the government of Canada on important developments across this country.

In the bill before us the minister has produced what I believe to be an extremely important and valuable piece of legislation. It introduces an important principle into arrangements for training Canada's work force and retraining people who are displaced by technological change. For this, I give the hon. gentleman all the credit I can, and all he wants. I am not sure he is right in saying this is the first time living allowances have ever been paid to trainees. I know of other places in the world where this has been done and in any case some kind of allowance was paid under the old scheme. But if the minister feels happier in making that claim, it does not worry me. The legislation is important, and I admit it. But there was no reason, other than the demands of the doctrinaire constitutional position now taken by the federal government, for scrapping every part of the old program as this measure does instead of amending the old program and making the necessary changes so that federal participation in the training of young Candians might be wider than the adult training described in this bill. The old program could have been amended and this new policy could have been grafted on to it. Obviously such a course

would have interfered with the determination of the government to follow the new constitutional policy about which we shall no doubt have an opportunity to speak on other occasions.

Introduction of this legislation by regulation has meant that the minister has had to be satisfied with the consultations which took place with the provinces during formal conferences in October and November of last year. I was aware of this, and other hon. members who have spoken were aware of it. But I am sure that the minister, as a practical person who for years was an officer and later the head of an important trade union organization, knows perfectly well that this kind of legislation, which is a practical piece of work involving the daily experience of people in the field, cannot be discussed adequately at ministerial conferences. Wide-ranging discussions between representatives of this government and people concerned with adult education and training in the provinces are a matter of necessity if these provisions are to work effectively. Such consultations have obviously not taken place, to judge from press reports, and I suggest to the minister that the result of the doctrinaire position he has taken may be dangerous.

I am uneasy about the proposal in clause 3 which defines an adult as a person whose age is at least one year greater than the regular school leaving age in the province in which he resides. I know the reason for this. The minister does not want anyone to come under this plan who would normally go to a vocational training school under provincial jurisdiction, and so on. All my studies of juvenile behaviour and the incidence of juvenile delinquency have persuaded me, as others have been persuaded, that the years which are most dangerous for the juvenile are the years immediately following the day on which he ceases to attend school. This is so whether a student has dropped out because he is not interested, whether he has dropped out for economic reasons or whether he has ceased to attend for psychological, emotional or any other reasons.

In Ontario the school leaving age is 16. For a young person having left school the year which follows may well be the year in which traumatic experiences affecting the rest of his life will be encountered. Yet this period of a year must elapse before such a person is eligible for training under this scheme, even without an allowance. What can these people do in that year? All they can do is enter the unskilled labour force until they have reached the age of 17 and are able to qualify for the training for which this bill makes provision and which is likely to be more relevant precisely because the manpower officer is given authority to relate the training given to employment possibilities.

I do not understand why the minister and his officials have introduced rigidity into the program to such a point that regardless of the situation in which an individual may find himself he cannot participate in this plan, in Ontario at least, until he is 17. The minister tries to excuse himself by saying there is a 17 year old limit in the present plan and that he has not retreated from any position previously taken. I am sure he would normally be the last to stand by something merely because it was in a former plan. It was wrong there and it is wrong here. If the minister feels he must establish a no-man's land to obviate certain difficulties which he has contemplated, I would make a suggestion to him with the best of good will and ask him to discuss it with his advisers.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I suggest it is possible to provide that the manpower officers in the department would have discretion in special circumstances to make a program available to someone immediately after leaving school. Assuming that the minister's officers are people with some humanity in them, assuming they have some experience in personnel training, job evaluation and job placement, and assuming if they have not got it now they will acquire it in time—I am not trying to needle the minister; he cannot start with personnel who are not there and there has to be a period of training —assuming these officers have the qualities which are desirable they should be given some discretion. If they have statutory discretion or discretion under the regulations they will be able to catch the unfortunate situation where the individual, in their view, deserves or requires because of special circumstances to be placed under training, without taking the risk of his either doing nothing for a year or doing something that may psychologically affect him for the rest of his working life.

I find even more objectionable the requirement that a single person without dependants must be a member of the labour force, substantially without interruption, for not less than three years. That seems to me to be an unnecessarily and heartlessly long period, unless the minister has a reason for it. What this means is that a youngster who leaves

school at age 16 or 17 cannot obtain allowances under the training plan. I appreciate that he can get training but he cannot obtain allowances under the plan until he is 19 or 20. It means that a young person who has left school at 16 or 17, or for that matter at 18, cannot obtain the allowances under this plan until he is 19, 20 or 21 and during those three years he either must enter the unskilled, untrained labour force or be available for work, without any skill, without any training, unless he can find the means from his parents, his relatives or somewhere else to enable him to enter into a training plan without receiving the allowances which this bill provides.

For the life of me I do not understand why this long period is specified. Again I suggest to the minister it is possible to do incalculable and irretrievable harm to a young man or woman during those three years. All studies of juvenile behaviour have shown that is the case, and if those three years are hopeless for the young Canadian male or female, in many cases this will do incalculable harm. Surely what we are interested in doing under this bill is to make as certain as the minister and parliament can, that young Canadians will receive opportunities to get the skills which the modern scientific age requires in order to enable them to make productive use of their labour and to make a productive contribution to the country. Perhaps the minister can give us some reasons why we need this long period of three years before a person is entitled to this; at the moment I can see none.

Despite the comments made by the minister the same is true for a married woman who suddenly becomes a widow or, even if she is not a widow, her children have grown up and she desires to go into the labour force and wants some training in order to enter the labour force. Unless I misunderstand this clause, and I do not think I do, such a woman would have to wait three years in some sort of work or be available for some sort of work before becoming entitled to the allowances provided by this bill.

Again I say that I believe it is only a doctrinaire approach to this problem which has made the minister specify three years. I do not want to speak at great length, Mr. Chairman, because I know the program that is before us today. I think I have made my point as clear as possible without repeating myself. In view of what I have said I am not going to move an amendment respecting the one year period after school leaving age because that is a little complicated, but I hope the minister will give some thought to my suggestion about giving the manpower officers in the field some discretion so they can deal with this situation. However, Mr. Chairman, I do move the following amendment:

That clause 3(b)(i) of Bill C-278 be amended by deleting the words "three years" in line 10 thereof and substituting the words "one year" therefor.

I point out before I sit down that this amendment would bring the clause in line with the first part of the provision and would wipe out some of the defects in the clause so that if the minister insists on the one year after school leaving age remaining a general rule, a person entering the training field would be able to do so without the deprivation which many will undoubtedly suffer as a result of the three year requirement.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I cannot but agree with the general principles outlined by the member for York South.

Naturally, I do not admit that the bill reflects a doctrinary attitude. It may reflect an attitude based on principle, but it is certainly not doctrinary.

Assuredly, it tries to set the limit between federal and provincial responsibility. Although the bill may be very specific, its scope is rather limited. Though it will have widespread results, and I feel that it is not intended to solve all the problems which may exist in the field of education and professional training of our young people or young workers.

I agree about the difficulties mentioned and the problems which will be created. I could state others. I could refer to 14 year-old children who, at a given time, have some problems and who also leave school, and this is tragic. What is done for 14 year-old children?

I am sure that the hon. member for York South is not ready to leave them aside; then, they should also be covered. This means that we must know where and when we really assume a responsibility, because if we were the only government and the only jurisdiction, I would agree with him completely, and those people would also have to be covered.

However, there is also the provincial government, and there are the municipalities, which have responsibilities, and I believe a line has to be drawn somewhere, and that is precisely what we have done.

Now this does not mean that this program will forever remain as restricted as it is now. There are problems which we are considering. The member for York South himself mentioned, this morning, I believe, the quality of the personnel, the tools we need to implement such a bill, and he is right, because I find that before we venture too far in this field, without being theoretical, we must wait until we hold all the tools, well sharpened, in our hands.

Therefore, in any case, the amendment he proposes will, of course, bring about the situation I mentioned yesterday evening and this morning, which is that young people, one year after leaving school, become adults according to law and are entitled to receive an allowance.

So, he implies that he would not touch the first part, but nevertheless he touches it by touching the second, because by bringing back the definition of an adult and tying it down to a year in the labour force, this means that the youngster coming out of school and waiting for one year or working for one year is eligible for allowances at that time, and the effect is exactly the same.

So, I do not know—he understood my position on the first point, he does not seem to understand it on the second, although exactly the same situation is repeated.

Anyway, I believe this will upset the entire financial set-up of this legislation. I think the reasons given have no sense, and I do not believe that we could, at this stage, accept an amendment of this type and run the risk of severely upsetting our school system.

• (4:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that the minister did not like my use of the word "doctrinaire", I think his answer underlines the correctness of the word. I should like to remind the minister that some weeks or perhaps months ago he was asked about the unemployment in Cape Breton Island and about the people of Cape Breton Island being retrained. I do not have the reference in *Hansard* before me but as I recall his answer—if I do not recall it accurately he can correct me—he said that of the hundreds of people who wanted training, some 1,700 I believe, only 200 were receiving it. The minister said one of the reasons such a small number were receiving the training was that there were not the necessary training facilities on Cape Breton Island. What did the minister do in the face of that answer and that fact? He withdrew from the field which would have enabled him to assist the government of Nova Scotia in building training facilities on Cape Breton Island.

The minister said that the argument I made with regard to the 17-year olds would also be applicable to children 14 and 15 years of age who leave school. Of course. Had the minister and the government not taken the doctrinaire attitude they have about drawing a watertight compartment between education and training in order to satisfy certain internal obligations—and I say this seriously—then, in respect of those provinces which were willing to co-operate, the minister and the representatives of the provinces would have sat down at a table and worked out a manpower training program that would take care of all young Canadians, no matter what their age, who, for psychological, emotional or other reasons, have ceased attending school. He would thereby have assisted not only the public training program and the manpower program but would also have assisted another very serious problem in Canada, namely, the increasing juvenile delinquency. The two are tied together; juvenile delinquency is tied in with attendance at school on one hand and with opportunity and decent environment on the other.

No one can tell me that because of some words in the constitution—and I say this with a full appreciation of the import of what I say—it is not possible in a federal country for the federal government, co-operatively with the provinces, to care for all young Canadians whether they are 14, 15, 16 or 17 years of age, be as concerned about juvenile delinquency as the provinces are and be concerned with building the training facilities and the other adjuncts which are necessary in that field. It is precisely because the minister and his government have been doctrinaire on this point and have refused to recognize the "status particulier" of Quebec that we find ourselves in the position where every province in the country now must accept a line which says that this is what the federal government is prepared to do and the rest is up to you.

I see no reason why the province of Ontario would not be able to handle the rest, or the province of British Columbia or the province of Alberta, but from my knowledge of Canada I see every reason why certain parts of the province of Quebec and certainly all the Atlantic provinces would not be able to handle the rest without the kind of assistance

which it seems to me the federal government has an obligation to give. This is the reason I simply cannot accept the explanation the minister has given for his opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say just a few words. Of course, if the hon. member does not recognize that there is a constitution in Canada or if he believes that we should not care about it—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Marchand: Well, there is a constitution and it means something.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. The minister has received from me, my colleagues and many other hon. members the courtesy of accepting his sincerity. Now he makes the kind of statement which turns me either into a moron or into something even worse. Whatever else I may be, I am not this. I know there is a constitution in Canada. I know there are divisions of power. I realize as surely as the minister does the difficulties which there are in any federal state. Those difficulties, however, are not solved by building walls such as those which divide East and West Berlin.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I have no intention whatever of insulting the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis). Obviously, if a constitutional problem is involved, concepts may be quite different over the way Canada should operate and I do not see why I should be a depository of eternal truth and he should be mistaken, or vice versa.

So, I am not at all at that level, but as far as we are concerned we take the attitude that, in the field of education, the provinces have jurisdiction and should exert it.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Otherwise, we will always be faced with problems. It may be that our philosophy is wrong; in that case, we shall have to decide at the political level with the people involved, how the Canadian people conceive this country. This problem may be over my head, as well as that of some of my colleagues in this house, but the Canadian people will determine in what kind of a country we shall live.

As far as we are concerned, we believe that when a provincial jurisdiction is clearly established, the province should deal with it and we naturally should help, if possible. This is what we are doing. When the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) says: You have withdrawn from vocational training, thus depriving Nova Scotia of the necessary equipment and institutions, I must tell him for his information that I have mentioned several times that we have not withdrawn from this program; on the contrary, we have extended the provisions of capital investments in the area of vocational training. As far as cost is concerned, we are ready to pay not only the cost of operation and administration, but also part of the depreciation of invested capital, so that the province may be in a position to build schools and to equip them properly.

In addition, we are ready to lend money to the provinces to enable them to be adequately equipped for vocational training.

I cannot understand how the hon. member for York South can say that we have withdrawn from this field telling the provinces: You handle this responsibility by yourselves while, in fact, under this new program, we are doing more than we were doing before.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the concept will be settled outside the house, but I also believe that the House of Commons must leave provincial responsibilities with provincial legislatures. If the provinces have a responsibility in the field of juvenile delinquency, they must handle that; on the other hand, if they cannot assume their responsibilities, they can negotiate with the federal government, but it is not for us to get further into areas of provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I believe the debate which has been going on for a while between the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) and the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) is a very good illustration of what I have always thought, namely that the constitution gives powers and jurisdictions to both the federal and provincial levels of government.

Mr. Chairman, we are precisely witnessing an effort to initiate an occupational training plan by a federal government which, because of certain jurisdictional limitations, keeps saying: We cannot do this, we cannot do that, because education comes under provincial jurisdiction.

The hon. member for York South is putting forward an argument which should be supported, in an attempt to have the three-year period, during which an adult should have

played a part in the labour market or have been a member of the labour force, reduced to one year.

The Minister of Manpower and Immigration rises and says: I agree with the objectives mentioned by the hon. member for York South, it is good common sense, I would accept all that, but unfortunately, it cannot be done, because it is another government that has jurisdiction in the educational field. The legislation actually cannot achieve the objective that would be the most advisable and the most desirable, since there are precisely two different jurisdictions. The federal government appropriates certain jurisdictions, recognizes other provincial jurisdictions and the provincial government also has jurisdictions. Therefore, what will the legislation be?

Mr. Chairman, it is going to be precisely what the Minister of Manpower and Immigration stated, and it is going to be what the hon. member for York South would not want it to be, namely a compromise, precisely because there are two jurisdictions, and there will be nine provinces, driving at centralization, that are going to bear the consequences and the after-effects thereof. Nine provinces would like centralization in the field of occupational training and education and will not get it. Why? Because one province is against it and says: Education is our responsibility; it falls under our jurisdiction. The constitution grants us that, so we want to keep our autonomy in the field of education.

The federal government will reach a solution which, in the end, will only be a compromise and will have to take into account some constitutional acts, some jurisdictions, in short some touchy people. That compromise will only endanger the success of a piece of legislation which could reach its objective but will not reach it precisely because it is based on a compromise. As a matter of fact, that is how Canada has been forging ahead from one compromise to another since 1867.

Two trends have been clearly set forth this afternoon in the house. Nine provinces tend as much as possible toward centralization in certain fields, whereas Quebec is tending towards autonomy. There is a clash between the two trends which results in endless compromises and half-measures and, as the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) rightly said earlier, the piece of legislation we will pass today will only be a half-measure, precisely because of the two different trends.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

They are opposed and harmful to each other; they cannot exist together and when they are made to do so, they are prejudicial to the full implementation of comprehensive pieces of legislation, either in the field of occupational training or in other fields.

Yesterday, Mr. Chairman, I proposed an amendment on this very matter in order to satisfy both aspirations and avoid the passing of half-measures.

If Quebec could opt out of this legislation and get fiscal compensation in return, the federal government could then legislate for the other nine provinces. But the latter would be ready and willing to give Ottawa as much jurisdiction as possible in this connection, and Ottawa would then be able to pass a much more complete legislation than the present one, because the other provinces would not be opposed to federal intervention in matters under provincial jurisdiction.

For its part, Quebec would get financial compensation, the funds necessary to enable it to administer this same act. The province could administer the act entirely, providing even greater help for those who are to benefit by this legislation. The two groups would be pleased and both aspirations would be satisfied—that of the province of Quebec towards autonomy and that of the nine other provinces toward centralization. The legislation could then be improved, in Quebec as well as in the nine other provinces, for Quebec alone would be in charge of the implementation of this legislation and, therefore, there would be no conflict of jurisdiction such as the one we are witnessing now.

This conflict was admitted by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration himself when he said: If there were no provincial jurisdiction in the field of education, I would agree with the remarks of the hon. member for York South, because we would then be the only government and the only jurisdiction involved.

Mr. Chairman, it is precisely there that something does not work. There are two different tendencies and they would like to compound both. Instead of leaving each one to its own, they try to check them. Quebec should be left free in its tendency towards autonomy and given fiscal equivalence which would give the province sources of income equivalent to what the federal government would spend. Then the Quebec tendency towards autonomy would be respected, and the other nine provinces would—

[*English*]

Mr. Munro: Mr. Chairman, I should like to speak to a point of order. I do not believe the hon. member's remarks have any relevance to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for York South regarding a change from the three year period to a one year period.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, the reconciliation is obvious with the amendment, since the Minister of Manpower and Immigration said that he would agree with the hon. member for York South with respect to the amendment, and here I will add the words of the minister: If only we were the only government and the only authority.

I am just speaking about one single government and one jurisdiction, in order to reconcile it all with the notion of the member for York South, who would like to reduce to one year the period during which an adult must have belonged to the labour market.

• (4:20 p.m.)

This can only be done if the provinces religinquish a portion of their authority in the field of education to Ottawa.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is an obvious link and I would ask the parliamentary secretary to the minister not to attempt to confuse things. I repeat. I say that this legislation represents another compromise, and one which will only compromise one thing, success.

Mr. Marchand: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. It is true that I referred in a broad way, in a sentence, to the Canadian constitution, but that is not the point I was making. My argument dealt with the value of clause 3, or the possibility or desirability of reducing from three to one year the period during which an adult must have been in the labour force.

This is the clause before us now, and I think that if the hon. member for Lapointe is basing his discussion on a constitutional problem, he is not complying with the standing orders and we will never see the end of it.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. The hon. member has presented his argument at length on clause 3. I think he has expressed his views in a rather elaborate way and I would ask him now to deal particularly with clause 3 and especially with the amendment submitted to the committee.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, this is exactly what I was talking about, the amendment that tends to reduce from three years to one year the period where an adult must have belonged to the labour force. This is what I was explaining, until the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) submitted his arguments in favour of reducing this period from three years to one year. Then, the minister stood up and said: That would be very good, I would agree with you, and then he added: I would agree, if we were the only government and if there were only one jurisdiction.

Accordingly, the minister is compelled to admit that the arguments of the hon. member for York South were valid and that his amendment would be good if there were only one jurisdiction. However, the minister says: Since there are two jurisdictions, we cannot accept this amendment and improve the legislation. This is what I talked about, and I say that it is precisely because of the permanent conflict between different jurisdictions that we pass measures that do not really achieve their purpose, and we always pass half-measures.

I wanted to suggest to the minister some means of improving the legislation, while respecting every jurisdiction and avoiding conflict. This would bring great advantages not only to those who will need them, but also to a greater number of people.

And this is when I stated that there would no longer be any conflict of jurisdiction, if tax equalization were handed over to Quebec—

The Deputy Chairman: Order. The hon. member has already moved an amendment on tax equalization. In fact, his amendment provided that any province which wanted to do so could establish its own system of occupational training for adults on payment of tax equalization. The house divided on his amendment which was negatived. Consequently, I do not think that the member for Lapointe can bring it up again after having already done so two or three times during his speech. I would ask the hon. member for Lapointe to keep to the amendment now under consideration.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I will not bring up again that problem of tax equalization. If the minister does not approve the idea of tax equalization—and he has shown it—I will ask him at least to find another means which would enable the government to bring in some measures which will not always give

rise to conflicts of jurisdiction, in short some measures which would not compel the minister to say: We would accept your amendment which would improve the legislation, but unfortunately there is a conflict of jurisdiction. This is what the minister said earlier.

If the minister does not want to accept tax equalization, he should find another way, so that he would be in a position to say: We have settled the problem from a jurisdictional point of view. Your amendment, when it no longer conflicts with the different jurisdictions, will improve the act and we will accept it. Can the minister find a point like this one? Can the minister suggest something that would improve the act while taking into consideration the various jurisdictions? Now, we talk of three years, one must have been a member of the labour force for three years, substantially without interruption. What does "substantially without interruption" mean? He has not told us. It might be well for the minister to give us some explanation on this.

Mr. Chairman, according to the latest reports on unemployment—and if anyone needs training courses, the unemployed certainly do—of the 353,000 unemployed in Canada at the present time, 40 per cent have not worked in the last six months.

Does six months' unemployment constitute a substantial interruption? Could the minister answer me on that?

Well, Mr. Chairman, that is the case of 40 per cent of Canada's unemployed persons, more than half of those who will need those courses most. What is the minister going to do for them? Will the minister consider that this is not a substantial interruption?

Now, there are classes of workers who find work only in summer, others only in winter. Well, those people indeed are the ones who have the greatest need for occupational training. Will the minister consider seasonal employees as having been members of the labour force for at least three years substantially without interruption?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I might answer right away. It would be shorter. They will be considered as part of the labour force. If they are unemployed, they are available, they report to the manpower centre, so it does not matter if they are seasonably unemployed or have been out of work for six months.

Mr. Grégoire: Therefore, all of them would be eligible as long as they had been able to report to an office within the last three years?

[Mr. Grégoire.]

Mr. Marchand: That is right.

Mr. Grégoire: Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the minister for his answer.

[*English*]

Mr. Munro: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Perhaps it will be just as well to clear up this matter now. It seems to me that this amendment should be taken under advisement as to whether it is in order. If the three years is reduced to one year under clause 3 (b) (i) it will be necessary to increase the federal expenditure substantially in order to finance it. I think it is a well known rule that no member of the opposition is in order in proposing such an amendment. Therefore all this discussion is out of order on that ground alone.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the point of order, surely under the bill—I am thinking particularly of clause 6—the contracts which the government may make with employers for in-plant training could very easily involve in that program alone more money than the total amount the government has included in the estimates for implementing this program this year. Obviously the government will have to make choices. It will have to make allocations of expenditure and decide how much it will permit to be spent on any part of the program. It seems obvious to me that if the committee were to adopt the sense of this amendment it would simply mean a reallocation of the way in which the money will be spent. There is nothing in the amendment which could change the total amount of money the government proposes to spend on this program. That being the case, I cannot see how the parliamentary secretary can suggest for a moment that the amendment is out of order.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Munro) raised a point of order about the validity of the amendment moved by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) and I am ready to give my ruling on whether or not this amendment is in order.

In view of the fact that the resolution was moved in very general terms, I feel that the amendment does not go beyond the resolution introduced by the government.

At this stage, may I be allowed to quote part of paragraph (3) of citation 250 from Beauchesne's 4th edition:

> This principle, however, is apparently disregarded when the recommendation of the crown is given to a resolution empowering the expenditure of public money which, framed in general terms, places no limitation on the amount of expenditure to be authorized by the resolution.

I think, therefore, that the amendment as moved by the hon. member for York South is in order.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, before the minister's parliamentary secretary can raise a point of order, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration—

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I would ask the hon. member for Lapointe to limit his remarks to the matter now under consideration, namely the advisability of voting for or against the amendment moved by the hon. member for York South and dealing with the length of time a person, particularly an adult, must have been a member of the labour force substantially without interruption.

Therefore, I ask the hon. member for Lapointe to restrict himself to the amendment, but he may perhaps make further remarks later on, if he so wishes.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I thought I was precisely dealing with the amendment moved by the hon. member for York South, because I endorse that amendment and I stated my reasons earlier.

Naturally, because of the technological changes being effected nowadays and of growing automation, young people tend very often to quit school before having received the proper training, and it is only after a year or a year and a half that they realize their education is inadequate. Now, if they have to wait three years, they can be hurt considerably, in fact, three years is a long time to help them to get back into vocational training.

So if, as the hon. member for York South suggests, they may undertake vocational training after only one year, I believe that one year is sufficient to show the drop-outs, whatever their reason, that they should pursue their studies.

To my mind, a one-year period is quite sufficient and after one year away from their studies, the youngsters can understand that they have not sufficiently advanced their training and their education and they will then understand that they need more vocational training. Then, they will have a responsibility. That is why I believe that the period of one year would be sufficient and that is the reason why I will second the amendment introduced by the hon. member for York South.

The Deputy Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

• (4:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Chairman, very briefly I would like to indicate why I and my colleagues, I believe, will support the amendment presented by the hon. member for York South. To save repetition I will make my argument by quoting two paragraphs from page 172 of the first annual review of the Economic Council of Canada which I think put the matter in very good perspective. They read as follows:

> There are three major kinds of labour mobility: occupational, industrial and geographical. An unemployed worker may face the need to undergo one, or two, or all three. In some cases, a worker may become displaced because his skill has become obsolete, and cannot be transferred elsewhere.

May I add that this could happen even to a person with only one year of employment in a particular industry.

> To be re-absorbed into the labour market, he will have to acquire a new skill. This means retraining. In other cases, a displaced worker may be the victim of a declining industry.

Again this could happen to a person employed for only one year in a particular industry.

> This may or may not require his learning a new skill, depending on whether or not his present skill is transferable. If he lives in a community where there are no alternatives, he will have no choice but to move to a new locality if he is to find employment.
>
> The importance of labour mobility has increased in recent years—

I suggest this is a very substantial part of the problem of labour mobility.

> —largely as a result of an acceleration in technological change and a more closely interdependent international economy. Occupational skills can be quickly wiped out through a new technical process.

Again this can happen to a person who has been in a job for only one year. Why should he be required to wait two more years

before some help is given him? I continue to quote.

> Whole industries can be sent into decline, either from technological advancements, from increasing import competition, or from changes in consumer demand.

We know how rapidly change can occur in that field.

> The day is probably gone when a new entrant into the labour force could reasonably expect to make one skill last throughout his working life, or, perhaps, to stay permanently in the same occupation, industry or locality.

These are words of great common sense. If a person, particularly a young person just entering the labour market who has had to put certain amounts of money into furniture, a home, a car and the like, loses his employment and we cannot give him immediate and fast relief, then we are not fulfilling our responsibility. For this reason the official opposition will support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for York South.

The Deputy Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Amendment (Mr. Lewis) negatived: Yeas, 28; nays, 40.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I should like to put a question to the minister.

According to clause 3(a):

> —"adult" means a person whose age is at least one year greater than the regular school leaving age in the province in which he resides;

Could the minister tell us what will be that age in Quebec?

Mr. Marchand: The age will be between 14 and 16 for the whole of Canada. I think it is 16 in Ontario and 15 in Quebec. I am not sure, but I can find out. It is between 14 and 16.

Mr. Grégoire: Will the age be fixed or will it depend on the grades completed.

Mr. Marchand: That is the legal age, Mr. Chairman, which is established by the act.

[*English*]

Clause agreed to.

On clause 4—*Enrolment of adults in occupational training courses.*

[Mr. McCleave.]

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to clause 4 which reads as follows:

> That Bill C-278, An Act respecting the occupational training of adults, be amended by adding to clause 4 thereof the following subclause:

Reports or recommendations of joint committee to be taken into account.

> "(3) Where the minister and the government of a province have established a joint committee as provided for in section 13 to assess manpower needs in that province, each manpower officer in that province shall, in forming his opinion as to whether an occupational training course will increase the earning capacity or opportunities for employment of an adult described in subsection (1), take into account any reports or recommendations made by that committee."

Mr. McIlraith: I so move.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, this amendment which refers to clause 13 provides for the establishment of an advisory committee, where the provincial authorities will be represented to give opinions or advice to our manpower centre on labour needs, on the possible orientation of the courses, so that the people having to take decisions are as well informed as possible on the local situation.

We have not given in detail, Mr. Chairman, the manner in which the committee will be set up, because we want to discuss this with the provinces and adopt ourselves to the circumstances in each province.

[*English*]

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment, but I must have missed something. I do not see where clause 13 of the bill deals with the appointment of joint committees.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is correct. There will be another amendment, which is why I referred to clause 13.

Mr. Lewis: The bill before us contains no such reference.

Mr. Marchand: That is right.

Mr. Lewis: Do I understand that the minister intends to move a later amendment inserting such a clause?

Mr. Marchand: Would the hon. member be satisfied if I read the amendment to clause 13?

Mr. Lewis: I am satisfied now if it is the intention to move one.

Mr. Marchand: I will read it.

The minister may, at the request of the government of a province, join with that government in the establishment of a joint committee to assess manpower needs in that province.

Mr. More: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in clause 4, subclause 2, the retraining assignment that a manpower officer may make must be to a public institution only. According to clause 5 the federal government has the right to arrange courses in schools other than those operated publicly in the province.

Mr. Marchand: The last three lines of that subclause read:

—unless there is no such course suitable for that adult being offered at or in the vicinity of the place of residence of that adult, in which he may be enrolled.

Mr. More: I did read that, but we are here getting into an area of decision. It seems to me that if the bill is to fulfil its objectives and is to work, facilities existing not only in the public but also in the private sector need to be utilized. I am wondering why it is necessary to include this provision at all. There may be cases where people have to travel quite a distance to attend a public institution which provides a suitable retraining course, whereas there might be a private institution right at hand such as a well established business college which could provide the retraining in the person's own neighbourhood, thus eliminating problems of travel, cost and so on.

It seems that we are delineating between the right of the province under the constitution to jurisdiction over education and the responsibility of the federal government in the field of adult and manpower training. Although the government is responsible for manpower training, it seems to me that through the provisions of this bill the provinces are being asked to take an interest in it. I am wondering whether the minister really sees any need for this provision. The manpower officer has to decide whether or not a particular type of institution can provide training. Provided a particular course meets the needs of an applicant, why cannot the individual concerned determine that he will go to a private school in the vicinity rather than to a public institution farther away?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I thought I gave a complete explanation of this. The provincial governments insisted on having some kind of control over this aspect of the legislation. They did not want us to bypass their own institutions. They want to decide at which institutions courses may be attended. As I say, this is because the provincial authorities want to retain jurisdiction and want the federal government to go through their own institutions, and we agreed to this.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I would liek to ask the minister for some information concerning clause 4, subsection (1), reading as follows:

—the manpower officer may, subject to subsection (2), arrange for the enrolment of that adult in any occupational training course that will, in the opinion of the manpower officer, provide training suitable for that adult—

Does that mean that the manpower officer will be able to express his opinion, or will have to express his opinion, and what principles will guide him then? Will he have authority to say that such and such institution, or such and such occupational training course provides suitable training?

Supposing the Quebec government were to put forward occupational training institutions which it thinks suitable, would the manpower officer be authorized to decide that a given institution does not provide adequate training? Clause 4, I repeat, stipulates that the officer may

—arrange for the enrolment of that adult in any occupational training course that will, in the opinion of the manpower officer, provide training suitable for that adult—

Does this mean that the manpower officer will have the right to decide whether or not an occupational training course offered by a province is suitable?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I shall repeat what I have just said, and that I have said many times before, that is: if the provincial authorities want to keep control over their institutions, we agree with them, and the department, the manpower centre, will be unable to assign a worker to a training course unless this course has been approved by the province.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, may I ask what the exact meaning of this sentence is:

—that will, in the opinion of the manpower officer, provide training suitable for that adult—

On what will be based the opinion of this manpower officer? Will it be on the man? I would like to have some clarification on one sentence, before clause 4 is passed.

I am willing to believe the minister when he tells us that the provinces are going to keep their authority. I could be sure of it, but according to the letter of the clause—I do not say it is now in the mind of the minister—does not this sentence allow manpower officials to judge, at a certain time the institutions giving these occupational training courses?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, there is also clause 5 which will be even more precise. Besides, there will be an amendment to clause 5 which will indicate that the provincial government will have to agree, even as far as private institutions are concerned.

The Deputy Chairman: Does clause 4 carry?

[*English*]

Amendment agreed to.

Clause as amended agreed to.

On clause 5—*Contracts with provinces authorized.*

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to subclause 3 of clause 5. The amendment would be as follows:

Where, pursuant to section 4, a manpower officer arranges for the enrolment of an adult described in that section in an occupational training course that is not operated by a province or by a provincial or municipal authority in a province *but that is approved by the government of the province in which the course is operated,* the Minister may authorize the payment of such charges for tuition or otherwise for the training of that adult in the course as are provided for by the regulations.

Therefore, should the province be unable to provide a course required by an individual, well, the latter could be assigned to another course and even outside the province, with the authority of the province.

[*English*]

The Minister of Public Works is moving this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McIlraith: I so move.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause as amended agreed to.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

On clause 6—*Contracts with employers operating training courses.*

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment of the same type. Clause 6 deals with occupational training in a plant, and provincial governments insisted on the fact that the requirements as to the courses provided in plants should be the same as those provided for other institutions.

Therefore, I should like to ask the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Nicholson) to move the following amendment:

The Minister shall not enter into a contract under this section with any employer described in subsection (1) or (3) unless he is satisfied that the content of the occupational training course described in that subsection has been the subject of consultation by the employer with the government of the province in which the course is operated or to be operated.

[*English*]

Mr. Orlikow: In a general way, can the minister explain how much the government contemplates spending on this part of the program? What percentage of the total expenditure is involved? Also, how will the department select employers from the hundreds of applications that employers in this country will very likely make?

Mr. Marchand: Where courses are organized by employers we will not pay for equipment, buildings or depreciation. We will pay for the direct cost provided that the course is of direct benefit to the worker and is not related to a skill useful only to his employer. We are ready to pay living allowances to workers receiving wages provided they do not exceed the $35 to $90 a week figures set out. We may pay living allowances if the worker who is training is not paid his full wages. We will pay for the direct cost of the course and that is all, and we will pay that provided the course results in a skill useful not only to the worker's particular employer but useful in other industries. Those are the restrictions. That means that on-the-job training will not be paid for except where workers are likely to be displaced on account of automation or technological change. We will pay if the worker is to be displaced and retrains for a new job. Under those circumstances we will pay for on-the-job training, but that will be the only exception. Outside that we will pay only for courses that are general in character.

Mr. Orlikow: That is very interesting but it is not what I asked about. I believe that for

the coming year $130 million has been estimated as the program's cost. What percentage of this amount will be devoted to the program I have referred to? Also, how will the department decide which applicants it will accept and which applicants it will turn down?

Mr. Marchand: I can only answer the first part of the question. It is estimated that about 10 per cent of our total expenditure will be devoted to that part of the program.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McCleave: I wish to ask the minister a question. Will he assure us that under this clause people in one province can go to another province for training? This matter is of vital importance to the Atlantic area which is becoming industrialized. Sometimes it is necessary to send our people out of the province to be trained and bring them back later.

Mr. Marchand: I am not sure I understand the question. Does the hon. member mean, is it possible under this scheme to train workers outside their province?

Mr. McCleave: Yes.

Mr. Marchand: That is possible if the courses are not available in the worker's province, of course.

Clause as amended agreed to.

On clause 7—*Training allowances authorized.*

Mr. McCleave: Under this clause are the training allowances broad enough to include the cost of transportation for those people I referred to who have to seek training in another province? Would a person moving from Newfoundland to Quebec for special training receive a transportation allowance?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, $15 a week is provided in the global allowances for travelling. We cannot go beyond that. Under the mobility program announced a few weeks ago it is possible for travelling expenses to be paid. The hon. member must take into account expenses paid under the mobility program.

Mr. McCleave: I was aware of that program but I thought its purpose was to move workers from one area to another where there were jobs. My question involves the moving of workers to other areas for training. If the minister is satisfied that travelling allowances are authorized in one way or another I shall be satisfied to take his word for that.

Mr. Marchand: Yes, it is so.

Mr. Orlikow: I wish to ask the minister about something which often arises. Let us take an example of a man who has passed his manpower interview and is authorized to take a course. It may be quite likely that because not enough people are ready to take a course its beginning may be delayed for some time. If the man has to wait for two, three, four or even five weeks he may become discouraged. He may decide to take another poorly paying job. He may lose his nerve or change his mind. My question simply is: Is there any provision for the payment of living allowances while he waits for his course to begin?

Mr. Marchand: No, Mr. Chairman, allowances are not provided to cover this period. If there is such a period it will have to be taken care of by unemployment insurance and not by the living allowances under this program.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Prittie: I should like to draw attention to a point which does not involve the direct responsibility of the minister but which does concern the Minister of Labour who is in his place. The allowances to be paid under this plan will be more generous than the amounts now paid by the Unemployment Insurance Commission. Has there been consultation between the two departments with regard to this matter? Will unemployement insurance payments be kept at their present level in order to encourage people to take part in this program?

Mr. Nicholson: Perhaps I might be permitted to say a word on that question. It has already been announced in the house that consideration is being given to possible changes in the Unemployment Insurance Act and in the regulations. The matter is under active study by an interdepartmental committee of senior officials which include officials from both the Department of Manpower and Immigration and the Department of Labour.

Clause agreed to.

On clause 8—*Rate of training allowances.*

Mr. Hales: The amount to be paid per week is spelled out in subclause 1(a) but I do not see any definition of what constitutes a week. I take it a week will consist of five days. How many hours will it contain?

Occupational Training

I have another question to ask. As I understand it the provinces will be sending the federal government the bills with respect to this training. Will their invoices bear the stamp of the auditor of the province from which the invoice is sent? Again, will the provincial books be made available to the Auditor General or his staff?

Mr. Marchand: Is the hon. member speaking of the allowances?

Mr. Hales: Yes.

Mr. Marchand: They will be paid directly to the workers by our centres.

Mr. Hales: What about the definition of a week?

Mr. Marchand: It is a five-day week, the normal week for training courses, and it usually corresponds to 35 hours.

Mr. Hales: Will the invoices submitted by the provinces bear the stamp of the auditor of the province?

Mr. Marchand: As far as allowances are concerned there will be no invoices from the provinces. We do not act through the provinces at all. The allowances will be paid directly to the workers.

Mr. Hales: Yes, but before paying the workers the department must have an invoice. Otherwise there would be no means of knowing how much should be paid.

Mr. Marchand: Of course we will have a certificate from an institution, I presume, saying that Mr. So-and-So attended a course as planned. But as far as allowances are concerned we shall pay them directly.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 9 agreed to.

On clause 10—*Research and development agreement.*

Mr. Prittie: There is one point here which bothers me. The minister has stated that the expenses of training are being undertaken completely by the federal government which is paying both the tuition fees and living allowances. This, he says, represents a new departure under the present plan. Could he tell us why the government is not taking over all the research costs necessary to maintain this program? It would be logical to do so when the central government is paying 100 per cent of the other costs. Some provinces might have difficulty in meeting these research costs.

Mr. Marchand: In all probability these research projects will not be confined to adult training. They might relate to some educational sector for which the federal government has no responsibility and this is why we have a joint program.

Clause agreed to.

On clause 11—*Loans for purchase or construction of occupational training facilities.*

Mr. Marchand: I have an amendment to clause 11. It reads as follows:

That Bill C-278 be amended by striking out line 35 on page 5 and substituting therefor the following:

"11. (1) The Minister may, subject to regulations made by"

I will ask my colleague the Minister of National Defence to move it.

Mr. Hellyer: I so move.

Mr. Marchand: The purpose of this amendment is to allow the minister to approve certain loans once the general terms and conditions have been established by the governor in council. You will understand, Mr. Chairman, that it will be necessary to make many small loans of say $10,000 or $15,000, and provided the general conditions are accepted by the governor in council the minister should have authority to make these loans in accordance with those conditions.

Mr. McQuaid: My question is directed to the main clause rather than to the amendment. The clause purports to allow a province to borrow from the federal government money required presumably for the construction of vocational training schools. The words are:

—for the purpose of assisting the province or a provincial or municipal authority in the province to purchase or construct occupational training facilities that will be used to provide training to adults—

And so on.

Could this be interpreted widely enough to allow provinces to borrow money to purchase equipment for these schools or to make additions to training schools which have already been built? I notice that while the scheme was in effect from 1961 to 1967 a total of $128 million was spent by the government of Canada on the provision of equipment and alterations to existing schools. This illustrates the cost of equipping and repairing these

schools. Could this clause be interpreted widely enough to allow provinces to borrow money for the purpose of adding to equipment, replacing worn out equipment or making additions to schools which are found to be too small?

Mr. Marchand: I am sure it covers additions to buildings. As far as equipment is concerned I will try to have the information available before the end of this discussion.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Régimbal: What will be done in cases where loans have been made and later the building in question is put to some other use by the local or provincial authority, the plan having been found unworkable, for example? What would happen in such a case?

Mr. Marchand: We would not be concerned with what use was made of the building. But these are loans and they will have to be repaid even though a decision is made to use the building for some other purpose.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Mr. Régimbal: Let us make up our minds. Is it to prepare training centres or not? Let us suppose they are maintained as training centres for two years and then put to commercial use or sold for some reason.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, it is difficult for me to foresee all the circumstances that may arise. The purpose of the loan is certainly to build occupational training institutions or establishments.

Now, it may well happen that, during the thirty-year period, those schools will no longer serve the purposes for which they were built. Obviously, in such a case, the loan would still be repayable. But I am not in a position to foresee all the circumstances. There is as much guarantee under those loans as there was under the old system of capital investment in occupational training schools.

Mr. Régimbal: But I am referring to vocational school purposes.

Mr. Marchand: That is not that certain, Mr. Chairman, and it is very difficult. Of course, when we lend the money, we will have to make sure that it will indeed be for that purpose. However, how can we tell whether that institution will always serve the same purpose? Well, then, that I cannot promise. The only thing I can say is that the loan will have to be paid back in any case.

Mr. Régimbal: Just the same, it is stated that the loan is made, but why? If the objective is not pursued, it seems to me that the answer should be available beforehand. We must not proceed at full speed toward a wasteland. It seems to me that this possibility should have been foreseen and maybe it was.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I think that when we reach agreements with the provinces we will try of course to foresee what might happen and how we will dispose of the properties when they are sold, if they must be sold or affected to other uses.

Now I will answer the hon. member who asked a question earlier.

[*English*]

It includes additions to machinery, equipment and so forth. The amortization period is a maximum of 30 years and less for short-life equipment.

Mr. McQuaid: Do I understand that money is available to purchase equipment repayable over a period of 30 years?

Mr. Marchand: Yes, except for short-life equipment.

Clause as amended agreed to.

On clause 12—*Regulations.*

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I have two small amendments to subclause 2 to amend clause 12.

The first is as follows:

That Bill No. C-278, an act concerning the occupational training of adults, be amended by deleting paragraph (a) of subclause (1) of clause 12, on page 6, and substituting therefor the following:

(a) defining the expressions 'instruction designed for university credit", "full-time instruction", "part-time instruction", 'labour force", "training on the job" and "regular school leaving age" for the purposes of this act;

[*English*]

Mr. Hellyer: I so move.

Mr. Marchand: The purpose of this amendment is to relate clause 12 to the amendment we made concerning part-time courses. In the first text there was a limitation of 52 weeks for the training courses. We have changed that and used the expression 1,820 hours, and this amendment is just to relate clause 12 to the other one.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleague to move another amendment to clause 12 as follows:

That Bill C-278, an act respecting the occupational training of adults, be amended by deleting subclause (2) of clause 12 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

(2) Regulations made pursuant to paragraph (g) of subsection (1) may, after consultation with the government of a province, be made applicable specifically to that province or to specific areas within that province.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, I so move.

Mr. Marchand: The purpose of this amendment is to provide for consultation with the province on any regulations providing for a schedule or method of training allowances in that province which applies only in that province. We have discussed the question of regional differences, and some provinces do not like to have a fixed amount. Of course we will insist on the minimum and the maximum, but inside this minimum and maximum we are ready to make a schedule with the provinces.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Knowles: Before the clause as amended carries may I ask a question. When this bill has been passed and the authority to pass regulations under it has been conferred upon the minister, making an honest man out of him, will the government be re-enacting the adult occupational training regulations which were passed by order in council P.C. 1967/585 on March 30? If so, will they be re-enacted in the same form or will there be alterations?

Mr. Marchand: A few amendments are being made to the bill now and I think we will have to adopt new regulations that will take these amendments into account.

Mr. Knowles: In other words, these regulations which were conceived in sin will have a very short life.

Mr. MacRae: Mr. Chairman, the minister knows that when I spoke on second reading I advised his able parliamentary secretary that I would be proposing an amendment in due course. The purpose of my amendment was to ensure that the resources of private enterprise, more specifically of private schools, would be employed to the maximum feasible extent in the various programs described in this bill. However, as discussion on the bill has progressed and as the minister has answered questions on second reading and in committee of the whole, I have come to the conclusion that the government is indeed very sympathetic and very much aware of the problems of the private schools, their wish to participate, and also their ability to participate to the maximum possible extent. If I might again have just very briefly the assurance of the minister on this point, it would not be necessary to propose the amendment of which I believe he has notice.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I think we will be happy to collaborate with private institutions which are certified and recognized by the provincial government.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I have given a little more thought to the legal advice which the minister has had about the meaning of the words "labour force". I have discussed it with a fellow lawyer. Without entering into an argument on this point, I must say to him that it seems to me it would be absurd even to suggest that the words "labour force" when they appear in an act passed by the parliament of Canada would automatically apply to the labour force of China, Italy, France, Belgium, Denmark or the moon. This to me would appear to be legal nonsense. It seems to me that an act passed by the parliament of Canada when it talks about groups of people refers to Canadian people and groups of Canadian people unless the act specifically says it refers to something else.

I urge the minister to make this clear so that those persons who have not heard his explanation will know where they stand. I have in mind those who sponsor immigrants. This should be made clear so that the immigrant who comes to Canada will know that under section 12 the minister has the authority to define "labour force". It is so defined in respect of the illegitimate child conceived in sin to whom my friend the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre referred a moment ago. I would merely urge upon the minister and his advisers that when they write the regulations defining "labour force" they do so in such a way that it will be clear in the legislation that the minister and the department intend to pay attention to the years of service in a labour force of an immigrant before he came here.

Mr. Marchand: I understand. When we redraft or amend the regulations we will take into account the point which the hon. member has made.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, before clause 12 is voted on I should like to ask the Minister

of Manpower and Immigration this question. Does he not feel that up to this time he has had all the authority he needed to make all the regulations he wished to make? If not, by what authority did he make the regulations I hold in my hand which run to 15 pages and bear a short title saying that these regulations may be cited as the adult occupational training regulations? How did these regulations come into force if it is necessary to pass clause 12 now stating that the governor in council may make regulations?

Mr. Marchand: This question was raised in the house at least twice and has been answered. I have nothing else to add.

Mr. Knowles: It was raised but not answered.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, clause 12(1) (c) provides that:

(1) The governor in council may make regulations,

(c) prescribing, for the purposes of subsection (1) of section 5, the method of determining the costs incurred by a province or a provincial or municipal authority in providing training in an occupational training course to adults described in that subsection;

Does that mean that the amount of costs will be determined by federal regulations? What amounts will be paid by the federal government? Who will determine the costs incurred by the provincial government in connection with adult training? I should like to know how we will proceed.

It is stipulated here that regulations will be made in that respect. But will the provincial government calculate the costs of facilities, laboratories, teachers, paper, books, and so on, and present the bill to the federal government? Or will there be federal regulations stipulating how much an electrician, or a plumber, and so on, enrolled in an occupational training course will receive per week? Could the minister give us some information on this subject?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, we will take into account the actual cost. Naturally, we want to discuss it. We buy services. This cost will include not only tuition fees but administration and depreciation costs. Naturally, we want to be able to discuss the matter, but we are willing to pay for the actual cost of occupational training courses as calculated by the provinces and checked by us.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, if I understand well, it is more or less the provincial government which would send its bill, and paragraph (c) woud merely confer whatever authority is granted under these regulations, that is, to discuss fees if the department finds the costs too high. However, it is in fact the provincial government which will send the bill, whereas the federal government, under this paragraph, will be free to discuss the matter according to existing rules.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, we already have rules and standards. We shall discuss according to such standards and come to some understanding; however, the point is to pay for the true value of the courses provided.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask another question concerning paragraph (e) subsection I of said section 12. Paragraph (e) provides that:

(1) The governor in council may make regulations

(e) providing for the charges for tuition or otherwise that may be paid for the training of an adult in an occupational training course that is not operated by a province or a provincial or municipal authority in a province;

Again, does this mean that, in the case of institutions that are not operated by province, the federal government can tell a private institution: Our regulations are the following. We pay so much for an occupational training course. Or will it be the private institution that will send its bill, subject to discussion with the federal department?

It is about the same kind of question, except that this has to do with a private institution and I would like to know if in the case of a provincial government, for instance, that government would be the one to send its bill, even if it had to discuss about it. I would like to know if it is going to be the same thing in the case of private institutions, since the wording is far from being the same.

• (5:30 p.m.)

In paragraph (c), as regards provincial institutions, it is stipulated that there will be regulations prescribing the method of determining the costs incurred by a province, while in paragraph (e), as regards private institutions or institutions in other provinces, it is said that regulations may be established providing for the charges for tuition.

Paragraph (c) deals with the method of determination which may be followed jointly by the provinces and the federal government,

while paragraph (e) deals only with regulations providing for the "charges for tuition", which means more or less that the federal government will come forward with its regulations and say: "In our case, it is so much per week or per year for an occupational training course." I should like to know what the minister thinks about that.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, it has been agreed with the provinces that we will have some kind of contracts to arrive at the costs. Both parties have agreed to this. As for private institutions, if there is no contract, we will negotiate the costs and pay them whatever the costs are, if we agree on them.

No one will send us a bill without our being able to discuss the costs too.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I understand that because the minister told us this morning that he has his auditors. But here is what I would like to know. If, for instance, an agreement cannot be arrived at, what happens then?

In paragraph (c) is described the method of determining the costs incurred by a province. What happens then? Does the federal department come along and say: We have regulations prescribing the method of determining the costs incurred by the province. Therefore, you must abide by our regulations.

Supposing there is no agreement, in my opinion, the federal government then assumes a great deal of authority.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, this is a hypothetical question, because there are already agreements governing such matters.

Mr. Allard: Mr. Chairman, I should like to put a question to the minister. He has told us that up to now contracts or agreements have been concluded with the provinces.

With respect to the province of Quebec, has there been up to now any agreement concluded on occupational training courses and have the terms concerning the occupational training courses been established and agreed upon by the federal department when Quebec officials met a few weeks ago the officials of the minister's department?

Is there any existing agreement and has there been any arrangement about the enforcement of the federal legislation with reference to the part played by the provincial government in certain fields or has there been no agreement at all so far?

[Mr. Grégoire.]

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, we have been told about the technicalities of the courses; there is no understanding on this matter since it comes under provincial jurisdiction and we have nothing to do with it.

As for the rest, meetings were held with the high officials of the province, who made representations, and an agreement was reached. In fact, I believe that the province of Quebec, as the Prime Minister mentioned at the last federal-provincial conference, is ready to try out this legislation.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, the minister says that the matter of agreement is hypothetical, because agreements are already made; it is the minister who just stated that. Are we then to conclude that as far as vocational training is concerned, agreements were arrived at between his department and the Quebec government? Have such agreements been reached?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, there is no capital investment in the province of Quebec; that is under the federal legislation which has been extended. There is no special agreement; when the province wants the money, it can have it provided it meets the requirements of the act.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I think the minister failed to understand my question or it may be that I did not make myself clear, but paragraphs (c) and (e) have nothing to do with facilities or institutions. They deal with tuition fees for the adults who will take the training courses.

I asked the minister specific questions about that in order to find out who would establish the tuition fees should any disagreement arise. Will they be established under the federal regulations or according to the cost of the bill submitted by the federal government to the provincial authorities?

The minister told me then: There cannot be any disagreement since agreements have already been reached. That is exactly what I would like to know.

Have agreements already been reached between the Quebec and Ottawa governments about the tuition fees of those who will take the vocational training courses?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, how many times will I have to repeat it? He can ask the question fifteen times if he wants to, but I will say that we agree on the standards;

we know what scale will be followed to reimburse the provinces and the provinces have agreed to it.

Mr. Grégoire: Well, Mr. Chairman, if there is full agreement on the standards, why make regulations? That is the point on which I would like to know where we stand.

The minister says he has answered several times but I am not the first to say today that he does not always reply to the question, he sometimes tries to talk around the question.

What I want to know is not the standards of training, construction, accommodation and facilities, but school fees. What I should like to know, no more and no less, is that inevitably the federal government will have to pay something for that.

Is the federal department going to say: We have made regulations and we will be paying you so much per pupil? Or is the provincial government going to say: to give professional training to one person costs so much and here is the bill? What would be a second method.

Will there be a third method? Negotiations?

That is what I would like to know. Have agreements been reached between Quebec and Ottawa setting limits on the fees to be paid?

I am not asking about the cost of the facilities or buildings, but about the fees for training. I may have expressed my question poorly. Can the minister tell us if agreements have been reached, at least on that score?

The Deputy Chairman: Does clause 12 carry?

Mr. Grégoire: One last question, Mr. Chairman, on clause 12.

I asked this question yesterday, and I should like to get an answer, for it concerns the definition of expressions which is dealt with in paragraph (a):

—"instruction designed for university credit"—

Could the minister tell us whether that expression has been defined yet?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, there is an understanding with the provinces as to levels of instruction.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, that is not at all what I asked.

I asked whether a definition has been given to the expression:

—"instruction designed for university credit"—

Although there may be an understanding with the provinces, we still do not know what definition has been given to that expression.

What I wish to know is whether a definition has been given to the expression:

—"instruction designed for university credit"—

[*English*]

Clause as amended agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I should like to introduce an amendment at this stage and, with your permission, I will ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Nicholson) to move it.

[*English*]

That Bill C-278 be amended by adding, immediately after clause 12, the following clause:

13. The minister may, at the request of a government of a province, join with that government in the establishment of a joint committee to assess manpower needs in that province;

and by renumbering clauses 13 to 23 as clauses 14 to 24, respectively.

This is the amendment I referred to earlier.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, could the minister indicate the necessity for the words "at the request of the government of a province"? I note the same words in the regulations. This is obviously a very important piece of machinery for any kind of civilized development. I do not suggest for one moment that the federal government should impose a joint committee because obviously if the committee is to be a joint committee it must be just that. Why can the minister not make a suggestion or request to a province in this regard? Why should he sit back and wait for a request? Surely this would not be an invasion of provincial authority.

I suggest that the clause should state that the minister may join with the government of a province in the establishment of a joint committee to assess manpower needs, whether the initiative is taken by the minister or by the province. I am sure he does not intend this, but as the clause reads now it appears that the minister is sloughing off the initiative to some other authority.

Mr. Marchand: This involves the kind of committee we would not like to impose on a province. If all the hon. member wants is to preserve the right of the federal government to ask for the establishment of such a committee if necessary, I have no objection to the suggestion.

Amendment agreed to.

On clause 14—*Recovery of overpayments.*

Mr. Patterson: Mr. Chairman, is this the clause which was formerly numbered 13?

The Deputy Chairman: This is clause 14 which was formerly clause 13.

Mr. Patterson: I should like to refer briefly to this clause because it provides for the recovery of overpayments to those availing themselves of the privileges of this program. When my colleague, the hon. member for Okanagan-Revelstoke, spoke on this measure yesterday he drew attention to the fact that in the past difficulty has been experienced in the recovery of other overpayments made in respect of old age pensions, war veterans allowances and so on. In many cases recovery has resulted in real hardship to people who have been placed in the position of knowing hardly where to turn in order to meet the requirement. What method does the minister propose using?

• (5:40 p.m.)

The clause says that the amount may be recovered at any time as a debt due to Her Majesty or may be retained out of any subsequent amount payable to the person as a training allowance. Does this mean, in the event the person is not still in training, that court proceedings can be taken against him and every possible method used in order to force him to repay something which he received through no fault of his, not because of false information given by him but solely because of an error on the administrative side? I wonder what method the minister is proposing to use in order to force these repayments.

Mr. Marchand: This is quite a technical point, Mr. Chairman. I will give the information later to the hon. member. At this moment I do not know what method will be used.This is not a very satisfactory answer but I must confess I have not looked into that aspect of the problem.

Mr. Patterson: I hope the minister will consider this matter very carefully because it is of real importance to those who may inadvertently be the recipients of overpayments. Therefore I hope the minister will give every consideration to this problem.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, the question here is to secure repayment from those who might have been overpaid. There are clauses like this in many bills and I have often seen people who had to repay in other fields. For instance, I know of some people who were overpaid by unemployment insurance and later such amounts had been deducted from their old age pension when time came for them to receive old age pension, at the age of 68 today.

I should like to ask the minister whether someone having been overpaid under clause 14, formerly clause 13, could find the amount deducted from his old age pension, as has been done recently in cases of unemployment insurance?

Mr. Marchand: I do not believe so, Mr. Chairman, but the only thing I can say to the house is that we shall proceed as humanely as possible, taking all circumstances into account.

Mr. Grégoire: This answer, Mr. Chairman, may be full of good intentions, but it must be admitted that the minister tries to answer as humanely as possible according to the circumstances. I admit that this comes from a good heart and I cannot but congratulate the minister, however, the experience of the past is there.

Take for instance, the case of a man who I know was getting unemployment insurance —that has something to do with the matter under discussion since it is a matter of interpretation and overpayments—and who had a dependant, his mother. A bachelor in his twenties, he was supporting his mother. Of course, with the $26 per week he was getting, he could not pay for everything. Since his mother was getting a pension of $30 a month, it was decided that he was not his mother's sole support. So, for the previous eleven months his unemployment insurance payment was reduced from $26 to $23, which means that he had to pay back an overpayment of $3 per week for 47 or 48 weeks.

I am sure that when the legislation was passed, that clause was inspired by humane and compassionate reasons and there was no question at all that the unemployed should suffer because of a defective wording. But this is happening because of a different interpretation given to such a section. That individual was even deprived of his unemployment insurance benefits during several weeks, even though his benefits had been reduced.

Therefore, I wonder whether clause 13, now renumbered 14, is specific enough. I wonder if a person is allowed enough latitude to prove that no overpayments have been collected.

They will tell me that, in this instance, it involves alleged overpayments by the department to an individual. They tell me that if the individual is not satisfied, he can always apply to appeal boards or state his case before the courts.

That is already the case for the Unemployment Insurance Commission but I notice, unfortunately, that individuals are not fortunate or do not have enough opportunities to assert their rights.

In order to avoid the dangers which were left in that legislation passed in too great a hurry in the past, because certain viewpoints were ignored, I wonder whether, in clause 14, the hon. minister could not provide for certain regulations, so that the individual who has been accused of receiving overpayments, might ascertain his rights without any obligation to assume all the expenses involved as, for instance, in the case of the Unemployment Insurance Act.

I wonder whether it would not be advisable to include in that clause provisions giving an individual from whom the department wants to recover certain payments, a chance to express his viewpoint without incurring too many expenses.

I wonder also whether the minister could not mention more specifically in the clause, that the old age pension of someone having received an overpayment will not be garnished.

Mr. Marchand: We will take all that into consideration when implementing the act, Mr. Chairman.

[*English*]

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 15 to 20 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 21—*Agreements authorized for occupational training facilities.*

• (5:50 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, this concerns new clause 21, dealing with agreements with a province as to capital expenditures incurred by the province on facilities for occupational training courses.

Can the minister tell us whether, under that act, the province will be able to set up vocational training facilities, receive the contributions provided for from the federal government and, at the same time, give in these same facilities receiving federal contributions for construction and expenses, courses to trainees other than those taking vocational training courses under the act?

In other words, is it possible to build a vocational training institution, with the contributions and loans provided in the act, even though, besides the people taking occupational training courses under the present act, other students take courses there from the same teachers, using the same laboratories? Could the minister tell us whether that would be possible?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, those grants or those loans are made by the federal government in the case of occupational training schools. As regards implementation, this is a question of judgment and also of proportion, and I cannot answer otherwise than by saying this: should there be, by accident, students taking other courses, I do not think the purposes of the institution would be changed for all that, only there is a certain limit and one has to decide about each case.

Mr. Grégoire: Could we come to the following conclusion: According to reasonable limits, provided that there is no principle going directly against the admission of students other than those who are attending the courses, provided there are reasonable limits observed by the province. Is that the conclusion we can infer from the remarks of the minister?

Mr. Marchand: I said precisely what I wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, I cannot say anything else.

[*English*]

Clause agreed to.

Clause 22 and 23 agreed to.

On clause 24—*Coming into force.*

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Nicholson) to move the following amendment:

That Bill No. C-278, an act respecting the occupational training of adults, be amended by the deletion of clause 23 thereof.

It is the clause providing that the bill shall come into force on the first day of April.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister whether it would not have been a good idea to amend the clause to make it read, "This act shall be considered to have come into force on the first day of April", thereby covering the minister's sins?

Mr. Marchand: I do not admit I am guilty of anything, so I do not accept the hon. member's amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

On clause 1—*Short title.*

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, on clause 1, a question concerning an item that has not been provided for in any other clause.

This legislation, Bill No. C-278, sets a limit of 1820 hours of occupational training for any individual.

Supposing someone is hired for a period of four or five years and there realizes that he is not sufficiently trained to keep his job or that demand has fallen off as far as this job is concerned and he loses his job. He will want to take further training. Could he do so under this act after a certain period of time?

Mr. Marchand: Is the hon. member for Lapointe anxious to start his studies over again?

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I believe this remark reveals the attitude the minister has adopted since consideration of this bill has started. I believe the minister could answer when the members ask him questions, instead of playing the smart aleck.

I am not the only one who complains that he does not answer. Several members here have said that the minister did not listen to questions and does not answer very much. Maybe it is because he is too tired. Maybe he is not used to work so long without interruption or maybe it is his trip in the Kenogami riding or the disappointments he had, which have put him in a bad mood.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask again my question which is quite in order. Can the minister tell us whether an individual who will have attended those occupational training courses which will have made it possible for him to find employment, and who after a few years, will realize that he is in a line which does not have enough openings for him to remain in it, or that he is not yet adequately qualified, will be able to take advantage of a second stage of occupational training under this legislation?

Mr. Marchand: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Grégoire: It would have been so simple for the minister to answer me like that.

[Mr. Knowles.]

[*English*]

Clause agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

INCOME TAX ACT

AMENDMENT TO REMOVE FIVE PER CENT REFUNDABLE TAX

Hon. Jean Chrétien (for the Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-280, to amend the Income Tax Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) gave the house notice of his intention to introduce this bill at the close of business on March 10 last. Because it is provided in the bill that it take effect from March 31, 1967, he had hoped that parliament would be able to deal with it before that date. However, as hon. members know, the parliamentary timetable made this impossible.

The purpose of the bill is to terminate, effective March 31, the tax period to which the special 5 per cent refundable tax on business profits applies and also to terminate on the same date the period of collection of the tax from corporations. In the case of trusts which are subject to the tax, payments may need to be made in June or September, but the over-all liability will be reduced in the same way as for corporations. Corporations may have to make some adjusting payment after March where their monthly instalments have not amounted to the precise amount of the tax as and when it is determined. This means that payments of that tax for April 1967 will not be required.

It will be recalled that this refundable tax was imposed as a special temporary measure to divert and immobilize temporarily a modest portion of the flows of funds that are the chief sources of finance for capital expenditures of businesses. It has applied to all corporations that are liable for income tax and to those trusts that have income from a business or from rentals. It was made effective for an 18-month period from May 1, 1966 to October 31, 1967 and was made payable for corporations in monthly instalments starting on May 31 last.

The tax was imposed on a special base which was devised to approximate the cash flow of a corporation. For example, in addition to taxable income as computed for income tax purposes this base included the

amount of capital cost allowances and depletion allowances deducted in computing income. On the other hand, the base was reduced by amounts paid as income taxes and by amounts paid in repayment of long-term debt.

This short Bill C-280 is quite simple. It merely substitutes the words "March 31, 1967" for the words "October 31, 1967" where they appear in the present law. This will apply to the definition of the tax period, which will reduce the total liability for the tax to a corresponding degree. It will also apply to the dates on which payments of tax have to be made.

No change is proposed at this time in the provisions for repaying the tax. The law will continue to provide that the tax shall be refunded, with interest at the rate of 5 per cent, at such time or times as the governor in council may prescribe by regulation, but that in any case this time shall not be less than 18 months or more than 36 months after the date on which the instalment was due, or the date on which it was paid if that is later.

• (6:00 p.m.)

My main remarks today relate to the reasons for proposing this bill. They apply, too, to an associated measure, which had the same purpose as this bill, on which action was taken by the government last month. This measure was the provision in the Income Tax Act regulations under which capital assets of certain classes acquired in the period after the date of the March 1966 budget but before October 1 of this year would be subject to deferred capital cost allowances. On March 22 last the Minister of Finance tabled order in council P.C. 1967-533 of March 21, which changed from October 1 to April 1 of this year the date at which this period was to come to an end.

It will be recalled that when the minister brought down the budget for 1966-67 on March 29 last year he reported the Canadian economy was under a good deal of strain. Most sectors and regions of the economy were working to full capacity and shortages of skilled labour had become evident. The pace of economic expansion was such indeed that unless some of the demands for goods and services and labour and other resources were moderated and postponed, the pressure upon prices and wages would become inflationary and there would be danger that the boom would culminate in an economic recession.

As a consequence of the conditions at the time, the Minister of Finance proposed a number of measures designed to pace and to prolong the prosperity. Among these were two measures of a temporary nature designed to moderate the rate of increase in the capital expenditures of business and to stretch it out over a longer period. This included the refundable tax on the cash profits of corporations and certain trusts, the subject matter of the bill before the house, and a deferral of a portion of the capital cost allowances which could be claimed on assets acquired after the budget date. In explaining the purpose and advantages of these measures, he mentioned that each could be terminated on short notice without serious effects, should our economic circumstances change substantially. This was in accordance with the general policy he had stated in that budget of keeping our fiscal policies flexible and readily adaptable to changing circumstances.

During the months following the budget the necessity for restraint in the economy became even more evident than it had been earlier. The activity and market effects of the excessive economic demands helped to produce excessive price and wage pressures of dangerous proportions. Some moderation of these demands was evident during the summer months but was not sufficient to accomplish what was necessary in regard to the increases in prices and costs.

On September 8, therefore, the Minister of Finance made a major statement in the House of Commons in which he outlined certain decisions the government had taken in order to further dampen the inflationary pressures on the economy. These related chiefly to government expenditures. He also called upon all Canadians to moderate their demands on the economy. Hon. members will recall the rather forceful public debates to which these measures gave rise, particularly of course the deferment of certain government programs.

The last three months of 1966 and the early months of this year have been moderation in the rate of increase in demands on the Canadian economy. It appeared by December that the rate of expansion had moderated to a much more sustainable level. Consequently the supplementary budget of December 19, introduced for the purpose of financing the guaranteed income supplement for old age security pensions, was essentially a neutral budget. My colleague the Minister of Finance said at the time that the economy seemed to be in a state of delicate balance and that our economic policies should be designed then neither to stimulate nor to restrain economic activity. He stated that should the economy

show signs of weakness we would be prepared to act quickly to relax the temporary fiscal restraints of the March budget.

I do not wish today to anticipate the budget he will be bringing down next month, nor the white paper on the Canadian economy which will accompany it. However, I will refer briefly to the events in 1967 which led the Minister of Finance to terminate the temporary measure introduced in the March 1966 budget. During the early months of the year the more moderate rate of growth of the economy continued. When my colleague introduced this bill in March, and when the government acted on the deferred capital cost allowances, it seemed evident that the rate of expansion this year would likely be considerably less than last year and within our potential capacity, taking into account the growth of the labour force and the increased industrial capacity acquired in recent years. Consequently he said that restraints upon capital expenditures seemed no longer to be required. The slower rate of growth in capital expenditures was subsequently shown in detail in the survey of private and public investment intentions, undertaken jointly by the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. It showed that planned investment spending in Canada in 1967 would increase only moderately over 1966 investment expenditures, in contrast with the large increases in 1966 over 1965.

We were also influenced in our decision by the signs of moderation in the rate of increase of United States economic activity. In particular, the survey of the intentions of American business in regard to its investment plans for 1967, conducted by the department of commerce and the securities and exchange commission, showed an increase much less for 1967 than for last year. It was not clear what was likely to happen to the rate of economic expansion in the United States in the latter half of the year, but it seemed fairly evident that during the first half there would be some slowing down. It will be recalled that President Johnson had recommended to Congress reinstatement of the 7 per cent investment credit that was suspended late last year and the accelerated rates of capital cost allowances which had also been suspended.

• (6:10 p.m.)

The action that has been taken in regard to capital cost allowances, and that which is provided for in this bill in regard to the refundable tax will encourage businesses in Canada to proceed with plans for capital expenditures this year and next year at more normal rates than would have been likely had these temporary restrictions remained. The 5 per cent refundable tax on business profits has been bringing in something of the order of $18 million a month from businesses to the government, which we have been deliberately holding idle in our cash balances, as he indicated was our intention last March. This flow of cash from business to the government has now ceased. We will feel free to utilize temporarily the funds that we have accumulated since last May. This will give us more flexibility in our demands upon the capital market during this coming fiscal year, although there is every indication that these demands will be high in any case, taking into account the high level of our expenditures and the very large amounts that we are lending, particularly through the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for housing and urban development and also through the Farm Credit Corporation for farm purposes.

We have not proposed in this bill any change in the provisions of the law concerning the dates of repayment of the refundable tax. This is a matter which I believe should more appropriately be considered during the preparation of the 1967 budget.

The resumption of normal rates of capital cost allowances in April will have an effect upon our revenues this fiscal year. It is difficult to estimate these with precision at this time, but our advisers tell us that the action will probably reduce the income tax revenue by about $60 million compared with what it would have been had the original termination date of September 30 been left in the regulations.

In addition to this effect on our revenues, there will be some additional effect in the reduction of accruing tax obligations of businesses, which should have some influence on their behaviour.

It is our hope that the action provided for in this measure and that taken in regard to capital cost allowances, along with whatever action we may propose in the budget, will enable us to maintain high levels of employment, production and income while keeping the increases in prices and costs this year down to more modest and tolerable levels.

Hon. R. A. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, Shakespeare had the words which adequately describe the laboured and unrealistic explanation of the new Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Chrétien) with respect to this bill.

Mr. Knowles: What is so unusual about that.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): The lady doth protest too much, methinks.

The protestations of virtue which he made in the speech—he attempted to convert it into a mini-budget—were as unrealistic as they were unwise. This bill well illustrates the ad hoc, fire and fall back fiscal policy of this government. It is tap on, tap off, swap horses in mid stream. The premature repeal, sir, of this special refundable tax is a clear admission that the tax ought never to have been imposed in the first instance. On this side of the house we opposed the special refundable tax and opposed it vigorously. We welcome its early repeal, but I say simply to the minister and to the government that this premature repeal is another illustration of the type of ad hoc fiscal policy this government is pursuing to the great detriment of the nation.

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I welcome the new Minister without Portfolio in his first appearance in his new role, and wish him success. I regret, however, that the present and the former ministers of finance are not with us this afternoon.

As the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) has said, this measure reveals the hit or miss ad hoc fiscal politics of this government. I think this bill can hardly be discussed without considering another fiscal policy introduced by the former minister of finance; the attitudes displayed in these two pieces of policy are revealing.

As you may recall, Mr. Speaker, the former minister of finance instituted a tax cut on personal income which, at the time it was introduced, I criticized on the grounds that it was clumsy and unimaginative. That measure provided tax relief for many taxpayers who did not really need it and who should not have been afforded it, and it gave no real relief to those in the lower income brackets. I was interested to find that the former minister of finance apparently had never heard of the concept of tax credits, which might have solved his problem without the necessity of granting tax relief to those who did not need it.

Our present Minister of Finance has repealed that particular measure which was designed inadequately and clumsily to benefit some individual taxpayers, and now he proposes to repeal a tax placed on another sector of the economy represented by the business interests of Canada.

When this measure was introduced I felt impelled to criticize it for its ineptitude and failure to follow any definite principle. I suggested that the Minister of Finance might with advantage read an article on the fiscal policies of the Swedish government. That government's policies with respect to refundable taxes is that they are funds which are neutralized until the government decides it is wise to release them into investment again. This measure, on the other hand, does not neutralize funds obtained from such tax, because 5 per cent interest, coming from the taxpayers of Canada, is paid on the amount gathered. The measure also ties the minister's hands.

Regardless of the developments taking place in the country, the minister applied the tax for a certain period, after which he would release the funds. Regardless of whether the economy improved or did not improve, stayed the same or did not stay the same, the amount so collected was collected for a definite period. This struck me, at the time, as an example of how this government has repeatedly acted. It makes a gesture which appears to aim in one direction and then it nullifies that gesture by a subsequent action.

As a means of controlling the economy it was obvious that the 5 per cent refundable tax, under the terms in which it was passed by this house, was useless. First, it was too small in scale; second, the minister, as I have said, had no freedom of action to use the funds derived from this type of tax in such a way as to control the economy, to stimulate it, or to curb it where it was necessary to curb it.

Mr. Chrétien: Will the hon. member permit a question? Does he not agree that the money so collected had an impact on the economy?

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I doubt if the measure had any serious impact. It may have had a slight impact.

What has happened is a revelation of the different attitudes this government has toward the individual taxpayer, particularly the one in the lower income bracket, and the business world. That difference in attitude is exhibited in this measure.

The government is to remove the tax affecting business; I heard no suggestion of restoring the 10 per cent tax cut on personal

income tax. Perhaps that is because the present minister realizes that his predecessor in the area of this measure was somewhat inept and clumsy. I should have thought that the minister would have had access to more sophisticated thinking, and that he might have considered tax credits to overcome the problem of granting tax relief to those who do not require it. He did neither of these things. In the light of the public's attitude toward the Government of Canada—and that attitude is important whether one supports the government or not—I think the minister has been unwise. He has been unwise to reveal so clearly that this government is interested primarily in the business community and not in the ordinary citizen.

• (6:20 p.m.)

The minister might have achieved the same result—the result contemplated in this measure—by the reinstatement in a sophisticated way of the 10 per cent tax cut with respect to personal incomes. He chose, instead of doing that, to place a time limit on the imposition of the 5 per cent refundable tax. We can be thankful that the other taxpayers of Canada will no longer need to pay 5 per cent interest on this refundable tax, a tax which amounted to a forced investment on the part of business in government at a certain interest rate; part of the profits had to be turned over to the government.

The present Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) should look at some of the speeches he made when members of this side of the house put it to him that he should be considering our fiscal policies in a much more comprehensive way than he has done so far. I recall several occasions upon which I was told I could not expect any comprehensive survey of our fiscal policies until the Carter report had been tabled. Curiously enough the only people who have said anything about the Carter report are members of this group in the House of Commons—perhaps representatives of the official opposition have made some comment on it—and the business community which, of course, has been squealing to high heaven. As far as the government is concerned the report has been received with a blank silence—not one word about it, except that it will not be implemented now.

The Minister without Portfolio might well suggest to his colleague the Minister of Finance that before he continues these ad hoc measures, changing one part of our fiscal policy here and another there, he should examine the Carter report to see whether we cannot put our fiscal policies into a more coherent framework in order that individual taxpayers as well as the business community may have a clearer idea of what lies before them. If this were done the people of Canada would also be in a better position to judge what is the political and economic philosophy of this government when it comes to a choice between the various sectors of our economy.

I suggest to the Minister without Portfolio that by the repeal of this 5 per cent refundable tax his government is revealing itself as one which is firmly wedded to the interests of the business community. This is part of the doctrinaire approach about which I and others have complained freely of late—a concept that the purpose of government is to serve the interests of those who conduct the businesses of Canada. It is a concept which implies at least that the most important section of our community consists not of ordinary citizens in their capacity as consumers, workers and salary-earners but of those who are in the position of being able to profit by the operations of business.

The proposal before us does at least reveal the position of the government. But I would seriously recommend to the Minister of Finance that he begin to evolve a coherent economic and political philosophy and put an end to this hit or miss approach—this making of empty gestures in an attempt to convince the people of Canada that he has some coherent policy and is concerned about the welfare of the whole of the community. He will not achieve this object by the sudden removal of the refundable tax, with all its shortcomings and limitations when at the same time he does nothing whatever to restore the 10 per cent personal income tax cut which was allowed by his predecessor.

Mr. Bert Leboe (Cariboo): A few words in connection with the short bill which is before us. I do not think there was any doubt in the minister's mind that this refundable tax was something of an experiment. I am pleased to see the tax is being removed.

I find myself both agreeing and disagreeing with what was said by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Cameron). I do share his view that the average taxpayer seems very often to be "lost in the shuffle" when changes are made. We believe more emphasis should be placed on the ability of taxpayers generally to meet their obligations. I know that the business community to which the hon. member referred is highly

aware of the fact that little business is possible if people do not have money in their pockets to spend. Thus the business community is very much interested in the distribution of purchasing power in this country.

I do not think it is correct to suggest that we must take the side of business or else take the side of the individual taxpayer. The whole process of production and consumption must be considered as a totality; it cannot be divided into parts. No matter how it is organized the business community must provide the necessities of life to the individual. The better we organize ourselves and take advantage of cybernation, the more our standard of living will rise.

I am concerned that the government and the Minister of Finance have not as yet found a way of looking after those regions where there is special need for capital expansion. I realize that this may present difficulties when at the same time inflationary pressures are building up in other parts of the nation—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have to interrupt the hon. member because I doubt whether his present trend of thought is directed toward the principle of the bill now before the house.

Mr. Leboe: I must, with deference, disagree. We are talking about a refundable tax and I am talking about the whole question of taxation in relation to this. When you are taking money away from business and business expansion you are lessening the tax base. I think we should concern ourselves with broadening the tax base. One of the reasons why a country can expand and lower taxes is if it has devised a way of increasing and broadening the tax base. I think it has to be done in Canada.

• (6:30 p.m.)

So you will understand what I am driving at, Mr. Speaker, I shall relate this to the business tax. It was a blanket tax all across Canada. It did not matter whether there was a lack of purchasing power or a lack of credit in a particular region, or a need for capital, the tax applied in that region just the same as in any other.

I am not convinced that there is no way by which the Minister of Finance can organize things so that there can be differences where differences are required, such as between areas which are expanding and need capital, and areas which are under inflationary pressures. I would hope the Minister of Finance and the Governor of the Bank of Canada could find means to make certain that areas which need capital for capital expansion will not be hindered, and also find means to curtail inflationary pressures from building up to the danger point.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Batten in the chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the said bill be read a third time?

Mr. Knowles: By leave now, and on division.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (for the Minister of Finance) moved the third reading of the bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

An hon. Member: On division.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would not be a good idea for us to take a little time off. We have done pretty well. We have got two of the four items done for the day. I suggest we rise for an hour, or maybe until eight o'clock.

Mr. Cameron (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask leave of the house to revert to motions in order to present a report before the suggestion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is acted upon.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I understand hon. members had made plans to get away. We seem to be making very good progress, and perhaps we could dispose of interim supply.

Mr. Knowles: Has the minister heard of such things as dairy policy, housing, and so on?

Mr. Drury: I am sure we could forgo food in deference to discussing dairy policy.

Mr. Lewis: You would have better humour in the house if we adjourned until 7.30.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the house give unanimous consent to revert to motions?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Knowles: Did I understand that the Minister of Industry (Mr. Drury) flatly and arrogantly refused the suggestion that we take a little time off to eat?

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Perhaps the minister will agree to adjourn until 7.30.

Mr. Drury: As there seems to be a fairly strong opinion in the house in favour of no work, then if the house will agree to revert to motions we could well adjourn until 7.30.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Eleventh report of the standing committee on justice and legal affairs—Mr. Cameron (High Park).

Third report of the special joint committee on penitentiaries—Mr. Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed now that this sitting be suspended until 7.30?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Maybe the house will also agree to go into committee of supply.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Batten in the chair.

INTERIM SUPPLY

The Chairman: Pursuantto the order just made by the house this sitting is suspended until 7.30.

SITTING SUSPENDED

SITTING RESUMED

The committee resumed at 7.30 p.m.

Mr. Drury (for Mr. Sharp) moved:

Resolved, That a sum not exceeding $1,034,689,911.16, being the aggregate of—

(a) two-twelfths of the total of all the items set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1968, laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, except Loans, Investments and Advances Item L40, for which no proportion is granted, $995,375,277.83;

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

(b) an additional eight-twelfths of the total amount of Public Service Commission Item 5 (Schedule A) of the said main estimates, $798,000.00;

(c) an additional three-twelfths of the total amount of Privy Council Item 18 (Schedule B) of the said main estimates, $394,250.00;

(d) an additional two-twelfths of the total amount of External Affairs Item 35, Industry Item 15, and Loans, Investments and Advances Item L25, (Schedule C) of the said main estimates, $30,897,500.00;

(e) an additional one-twelfth of the total amount of Energy, Mines and Resources Item 35, Fisheries Item 20, Forestry and Rural Development Item 15, Justice Item 1, Legislation Items 5 and 20, National Gallery Item 1, Secretary of State Items 35 and 40, Trade and Commerce Items 15 and 29, (Schedule D) of the said main estimates, $7,224,883.33,

be granted to Her Majesty on account of the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1968.

He said: Mr. Chairman, I should like to give the usual assurance that the proportions requested in this resolution and subsequently described in the bill are intended to provide for all the necessary requirements of the public service up to June 30, 1967. In no instance is the total amount of an item being released by this bill. The form of the bill is the usual one for interim supply bills.

The passing of this bill will not prejudice the rights and privileges of members to criticize any item in the estimates when it comes up for consideration in committee and the usual undertaking is hereby given that such rights and privileges will be respected and will not be curtailed or restricted in any way as a result of the passing of this measure.

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Chairman, I think the people of this great nation of ours are very fortunate indeed that there are provisions in our parliamentary rules which make it possible from time to time in this particular debate to bring to the attention of the government grievances from those segments of the population which feel they are not receiving the treatment to which they are duly entitled or, on the other hand, bring to the attention of the government, on behalf of a segment of the Canadian population, a policy laid down by the government which seems to be placing a direct and dire hardship on that particular segment. It is in respect of the latter that I wish to speak tonight.

Mr. Chairman, you will recall that some two weeks ago an attempt was made to set aside the regular business of this house in order to promote with the government a debate on the plight of the entire dairy industry in Canada today. You will recall that parliament in its wisdom refused this debate on this

particular occasion, indicating that we would have a later opportunity to discuss this important matter. We on this side of the house felt that there was a great deal of merit in calling for the emergency debate, because it was our considered opinion that the government's new dairy policy which had been in operation for only a few weeks was creating chaos in the dairy industry and was bringing about a direct hardship rather than a benefit.

• (7:40 p.m.)

Our feelings were borne out by the fact that wherever in this nation the dairy industry formed a great part of the economy, emergency meetings were held. At these meetings the dairy farmers expressed the feeling that this new policy would not suffice to meet their critical needs. Indeed there were and still are rumours about a parade of dairy farmers in the thousands to parliament hill to protest this policy. There also have been rumours that it might be necessary for these farmers to promote a strike similar to that which was held in the United States, including the dumping of precious dairy supplies on the ground and the selling of dairy cattle. This would cause a disruption which would be felt right through the economy to the consumer level.

It is our hope tonight that by bringing these problems to the attention of the government some measures will be adopted which will make such contemplated action in this country unnecessary. Surely it would be to no one's benefit to have food destroyed at this time when it is so precious to the peoples of this world.

This government took great credit for the proposals set out to the dairy industry when this new policy was introduced. Whether the government intended it or not at that time, it left the impression with opposition members in this house and with members of the Canadian agricultural industry as a whole that in its opinion the farmers had never had things so good. When the Minister of Agriculture announced the new policy he indicated, and I believe rightly so, that while this government had been in office the price per hundredweight of manufactured milk, based on a 3.5 test, had increased from $2.85 to $4.75. He seemed to take undue satisfaction from the fact that what this government had accomplished had been more than that accomplished by the previous government.

Let us examine the figures for a moment to see what has happened to the dairy industry. The $2.85 per hundredweight is presumably what the producers of milk actually received during the fiscal year prior to 1962-63, and the $4.75 per hundredweight is the amount the minister alleges will be paid to the producers this year. In the first place these figures are not accurate. The farmers will not receive $4.75 per hundredweight because, as it was indicated earlier, 10 to 11 cents per hundredweight will be required to finance the export of excess dairy products. In addition to that we must consider the 12 per cent sales tax which farmers must pay, the increase in old age pension tax, the contribution to the Canada Pension Fund—which in itself is a tax—the increase in income tax, the drastic increase in the cost of living and the tremendous increase in the cost of goods and services which the farmer must have in order to produce milk.

It is astonishing to find, after analysing the situation, that farmers in 1962 receiving $2.85 per hundredweight actually netted more than they will today under the new dairy policy. That may be astonishing but it is the economic fact. When we refer to the fact that producers of fluid milk are in dire circumstances due to the withdrawal of federal subsidies—and I want to be fair—I am sure members of the government will indicate that this is a matter of provincial concern.

These salient points are so important that some of my colleagues who will follow me intend to deal in greater detail with the causes of the direct hardships dairy farmers are now experiencing. In my view the dairy farmers have every right to parade to parliament hill to protest. If I thought it would add anything to their cause I would join them in this parade. We have learned from experience that representations to this government have little or no result so far as relief is concerned.

When these farmers come to parliament hill they can only once again present the facts and proposals which they have already presented. I might add, these representations were made to this government before this new policy was determined or announced. Certainly their problems are not new, but it is unfortunate that this government since it took office has never put into effect one single recommendation proposed by the various representatives of the agricultural industry. These representatives are directly concerned with this great industry and have every right to approach the federal government in respect of their problems. The plight in which they find themselves today is a direct result of the

course of action of federal governments over the past years. These governments have interfered directly with the operation of this industry by establishing additional payments, bonuses, stabilization activities and subsidies. It is no wonder this great industry is out of balance from time to time.

Representatives of this industry proposed the formation of a national dairy commission which could deal with the industry's problems, so that permanent solutions could be found and concrete things done on their behalf. I believe this is a sound proposal. Apparently the government adopted the proposal, and in this regard we supported the government. But what happened? We find now that the government is in process of going in the opposite direction. The first thing it did under the new policy was to put the producers of fluid milk and producers of manufactured milk in different categories. This government cut the industry in half by putting one part under provincial jurisdiction and the other part under federal jurisdiction. We now have a national dairy council which can only concern itself with one half of the industry.

This government went a step further. We now have three segments of government looking after national dairy interests. We have the National Dairy Council, the stabilization board and the Department of Agriculture. I suspect that like many of the commissions set up by the government, the National Dairy Council, with all its good intentions and with its high calibre of men, will be hamstrung by direct interference from the other two levels of government.

• (7:50 p.m.)

So we find that the dairy industry is now in chaos, it is in confusion and there seems to be no direct policy in this regard. As I said before, the government took great pride in the introduction of this dairy policy for the coming year. We used to believe that this government had no policy for agriculture, but this has proved to be not the case as far as the dairy industry is concerned, for here the reverse is true; this government has been in office for four years and we have had four distinct and separate dairy policies, one for each year. We ask therefore why will the government not listen to the recommendations of the industry and promote a policy for the welfare of the industry rather than for political expediency?

The Minister of Agriculture in his very capable way in the house, on the hustings, on radio and television has put forward the proposition that millions of dollars are being poured into the dairy industry in the form of direct subsidies. He has said that the price obtained by the producers of manufactured milk is higher than it has ever been in the history of this country. The minister says that all is well in the industry, dairy production is as high as it has ever been and the returns are greater on a dollar basis than they have ever been.

Let us deal with these various assertions. First of all, with regard to the millions of dollars being poured into the dairy industry in the form of direct subsidies, if you look at the records of the stabilization board and the Department of Agriculture with regard to the payments made to the dairy industry—and I am speaking of net cost to the government—a startling picture becomes apparent. It seems that as far as dairy farmers are concerned the policy of this government is progressively to reduce the amount of stabilization funds, and not increase them. We find that whereas in 1963 farmers in the dairy industry received $117 million in subsidies, the figure was reduced to $55 million last year. This is a reduction of $62 million.

I point out to the committee that this industry is marginal and is struggling to maintain itself. The government tells us that the dairy industry never had it so good. This is the impression they wish to leave across the country. What about the status of the industry today? Dairy production is as high as it has ever been. However, this situation reflects absolutely no credit on the government; the credit is due to the men and women who look after the dairy herds. The average dairy farm production has risen to such a degree that it is maintaining the industry in Canada. But production has almost reached its ultimate. I believe that in the future we will see a drastic curtailment in dairy production unless action is taken now to halt the chaos that exists in the industry. As a matter of fact, the production of milk today has been kept on a par with previous years, although in the last four years there has been a reduction in top-notch dairy cattle and young stock of almost 600,000 animals. These are the best animals we have in Canada.

It is a sad sight indeed to visit the export ports of this country and see these fine animals with their excellent pedigrees, these foundation stock animals, being exported all over the world. Only two parties can profit from this type of action, the merchants concerned in the purchase and sale of the cattle and those in the foreign country who purchase the animals knowing their value. It is a

sad day when we see this decimation of our very best herds. This decimation is taking place at an alarming rate and I believe the figures published are in keeping with the actual fact. In my county alone, which at one time was a top producer of dairy products, I was very alarmed to find out from the Department of Agriculture a few weeks ago that the number of producers of milk, which was 18 to 35 on each of many routes, has dropped to only 72 in the entire county. This is the number of milk producers left in a county of 90,000 people.

It is said that we have never had it so good. Whenever we criticize the government they always come back with those two shop-worn phrases, namely what did you do when you were in office, and, are you against our present policy? As an indication of what we did while in office—and we were in office for only six years—I would point out that at that time the dairy products of this country were in excess. As a matter of fact, the main problem confronting the Department of Agriculture at that time was the storage of excess dairy products. It may be said that this government has depleted these stocks by supersalesmanship. This is not true. The stock of 200 million to 300 million pounds of butter was decimated by a fire sale in order to balance the government's budget for the 1965 election. This is what happened to the tremendous carry-over of dairy stocks; and now we are importing the very products which we gave away.

Hon. members opposite try to criticize us, but the record speaks for itself. They find it impossible to refute the fact that there are far fewer creameries in Canada today than there were just four years ago; there are fewer dairies in Canada today than there were four years ago; there are far fewer farmers in the dairy industry in Canada today than there were four years ago. To give the committee an indication of the reduction in the number of labourers on the farms today I would point out that with respect to a bill that was before the house a few hours ago, that concerned with the retraining of workers, it was said that provision may have to be made to retrain 500,000 labourers who are leaving the farms. This is the problem with which we are faced today. There is only one way to describe the condition of the dairy industry; that is, that there exists confusion and chaos through no fault of those in the industry.

• (8:00 p.m.)

We feel it is time that this government started to formulate policies which will save the major industries of this country. The dairy industry today would not be able to support itself were it not for the tremendous immigration into this country in the past few years of top flight dairy farmers from the Netherlands, Denmark and from other countries. I have nothing but words of praise for the great effort put forth by these men, who are promoting the dairy industry against almost impossible odds.

I come back to the fact that the dairy industry is in trouble. Farmers would not be taking time off from their busy lives to go to meetings, they would not be promoting demonstrations for no good reason. They are fine, sound, educated businessmen, because a man who wants to stay in the farming industry today must be a businessman. When these businessmen take the time off to approach parliament hill it is because they feel the situation is critical. Therefore my request to the government tonight is to call in the leaders of the dairy industry, not just the few known party supporters but the men who are generally concerned with the industry and the future of the Canadian population. The government should listen to their representations and not just give them a polite hearing. It should analyse their propositions. These men are businessmen who have advanced these propositions only after thoroughly scrutinizing their feasibility and the ways and means to help this great industry. If they receive a sympathetic hearing from the Department of Agriculture, if new ways are determined to bring direct financial relief, and if the government brings the dairy industry under one jurisdiction instead of dividing the responsibility, thereby relieving itself of all direct criticism—which might be politically expedient but which does not solve anything—then we would consider this to be a step forward.

I think the time has long passed when this last mentioned method of dealing with the basic Canadian industry can be used. The government has announced a dairy policy but it has indicated that a year is needed to assess it properly. A year in the dairy industry will see a great number of remaining farms close down. It is not only the small farms that will be affected but also farms that are milking anywhere from 60 to 150 cattle, farms which, using the best businesslike approach, find it impossible to continue under the present circumstances.

This is not just a problem which faces the farmer and the primary producer. It faces also the manufacturer and the distributor.

Now is the time when we should consider all aspects of the industry, so that all the cards can be placed on the table and a feasible method determined whereby each section of the industry will be able to continue to operate at a reasonable profit. This does not seem possible under the present government policy. The announcement of four policies in four years can only mean that the government has no basic policy and that it is experimenting at the cost of the industry.

The dairy industry of Canada has been patient far too long. It will not show sympathy for this government's experiments which are costly in men, in cattle and in our over-all production. If our immigration policies are sound in the next few years we will be faced with a tremendous influx of population. We will be faced with great expansion in the industry, if the economic climate is one quarter as good as is indicated by government spokesmen. If this takes place, there will be a great expansion in the dairy industry in order to provide the Canadian people with basic requirements in dairy products. Now is the time to take action, not a year from now. We cannot brook any further delay. The opposition in parliament is determined to see that the government is not allowed to forget this problem which is facing us.

The Deputy Chairman: I understand the hon. member for Yorkton has a question for the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Clancy: Mr. Chairman, I do not really like to contradict one of my confrères, but can he tell me why several years ago milk for the children in the schools in Ottawa was replaced by orange juice? Let us be logical. Milk comes from Canada and orange juice comes from Florida. So every Friday I give my children some milk for their ten o'clock recess.

An hon. Member: Speak to the point.

Mr. Clancy: Mr. Chairman, this is relevant. I pay my taxes yet I have to give my children 55 cents every Monday for orange juice.

Mr. Allard: Why does the hon member not speak French?

Mr. Clancy: I will be bilingual, but if the hon. member wants to hear it, it will not be a compliment. Recently we have been fighting for a dairy policy. We want a branch of the department for our farmers and we want milk, butter and cream for our people. However, when a big area, such as the greater Ottawa valley, switches from milk to orange juice, there can be no explanation. Their excuse for doing it is that milk at ten o'clock in the morning destroys the children's appetite for the noon meal. Let hon. members fight that one out.

Mr. Peters: Not long ago I was asked by a farmer who represented the farmers on one of the provincial boards which was investigating the price of farm machinery whether I was not of the opinion that it was really too late for farmers to do anything about their particular problem because they had lost so many members that they ceased to be an effective pressure group. He asked me whether it was not a fact that as the number of farmers dwindled, their problem would receive less and less attention. I am of the opinion that this is not the case. I believe that although the farming community is decreasing because many of their members have left the rural areas of Canada to join the industrial segment of our economy, they are not doing so by choice. They are there because of economic conditions which force them to be there. In my opinion the children who have been raised on farms, with no opportunity to enter this industry, are bound to come to the conclusion that something must be done to develop an economic agricultural climate in this industry, and the government should learn this before it is too late.

• (8:10 p.m.)

We listened this afternoon to another debate in which we were discussing the retraining of workers and at that time the question of the constitution was raised. I think we in this house are plagued with the raising of constitutional points of view on the part of one or two provinces which really have little basis in fact, and in any event have no basis of popular support.

We in Ontario were very proud of the operation which took place a year ago in the province of Quebec where that province gave a much larger grant to their manufactured milk producers than was the case in Ontario. The minister got himself into the middle of this particular constitutional problem. The minister of agriculture of Ontario, Mr. Stewart, said that this was Ottawa's problem, whereas our Minister of Agriculture said it was a provincial problem and he would not get involved in it.

A solution to the problem occurred last year with the promise of the minister to take up the 25 cents that was being paid in Quebec at

the time if the province of Ontario would pay the 25 cents on a temporary basis. We now have an arrangement whereby the federal government has decided to get into the manufactured milk field, and yet under the constitution can claim that fluid milk is not a matter that falls within their jurisdiction.

I am sure that many hon. members are confused about this matter. There are many farmers in the country confused over the problem of jurisdiction in this field. But surprising as it may be, Mr. Chairman, the federal government has decided it will enter the relatively uncontrolled field of secondary milk production for manufacturing purposes, at the same time leaving the fluid milk in the hands of the provinces.

Most provincial acts which govern the marketing of fluid milk originated in the province of British Columbia. I am not aware of the extent of the British Columbia legislation, except to the extent that it has been applied in other provinces. However, I think we should take a very close look at some of the problems which are going to develop out of the arrangements which have been made, and it may therefore be wise to consider what these arrangements are.

I have had considerable knowledge over many years of the fluid milk market. For a number of years my father was an executive officer of the Ontario fluid milk producers. He was a member of a number of agencies concerned with the development of fluid milk marketing legislation and over the years acquired some knowledge of this particular field.

Farmers producing fluid milk built up an industry that was considerably larger than manufactured milk operations. They were under strict control as to the type of milk they produced. All of their farms were inspected. The milk board established, through a co-operative arrangement with the producers and the marketing agency, quotas which imposed upon the producers many responsibilities, including supplying the quantity of milk that the quota called for.

As a result, Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member for Kent (Ont.) pointed out, there were built up not only in Ontario but in other provinces as well some very high grade dairy units. These fluid milk producers bred herds which have since been exported to places such as Guyana, France and Great Britain. In fact, our cattle, particularly our dairy breeds, have been exported to many countries in the world, with much credit to the producers.

Over the years the producers negotiated with the dairies the prices for their products. I can remember when fluid milk used to be sold for $3.85 a hundredweight. That was not the price of milk from the ordinary type of farm. This was milk that had been inspected, had been given the bacteria colii test the result of which had to be within certain limits, and had been given the strep test. These controls were applied so as to protect the consumer, the dairy and also the producers. A great deal of money was spent on developing this quota system and raising dairy cattle. Negotiations were carried on over the years to set the proper price, sometimes with great difficulty. The last price I heard about in northern Ontario was something like $6.25 a hundred.

One of the problems which always plagued the fluid milk producers but which was a boon to other segments of the industry was the surplus milk that was produced. I had always thought the farmers might be wise to do what the miners did. When the miners decided to work an eight hour day, they worked eight hours only. They did not work an extra two hours because they were not tired; they decided that eight hours meant eight hours, not 10 or 12 hours, unless they were paid a premium for their extra labour.

What happened in the case of the farmer, Mr. Chairman? He found that having filled his quota the dairy did not require all of the milk. The dairy had over estimated their need and the farmer ended up with a surplus of milk he had to dispose of. It is interesting to note that while I was paying more for chocolate milk than I was for whole milk, this was really surplus milk for which in the early days the farmer was paid only $1.75 a hundred, and for which I as a consumer was paying more than I paid for the fluid milk for which the farmer received $4.25 a hundred. However, that is one of the anomalies of the fluid milk industry.

As the years went by the fluid milk producer found that his ability to increase his production, indeed his need to increase his production if he was to retain an economic unit, meant that he had far more milk available than he had quota to meet. This meant that his surplus of milk increased. I was talking to my brother recently, and he told me that not long ago, when milk sold for $6 a hundred in his local dairy under his quota, he was supplying over 50 per cent of his milk as surplus milk for which he received $2.85 a hundred. This meant he was getting less than $4 a

hundred for the milk that he produced many months of the year.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, hon. members should consider this situation, because the government are now promoting this state of affairs in another way. The milk producers of Ontario, British Columbia, Nova Scotia, indeed most provinces in Canada, have developed a considerable market for fluid milk which has remained relatively stable but has not received the same impetus of growth that you would expect in other fields. This is emphasized by the fact that the farmer can produce a great deal more than he could originally produce.

• (8:20 p.m.)

One year ago this problem blew up, with the Quebec farmers blocking the highways to draw the public's attention to their plight. The same situation later developed in Ontario, and when the farmers took their tractors out on the roads the government decided, on looking at the problem, that it was in the position to provide subsidies, and that the milk going to the creameries and dairies would run at least at $3.25. That figure has since been raised by federal and provincial supports to $4.25.

The minister made a statement in January saying that the matter was solved and that the farmers could expect no further assistance from the federal government. The price of this milk had been raised to $4.25, and with additional subsidies in the manufacturing field it went to $4.75, although 11 cents from that was deducted. I have always been curious about that 11 cents. I do not know what happens to it, neither do the farmers.

When the proposal to set the price at $4.25 was considered last year the federal government agreed to subsidize the surplus of the fluid milk producers. Within limitations it agreed to pay a subsidy on part of the fluid milk surpluses. That created some havoc, because producers of fluid milk who had originally sold half their production shipped their milk to northern Ontario under dubious sanitary conditions and competed with the producers up there. The whole problem blew up when Mr. Cooper, the president of the dairy council warned that there would be serious repercussions unless the federal government took active steps in the field of milk production to eliminate some of the difficulties.

To protect farmers it was recommended that the price of manufacturing milk be raised to $5.10. The farmers would break even at that figure and make no profit. That

[Mr. Peters.]

advice was ignored, and the National Dairy Council considered the position of farmers and warned what such a refusal would do. Since then, as the hon. member for Kent (Ont.) has said, the government has taken little constructive action, though it must be aware of the storm centres that are brewing.

The provincial marketing board at Queen's Park has agreed to raise the price of milk to producers by 35 cents; considering that there are 38 quarts in a hundredweight, the net effect ought to be that the consumer will pay one cent more per quart; yet he will pay three cents more. Three cents more has been charged in some areas quite legitimately, but I would not wish it to be thought that such increase benefits farmers. The dairies, by charging this extra 3 cents, have seen a way to blame farmers and the government, and at the same time ease their own difficulties.

In an article from Queen's Park, Don O'Hearn says that the provincial authorities cannot control the situation, and that the Ontario government is in serious difficulties. Probably there will be a consumer outcry which will reduce fluid milk sales in Ontario, with the farmer gaining not one cent.

The minister is not unaware of the situation, because in his own area, Arnprior, 1,000 farmers attended a meeting to protest what is happening. For the sake of his future the minister ought to be interested in the implications of what is happening, because the farmers are not satisfied, and they are not going to be satisfied with the small relief given to them.

In one of its releases the dairy commission, on April 14, talked about price equalization. They said that only manufacturing milk and creamery shippers will be eligible for the subsidy. Furthermore, the commission says—and these remarks apply not to the big shippers shipping 10,000 or 20,000 pounds annually—that should any portion of the fluid milk producer's product be diverted to the manufacturing field, that fluid milk producer will not be eligible for any subsidy on milk that is delivered for manufacturing.

This means that many of the quotas which have been set are unrealistic, as some producers at some times have enormous surpluses. I know that the minister has had problems with quotas, but the position of the farmers is that they will not be able to sell their milk in the manufacturing field. What is the good of that? Quotas have been established, farmers have built up their herds and farms, and yet

they will not be able to sell their surpluses in the manufacturing field, since they would be forfeiting the subsidy on that milk.

Let us look at the figures. Taking into account the 11 cents that is deducted, the subsidy will be $1.10. That will bring the price of milk f.o.b. the factory, to the fluid milk producer, to $3.65. That is what the farmer will get for his fluid milk production. It should be borne in mind that the milk to be sold at $3.65 cost that much to produce. That milk was produced under the same conditions as the milk which fetches $6, $6.10, or, in some instances, $6.50. The upshot is that the farmer will produce part of his milk to be sold at $6, part to be sold at $3.65, and the average price he receives will be something less than $4.75.

Clearly, if what I say is correct, and I think it is, a farmer's best interest is to quit the production of fluid milk and go into the manufacturing milk business. The farmer will have his equipment, his investment, his herd, and he will have a guaranteed market for up to 300,000 pounds of milk. He will find he receives the same amount of money while spending far less money on equipment and far less time looking after the operation.

• (8:30 p.m.)

I have outlined the problem facing the fluid milk producer. It seems that the Canadian Dairy Commission intends to establish quotas for producers of manufacturing milk; it will give quotas only to those who have produced over 10,000 pounds in 1966-67 and will only allow quotas for the following year to those producing over 50,000 pounds of milk. This quota, according to the dairy commission, would be their property. In one case the Ontario government will own the quotas of Ontario farmers and in the other federal government will own them. Now, one can go into the market place as though he were buying or selling a house and put a quota up in a magazine or a daily paper, and ask for quotations on it—"how much am I bid?" This will create chaos. It will mean that everyone who wants to buy his way into the dairy industry will be able to do so but it will be impossible to get into the manufacturing field without a good deal of money, and it will be impossible for young people to get started.

This might be all very well if we did not need farmers. The program put forward by the Liberal government in the last election indicated they were pledged to get rid of the small, uneconomic farm. Well, they have done a good job as far as the cream producers are concerned—such a good job that we now have to import butter from New Zealand. We are not even fair about our butter imports. I understand that the price of a pound in Great Britain is 40 cents. If the Canadian Dairy Commission were to sell it at the floor price we have established they would earn enough money to subsidize some of the farmers who have been put out of business.

Not very long ago a great deal of cream was produced by small farmers who worked out. When they came home at night they milked two or three cows, separated the milk, fed a couple of pigs and a dozen hens and took their cream to the creamery at the end of the week, thus providing themselves with a small amount of spending money—sometimes it went to the wife as "cream money".

I invite hon. members to look around their ridings and tell me how many people are still milking two or three cows. It is no longer possible to do things in this way. We have discouraged the producers of cream to such an extent that there are very few farmers who still separate the cream on their farms and take it to the local creamery. Their milk is used for manufacture and it is the plant which decides whether it will go into cheese or casein, or into butter. The farmer no longer makes the decision.

I asked the minister to produce the legal documents which authorize him to participate in the manufacturing field. I defy the provincial governments to indicate the constitutional right they have to enter the fluid milk field. This does not apply to manufacturing milk because we are handling fluid milk in the provincial field in the same way as we are handling manufacturing milk in the federal field.

The government may be surprised to find that the farmers are not playing any more. The farm movement in my own area has grown by leaps and bounds since the tractor parades were held in Quebec and Ontario. Membership of both farm organizations has increased rapidly. Membership of one of them has, I believe, increased 15 or 20 times during the last year. This indicates that farmers are now aware that if they get together and make a good case something will be done—that it is not necessary for them to wait until the government is defeated at the polls before action can be taken to find a remedy.

We are being very foolish if we decide to force this type of exercise upon the farmers and try to deal with all these questions in piecemeal fashion. Consider what has happened to the farm machinery inquiry. Today

this is a "dead duck" in Ontario. I had the opportunity of appearing in connection with this inquiry. The provincial authorities said this was a matter within federal jurisdiction and no doubt the federal authorities claim it is a matter for the provinces to deal with. The buck is being passed until the farmer is losing sight of it.

This should not be allowed to happen with regard to dairy policy. I believe the Canadian Dairy Commission should co-operate so closely with the provincial governments that arrangements for dealing with both fluid milk and manufacturing milk can be combined. Ideally, in my opinion, the Canadian Dairy Commission should be able to control the whole operation and utilize this dairy product to such advantage as to remove one of the problems which has always plagued the stabilization board. The board found that whenever the floor price of butter was raised in relation to cheese it ran into difficulty because almost immediately more milk went into butter than into cheese, and a surplus developed. An attempt was made to correct the situation by increasing the amount offered for cheese. Again, the balance was thrown out, simply because the board could not relate its actions to the whole marketing situation. One day the government will be obliged to consider the establishment of a national marketing plan involving the pooling of production from all the provinces whether the product is intended for home consumption or for export.

• (8:40 p.m.)

They are going to have to come to some co-operative arrangement that will allow them to devise a constructive policy that will take into consideration fluctuations in sales and production and at the same time allow all the farmers in the dairy industry to make a decent living and overcome the cost-price squeeze which, if not overcome, will drive farmers off their land very quickly.

The minister and the country are going to hear a great deal more about this problem before interim supply passes tonight, and I for one would appreciate it if the minister would outline what he has in mind before we spend the next six or eight hours debating this matter.

I think the minister is well aware of the problem. He knows that there are 1,000 farmers in the Ottawa valley meeting in the town of Arnprior to discuss this matter. They are not meeting to discuss the weather; they are vitally interested in this problem. The minister is also well aware of the fact that these farmers have some influence not only on the political scene but also on the news media. He knows their complaints will receive a very receptive hearing from the average Canadian who is sick and tired of finding the farmers always getting the short end of the stick. City and townspeople are well aware of this because when they drive out into the country on week ends to visit their friends and relatives, they discover that the farmer is not getting the benefit of the increased price which the consumer has to pay. The reason for this falls partly within the jurisdiction of the federal government, and thus is within our purview to review. If we do not get some decision on this matter, or an indication that something is going to be done about it, we would be well advised to stay here and debate interim supply for the next two or three days.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Chairman, I take the opportunity we are given tonight—really the first—to join the members for Kent and Timiskaming (Messrs. Danforth and Peters) in submitting our grievances to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Green).

We would have liked you to hear the voice of our electors, especially that of the leaders of our agricultural organizations, because had it been possible for the presidents of farmers' unions to speak in this house this evening, I feel the minister might sometimes change his mind.

On April 18, we tried to adjourn the business of the house. At that time the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste (Mr. Caouette) wanted to protest without delay against the new dairy policy announced by the minister. He wanted to tell him that his policy was simply antiagricultural.

Mr. Chairman, all the farmers in my district wonder if indeed they are not dealing with an antiagricultural minister.

Every possible representation was made way before the policy was announced. Our organizations did their utmost to influence the minister and obtain from the government, their government, justice and equity, so that the farmer might be able to earn a living as easily, and as honestly as people in industry.

I think the minister has always turned a deaf ear to those appeals. I can see him in his seat tonight and he seems somewhat ashamed to look us straight in the eye. When he visits our agricultural ridings, if he ever does, he

will be even more ashamed, because the farmers will show their anger.

The farmers did not ask for anything extraordinary, just for a fair minimum. They asked for $5.10 per hundredweight, which, I think, is a reasonable price. That is what I told the farmers on one occasion. I promised them I would support them completely. After all, we are simply the spokesmen of our large organizations and the minister or the representatives of the Canadian Dairy Commission should have listened to us.

If the minister were to establish the price of manufactured milk on a more rational basis, such as the price of fluid milk, I think this would be the best indication that the minister intends to be fair to the farmers, since the price of fluid milk is always more or less on a level with current prices. I do not know what was the basis used, and we may never know.

Who is responsible for this whole policy? For days on end, before the policy was announced, we tried to pry from the minister the secret he kept to himself, and we were answered only on the day he announced his policy, although he knew very well that all the farmers in our ridings had asked to see us in the preceding weeks. I myself met more than 700 farmers who asked me who was in charge of the dairy policy. I had to tell them that I knew no more than they did.

I think that the minister was partly prevented from disclosing anything by a feeling of embarrassment, because when we heard his announcement we realized that he had a reason to be embarrassed, for he had led us to believe that farmers would certainly find the policy satisfactory.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Mr. Chairman, we are now seeing the beginning of the farmers' answer, and I hope there will not be a repetition here of what took place in the United States.

I say that the government should be responsible enough to take action before those things happen, for it can certainly not claim that it was not warned in the process of making its decisions.

I am not the one who says that, Mr. Chairman. It is not a member's tale, as the saying goes, because I have here an issue of *La Terre de Chez Nous*, where one finds an article published following the meeting of the farmers with the Minister of Agriculture here in Ottawa. I quote:

> On April 7, a group of about 20 persons representing member organizations of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture met with the Hon. J. J. Greene in Ottawa, with a view to acquainting him with their views on the 1966-67 dairy policy.

It seems to me that it was only natural that farmers should come and explain their needs to the minister and tell him what they expected from him. It seems to me that that was only natural but, judging from the minister's actions, even before that delegation arrived, the decisions were already made, everything was arranged in advance and not an iota was changed.

I read further from the article:

> Mr. Lionel Sorel, president of the C.F.U., and Mr. Léopold Harvey, president of the Quebec Manufacturing Milk Producers Federation, took part in the meeting. Mr. Roger Perreault, a C.F.U. economist, accompanied them. Following is the text of the press release issued by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, after the meeting with the minister.

The minister was not alone, for it says later that he was accompanied by Dr. S. C. Barry, chairman of the Canadian Dairy Commission, and by Mr. S. B. Williams, federal deputy minister of agriculture.

As a matter of fact, that is what I had advised C.F.U. members in my riding to do a week earlier, that is to meet with the minister, to send their representative, to get in touch with the minister in order to influence him and tell him what procedure he should follow before making his statement.

But it has become obvious that the words of the senior officials and those of the farm experts are a little like those of the opposition members in this house when the government has decided on a piece of legislation. The debate may last 5, 10 or 15 days, it does not change a thing. It seems that the legislation is prepared by another group outside parliament, that everything is set and that the ministers have to conform, to agree. That is more or less our impression after five years in the house.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the minister will have to do something and before the end of this session. He should start getting letters because I told all my electors that the only way to protest was to swamp the minister with letters, to bury him under them. And when the minister has received enough letters, he might understand the needs of the farmers because it is the only way to wake him up or bury him forever.

Mr. Chairman, the farmers have been made fun of long enough and I assure you that the fight is not over; on the contrary, it has just begun.

I shall side with the farmers and just wait and see who will win, the farmers or the technicians here who have never even set foot on a farm.

Mr. Chairman, there is a limit to such blackmail. In order to know the views of the farmers of my riding, listen to this further article written by Lionel Saurel, grand president of the Catholic Farmers Union. Here is what he wrote on the editorial page:

After taking numerous steps to obtain a fair dairy policy and, following the announcement of that policy, to have its main deficiencies corrected, the Quebec dairy farmers are greatly disappointed. The general public may have thought that the new policy ensured the farmers a $4.75 guaranteed price, but such is not the case. In spite of the increased funds provided by the state to help dairy farmers through a critical period, the efforts of the government are inadequate to meet the requirements of the dairy farmers, since the minimum assistance asked had been estimated at $180 million.

Now, the new policy provides for $120 million, perhaps $110 million, perhaps even $100 million, because all expenditures have been greatly reduced.

A slight increase has been granted for industrial milk, but quotas have been maintained, when our areas are known to have lost ground for the past three years with regard to dairy farming because of bad weather and illness of our cattle. In some areas, 50 per cent of the herds have been destroyed. And then, the grants have been set according to the quotas of those years.

Imagine, sir, the effect of the new policy in our areas especially. When I went to their meeting, mention was made of $4.75 per hundredweight. They said that the minister would not probably grant more than $4.75 per hundredweight. I said that if the minister granted $4.75 per hundredweight, inasmuch as we already received 25 cents per hundredweight, in Quebec, that would amount to $5. But the department played a real nasty trick on them. It forbade Quebec to give 25 cents. If it grants 25 cents, it will be deducted from the $4.75. This is the most nasty trick that the minister could play on them.

And they say that they want to help agriculture. And this is not all. Before that, there was a subsidy for fluid milk, and it was suggested during the meeting to ask the department to abolish the famous percentage of

[Mr. Gauthier.]

120 per cent for surpluses of fluid milk; instead of that, the whole subsidy is abolished on fluid milk.

Well, work it out and you will see, Mr. Chairman, that the farmers are rightly dissatisfied.

And I will now continue Mr. Sorel's article:

The producers of manufacturing milk are not assured that they will be paid a guaranteed price of $4.75 per hundredweight of milk. It was announced in the first place that an amount of 10 cents per hundredweight would be set aside to pay exportation subsidies. Now, the Canadian Dairy Commission has just announced that an amount of 11 cents will be used for that purpose and will be earmarked for the entire production whether or not it comes under quotas—

This is a marvelous thing. Quotas will not be overreached to pay subsidies but the transport costs will be deducted from the entire quantity of milk. Can you see the advantages dwindling away, hypocritically, once again.

• (9:00 p.m.)

—in other words the whole production comes from people subjected to quotas. The result is that producers will receive a subsidy which is substantially less than $1.11 per hundredweight.

The producer expects to receive $1.40 per hundredweight, and now we immediately reduce the price to $1.11, that is a ceiling of $1.11; well, if this is not lying to the farmers after all we promised them, I wonder what is the meaning of words.

The following factors will contribute to reduce the direct subsidy:

(a) quotas

(b) export subsidies

(c) the deduction of 11 cents per hundredweight for exportation purposes on all deliveries made by those subjected to quotas.

(d) possible government losses with respect to the sale of dairy surpluses.

Producers deplore the fact that at the time of the quota determinations they received little or no notice—

They have not been consulted at all.

—that quotas were set without prior study of the consequences and without their being consulted.

As it is, the system will result in placing in a very difficult situation those producers who intended last year to expand their farm to increase the efficiency of their operations. Moreover, quotas unfortunately do not take into account the regional damages caused by weather conditions or the losses of the producers as a result of cattle diseases.

That is what I was referring to, Mr. Chairman, because in the constituency of Roberval particularly—I am not fully aware of the situation in other constituencies—we have been sorely tried in these areas.

The new policy is unfair to producers of fluid milk. Last year, the federal government estab-

lished a direct subsidy for part of the fluid milk which was not paid for at the class 1 rate or bottling price. This year, that subsidy is eliminated. As a result, with the new dairy policy, a large number of fluid milk producers will receive a lower unit price per hundredweight than before. This decision is unfair and backward. Furthermore, it will result in an increase of fluid milk prices to an undesirable level.

Even if they are fewer in number, the fact remains that cream producers are being handicapped.

Well, fluid milk producers are not the only victims; cream producers, the cheese producers were also left out.

In many areas of Canada, they have no other choice but to ship their cream to the butter-dairy. The new policy does not enable them to earn an income equal to that of the producers whose milk is processed into butter and powdered milk. The producers had asked for a special subsidy so that they might earn as much per hundredweight as those who ship their milk for processing into butter and skimmed powdered milk. The producers whose milk is processed for butter and casein are also in the same situation. As for those whose milk is processed into cheese, they could hardly compete with the dairy producers whose milk is used for butter and skimmed powdered milk. On the other hand, it is difficult to understand why the government did not decide to increase the support price for cheese.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the minister received many letters about this from cheese producers, with the support of dairy farmers, asking for more justice for cheese producers, because there is a gap. There is a gap between the price of butter and that of cheese, and I think that it is unfair for factories producing cheese only to absorb that gap themselves.

I read further from the article:

In the last several years, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture has been pressing for the setting up of formal consultation procedures between the federal government and farm producers' organizations.

That is what all farmers hope for, namely to be consulted in the making of any policy, whether they produce butter, cheese or manufacturing milk. It seems to me that the representatives of associations have enough contacts with the department for the departmental officials to be able to discuss with them and to get advice from them.

At this stage, I would ask the minister to take the information supplied by his technicians, who are not only technicians but practitioners because they live among the farmers 365 days a year and are familiar with production, and to give it to his officials so that they will make out of it a more concrete and more realistic policy for Quebec as well as for the whole of Canada.

I will continue reading the article:

For all those reasons, the various associations of dairy producers asked the Minister of Agriculture on April 7 last to reconsider the dairy policy. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture stressed the fact that the amount put at the disposal of the Canadian Dairy Commission, that is $120 million, is clearly insufficient.

It surely does not make it possible to ensure income parity with that of all the other classes of society. It does not make it possible to encourage the dairy producers to make the investments needed to put dairy operations on an economic basis. The dairy producers are therefore considering the means to get justice.

Mr. Chairman, that is what I wanted to say tonight. I did not want to make a long speech and personally plead the case. I did it through technicians, the real farm experts in the province of Quebec. I hope for only one thing. That the minister will give them justice taking as a basis once again the price of fluid milk.

If, as it was done last year, up to $5.60, $5.80, $5.85 per hundredweight, is paid in my region for fluid milk, those prices should be taken as a basis and a policy should be elaborated to enable the producers of manufacturing milk to live like the producers of fluid milk because they have to face the same obligations and the same costs as before. I think that the Minister of Agriculture would then only be doing an act of social justice.

• (9:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, I believe this debate should have taken place following the announcement made by the minister several weeks ago on March 22. The minister will agree, I am sure, that I am not being unkind when I say the content of that statement and the statement subsequently released by the dairy commission on April 14 is not very enlightening.

The minister suggested that the amount to be made available to the dairy commission for the payment of subsidies was to be increased from $90 million to $120 million, but that does not tell the whole story. He also said in his statement that the rate for manufactured milk was to be increased by 85 cents from $1.21 per hundredweight. That does not tell the whole story.

When we look at the statement that was released, I am not too sure of the date but I think it was April 14, by the dairy commission outlining the details of its price stabilization and subsidy program for the year, we see there is a lot more involved in this problem than that contained in the minister's speech.

For example, there was a little, but not a complete, indication that the fluid milk subsidy would be withdrawn. It seems to me that only a few months ago the minister had meetings with the ministers of agriculture of Ontario and Quebec to see whether they could find some means whereby there would not be a division in the jurisdiction in so far as the payment of dairy subsidies was concerned. If my memory serves me well, great dissatisfaction was expressed by some of the dairy producers in Ontario because they were receiving substantially less, net, for their product than the farmers in Quebec. The reason was that a subsidy was paid by the Quebec government and it was not paid by the Ontario government.

If that was a problem, and if there was some kind of agreement—which I believe the minister indicated in the house was the case—that the federal government would take over the entire responsibility for paying dairy subsidies and after a period of time the Quebec government would withdraw from this program so that there would be an equalization between the amount the farmers in the two provinces received, why is there now this complete departure from that principle?

The minister said in reply to a question I asked a few days ago that the whole matter of fluid milk, its control, price and so on, rests with the provincial governments. He said, furthermore, that if the fluid milk producers are to be paid nearly as much for their over-quota milk, as manufacturing milk, they would have to look to the provincial government to authorize and make the payment. In this respect there seems to be a contradiction, and I hope the minister is now prepared to explain why he is taking this position.

I believe in recent statements the minister also said that in the new program the provincial governments would be entirely responsible for fluid milk sales and subsidies. I believe he said this was mutually agreed after consultation with the two provincial ministers to whom I have referred. Therefore we do not understand this change in policy. As a matter of fact, I believe that the subsidies paid should not be different from one province to the next. I think that if the federal government assumes any responsibility for subsidizing dairy products they should do so on an equal basis all across the country. We know there are many provincial milk control boards and provincial governments that do not pay a subsidy for fluid sales or surplus milk which goes through this channel into the manufacture of other dairy products. I hope we are to have some uniformity in this respect.

[Mr. Olson.]

Another thing I cannot understand about this new policy is, why is it that over-quota fluid milk is excluded? Surely the cream, butter and other products manufactured from over-quota milk is equal in quality and many other respects to milk obtained from any other source. In fact, I think it would be fair to say that the fluid milk producers in Canada are probably best able to produce a high quality product under sanitary conditions which gives us the very best available raw product from which to produce butter. If we take the position, and I think it is a valid one, that Canada is no longer producing all the butterfat we consume, surely we should be encouraging rather than discouraging the fluid milk producers to ship over-quota milk for the manufacture of butter. Yet this subsidy is being withdrawn. If you read very carefully the statement issued by the Canadian Dairy Commission on April 14 there does not seem to be any way at all in which the processor or the producer is able to obtain any federal subsidy for over-quota milk. The minister said that either the provinces pay this subsidy or nothing will be paid.

I do not understand how you can square that statement with the fact that we are losing so much of our dairy production that we are not even taking care of our domestic requirements. There are some other disturbing statements in the program outlined by the Canadian Dairy Commission. One is as follows:

> Only manufacturing milk and cream shippers will be eligible for subsidy. Shippers are not eligible if any portion of their deliveries are used for fluid purposes.

I ask, what about those dairy operations—and we need them—which are just getting into business? Surely we are not taking the attitude that the dairy farms which we have today are the only ones we will need? If a small portion of a dairy farmer's product is used for fluid purposes, that farmer will not be eligible for subsidy. I think there are dairy farmers who are shipping a small portion of their production and trying to build up a quota in the fluid market; they are shipping some for manufacturing milk and are probably even shipping some cream. But this statement says that if any portion of their deliveries is used for fluid purposes, they shall not receive a subsidy. I do not think this augurs

well for the future of the dairy industry in Canada. This statement also says:

> Each manufacturing milk and cream shipper will be allotted a quota, which will be his share of the total for which he will be eligible to receive subsidy in 1967-68.

This statement says further:

> The commission proposes, in 1968-69, not to issue quotas to producers who delivered less than 50,000 pounds of milk in 1967-68. To provide the opportunity to producers whose 1966-67 deliveries were below that figure to expand, such producers will be allotted a quota for 1967-68 equivalent to 50,000 pounds of milk or 1,750 pounds of butterfat.

In other words, after this year, if I interpret this statement correctly, there will be absolutely no quota for any manufacturing milk shipper who produces less than 50,000 pounds. There may be some justice in this, but it appears also that there will be no quota allocated to any shipper of cream unless he ships 1,750 pounds of butterfat. If this is to be the situation, what will happen to the small farmer who tries to supplement his income by keeping three, four or five dairy cows on a part-year basis. No longer will he be eligible for any quota, and this statement says there will be no subsidy paid to anyone who does not have a quota.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Mr. Chairman, the statement goes on to try to explain this away by saying that this is done to avoid the perpetuation of non-economic units. Anyone who would have to take 31.24 cents per pound less for his butter than those who are in this production will certainly not even try it. Is that what the minister wants? Is he saying that the dairy commission is now set on a course whereby no one new will be allowed into the industry? Is he saying that the small producers will not be allowed any subsidy whatever? I realize that the policies of the Canadian Dairy Commission are only in the initial stage. I presume the minister will try to work out a policy by means of trial and error and that there will probably be adjustments from time to time. However, I think the commission is set on the wrong course if it is trying to keep anybody new from entering the business or if it is trying to squeeze out all the producers who produce less than 50,000 pounds of milk or 1,750 pounds of butterfat. This is what appears to be the result of the new dairy policy.

I do not intend to speak much longer on this. Perhaps it is unfair to say, as was said by the hon. member for Kent (Ont.) that the dairy producers are worse off today than they were two, three of four years ago when the price for milk was substantially lower. I do not think it makes sense to suggest that dairy producers are much worse off now, when the federal government is putting in something like $120 million for the support of the industry, than if they did not receive any of this money.

However, there are certain ramifications in the application of the policy which would lead me to believe, although I do not have the exact details, that some of the dairy producers will be worse off under the new policy. Therefore I hope the minister will not continue on this course, because even though there appeared to be a substantial increase in the price of manufacturing milk and surplus fluid milk since April 1, 1966, there continues to be a decline in the number of dairy producers in Canada. Furthermore, I am told there is a decline in the over-all production.

The government is creating new problems by keeping out small and new producers. I do not believe the federal government's subsidies should become a permanent part of farm income. I believe it might be beneficial in raising the selling price of dairy products for the farmer to bring in the total amount of his receipts over a long period of time, but when there has been an incorrect allocation of the farmers' income, subsidies do play an important part in the adjustments. I also believe we must recognize that the dairy industry has been neglected far too long. Certain policies have been continued over long periods of time owing to the resistance to change, and as a result the industry has not been particularly profitable.

Apparently we have reached the stage at which Canada is no longer over producing dairy products. We are still an expanding country, and we hope our standard of living will continue to rise. This would indicate that we need more, not less, dairy products both in the immediate and in the distant future. Surely the government's policy should encourage this expansion.

In closing I want to ask the minister again to try and give us some answers as to what will happen to the smaller producers. I am not concerned too much about the immediate future in 1967 and 1968 because they will get a subsidy according to the stated policy. But what about those who cannot deliver 50,000 pounds of manufacturing milk or 1,750 pounds of butterfat? Will they have to sell it without a subsidy, which will mean they will have to sell it for 31.42 cents below their neighbours' price.

I would also like to have an explanation of the complete change in policy so far as quota milk is concerned, the price and control of which has been transferred to the provincial authorities. This seems to be a complete contradiction of what the minister told the house a few months ago when Quebec was paying a subsidy not paid by Ontario.

There is another matter concerning the new policy which disturbs me a little. We are told that quotas are the property of the commission and may not be sold or transferred by the person to whom they are issued. The statement reads as follows:

> Reallocations of quotas will rest with the commission. In any reallocation of quotas in normal transfers of ownership the prime objective of the commission will be to so manage such reallocations as to assist existing quota holders to develop economic units and to avoid perpetuation of uneconomic units.

What will happen if a dairy farmer wishes to sell his operation? The statement goes on to say that the commission will consider application for the reallocation of quota from the quota holder to an immediate member of his family such as a husband, wife, brother, sister, son or daughter, but it does not say anything about what happens to the quota if it is sold, what is commonly referred to as being at arm's length.

Another point is that the acquisition of an additional quota, at least in the fluid milk business, is a very expensive undertaking. Dairy producers must ship above their quota and accept a substantially lower price for a long period of time before their quota is increased. As a matter of fact there are areas in Canada where the fluid milk quota sells for as much as $15 to $18 a pound. This is an indication of its great value. In most cases the reason that it is so valuable is that it is extremely expensive to establish in the first instance. In the province of Alberta—I am not certain about other areas—a dairy farmer must ship milk above the quota for many months before he can have his quota increased. He must sell milk above the quota at a 40 to 50 per cent reduction in price. In addition to that, even though he may ship away above the quota for a few months, in some provinces the quota is set at the lowest two months of the year. This means that his quota is set on the basis of those two months when his production costs are at their peak.

I suggest to the minister that the production of manufacturing milk or butterfat is almost as expensive as the production of fluid milk. Therefore it seems to me the farmer should be allowed to transfer quotas when the farm unit is sold, or even transfer his quota for a certain sum of money if he wishes to reduce his production.

[Mr. Olson.]

• (9:30 p.m.)

According to the information we have before us from the dairy commission, it appears that all quotas shall be the property of the commission and they will not be transferred for any consideration to the producer who has established that quota.

I am not going to detain the house further. These are important questions to the dairy farmers of Canada. While I said at the outset that we should have had this debate some time ago, perhaps the minister will now be ready to provide some illumination of the statement he made on March 22 and some detailed explanation about what will be the application of this new policy from the point of view of the farmer.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, it will be five years in June since I was first elected to the House of Commons and sat in opposition for ten months. Many of us were re-elected in 1963, and a larger number of Liberals having been elected the government and cabinet was formed by Liberals who sat to the right of Mr. Speaker.

I believe that every member of the house is well aware of the seating plan which is distributed to visitors in the gallery and to those who tour the premises when the house is not in session. Following the acquisition of power by the Liberal party in June of 1963, a very clever Liberal Gordon Moore from the riding of York-Humber came to Ottawa on business and one afternoon sat in the gallery. When dinnertime arrived I met him in the lobby and he greeted me with the statement that he would not be working for the Liberal party again after reading the seating plan of the House of Commons.

I asked him what had caused him offence, and he said to me: "This seating plan shows a little black fence around the cabinet ministers". I point out that this was in 1963. I said to him: "Certainly, it has been there for some time". He said: "But it is labelled 'The Government' ". And so it was, Mr. Chairman. Then he said to me: "What the devil are you doing sitting a couple of seats behind the government? I thought I and other working Liberals had elected you to the government, but I come to Ottawa and I learn something entirely different".

Gordon Moore was 100 per cent correct in his comments about the seating plan, which showed the government consisted of cabinet ministers and nobody else, though occasionally the whip has been shown inside the little black box which designates people who have been called—I prefer to use the word "called" rather than "chosen", but you might call them the chosen few. There used to be fewer than there are now; today there are 26 of them in the house. Anyway, this little black fence went around the chosen few who were labelled "The Government".

I directed a memorandum to the Prime Minister setting out Gordon Moore's comments on the situation, indicating that the seating plan showed the government consisted of the members of the cabinet and nobody else. I also made the comment that people who worked hard in constituencies to elect a majority of members so that an effective government could be formed were certainly disappointed to learn that their efforts were in vain if they did not elect a cabinet minister.

The next point I made in the memo was the suggestion that the ministry be designated as "The Ministry", and that those who support the ministry be designated as "The government party". I then had a visit from our very good friend, the hon. member for York Centre, who at that time was chief government whip. He came to me with my original memo which I had addressed to the Prime Minister, and up in the corner in handwriting was written: "Jimmy, R.B. raises a point that sounds as though it has some merit. Talk to him and see if this should not be rewritten".

I spoke to the hon. member for York Centre for a few moments, and he spoke to the then Speaker of the House of Commons and almost immediately thereafter there was a change in the written portion of the seating plan of the House of Commons in that in front of the seats of the ministers appeared the statement "The Ministry". Then in the written body of the plan appeared an expression for which I would like to give full credit to the Prime Minister, to the hon. member for York Centre as well as to the Speaker of the day, the former hon. member for Mount Royal. I do not know which of these gentlemen was responsible for rewording the seating plan, but in the ones that are handed out today—in fact, a new one came out this afternoon—you will find this sentence:

To the right of Mr. Speaker sit the Prime Minister, his ministers and other members of the government party (Liberals).

I should like to point out that when we receive our calls to caucus, which meets nearly every Wednesday and sometimes more frequently, we still have the amusing notice that the supporters of the government are called to meet at such and such a place. I often wonder what the supporters are called, Mr. Chairman. The supporters of the government are asked to meet in a certain place. I do not know why the call could not refer to members of the government party, as is the case in the House of Commons seating plan; but then, Mr. Chairman, there are many things which go on in the House of Commons that perhaps one will never understand.

I give the committee this little episode in House of Commons history for one reason in particular. I wish to point out that the Prime Minister must agree that the cabinet is not the government. If he held to the belief that the cabinet is the government, he would not have changed the wording of the seating plan going on four years ago to the point where the cabinet is today referred to in the seating plan as "The Ministry", and the members of the Liberal party are referred to as "members of the government party (Liberals)". If in the seating plan the ministry is called the ministry, why cannot the cabinet be called the cabinet when it makes some announcement to this, that or the other effect?

Members on the government side of the house are everlastingly hearing on the radio or picking up newspapers and reading about the government announcing this, the government announcing that; that the government is doing one thing and has decided not to do another thing. It is the government that is making these announcements. Liberal workers come to us and say: "In the name of heaven, you are a member of the government; why did you allow this to go on? What is the matter with the government?" You simply have to say, Mr. Chairman, that you know nothing whatever about the matter, that you read about it in the paper as they did, and that the only information you have is what is vouchsafed in the newspapers, on the radio or on television.

In the book which has been the subject of discussion for some time written by Messrs. Saywell and Ricker, with regard to whom we are endeavouring to ascertain how much of the taxpayers' money the C.B.C. pays to these biased men who write that the printed word cannot be believed because it carries advertisements, whereas the C.B.C. can be believed because they just milk the common taxpayer,

there is a paragraph about the unbiased nature of C.B.C. news coverage. There is also a paragraph pointing out that the common parlance of today calls the cabinet the government.

As a member of the Liberal party and quite evidently not a member of the government, I should like to emphasize that when the cabinet makes announcements that the government is going to do this, and that the government is going to do that, it nettles Liberal workers from coast to coast, who in many cases want to know whether the Liberal member for their local constituency has agreed to such statement on the part of the government. I am pointing out here as plainly as I can that in the majority of cases the Liberal member does not know anything about these so-called government announcements until he reads them.

• (9:40 p.m.)

In my opinion nothing is the matter with the word "cabinet". It is not like "cabal" which has a derogatory significance and intimates some sort of crookedness. Why can't the ministry use the word that has always been quite straightforward. Why does the government not say: "The cabinet suggests this", "the cabinet is thinking of doing this" "the cabinet is thinking of doing that"? Or, do they not want the public to think that the cabinet has to ask permission from anybody for anything? Do they want to create the impression that they are all-powerful, beholden to no one, and that when they make an announcement it is like the law of the Medes and the Persians, subject to no change, not even by Liberals who might have been elected on the basis of the overthrow of the former government.

I did not mean to take part in the discussion on interim supply tonight but I felt that if I did not rise today and comment about some announcements which have been made in the name of the cabinet, the country as a whole might come to the conclusion that every Liberal in the country had acquiesced in those policy statements which have been issued, since no voice had been raised in protest. The longer the silence the more will be the uproar when in future, some objection is taken to a so-called government announcement.

I could give a few instances of these so-called government announcements, but tonight I shall only speak on two, and I shall refer to the subjects of abortion and this new system of honours and awards for Canada.

[Mr. Cowan.]

I have been a member of the Liberal party all my life and some people resent that I intend to die a Liberal—and I do not mean to die in the near future. I would point out that as a Liberal I have attended every Liberal party convention since 1921. You might say that in 1921 I was a minor; I was 19 years old, but I was a newspaper reporter; and if I was not voting at least I had a seat at the press table. I have attended every Liberal convention nationally, and in Ontario, provincially, from that time. I have attended 90 per cent of the caucus meetings since election, five years ago this June, and I have an idea of the thinking and the discussion going on at these affairs.

You will remember that last October we had a big hoop-la at the Chateau Laurier which was announced as the national Liberal party policy convention. All the time it was policy, policy, policy—policy all the way last October at the Chateau Laurier. I remember some fine westerners coming from British Columbia—the finest delegation in the entire convention—and they had a resolution on free trade which swept the Liberal convention at the Chateau Laurier. I was there when they carried the vote in committee; I was there when they carried it in the general plenary meeting of the Liberal party. The British Columbian men and women were very happy with the great acceptance of their idea of free trade between Canada and the North American continent.

That was the policy convention of the Liberal party, you may remember. It was advertised that way and reported that way. And you may recall that a few days later a voice came down from on high—and I do not mean from heaven; I mean from the top of parliament hill, which is higher than the Chateau Laurier—and it said: "You know, boys and girls, a policy convention is all right. After all, boys and girls get together, and they meet in halls and banquets. These do's are billed as policy conventions—but we will talk about that later on. Do not take it too seriously." This is how certain people would like to handle policy, even though those at the convention think they are making policy for the Liberal party.

In the *Globe and Mail* for Monday, April 24, 1967, there is a report of a policy convention which was held by the Liberal party for the province of Ontario in the Royal York Hotel, Toronto. In the same edition there is a fine report of the nomination of Joe Potts, past President of the Toronto and Yorks Liberal Association, who will contest St.

David. There is a full report of the policy convention of the provincial Liberal party. I might state that in Ontario there is no distinction between federal and provincial Liberals. In Ontario, once a Liberal you are always a Liberal. The last paragraph of the interesting report reads:

> The Toronto and district policy conference last year launched the campaign that led to changes in the party constitution to provide that the right of establishing party policy belonged to the rank and file.

Well, the *Globe and Mail* had a lot of accurate reporters; perhaps the reporter who wrote that thought he was accurate.

I want to give two examples tonight, in passing, of where policy is evidently supposed to start. As I said before, I shall talk of abortions and the establishment of the new system of honours and awards in Canada. I happen to be a member of the House of Commons health and welfare committee and have taken a deep interest in its work. I have not missed many meetings; if I have missed any it is because the whip has dragged me out to form a quorum on the veterans affairs committee or the broadcasting committee—but my first preference was health and welfare. We spent much time this past fall and winter discussing birth control. Man, oh man, we know more about contraceptives and what they do to prevent births throughout the world than any other group of men in North America.

An hon. Member: Tell us about it.

Mr. Cowan: It is too late tonight to tell you. But there were people running around the halls of parliament grabbing the coat lapels of the members of the health and welfare committee, whispering, "If anybody brings up abortions, we are not discussing abortions this year. Next year we will discuss them. If anybody asks you what you are doing about abortions just say that abortions are out this year; tell them they will be discussed next year. If they want to talk about contraceptives or birth control, tell them—don't discuss abortions. Tell them we are not discussing them."

It was most amazing, therefore, in February to be sitting in Toronto and to hear the announcement from on high that in 1967: "The government is going to change the laws on abortions." Well, that was interesting. That has never been discussed in caucus, never been discussed at a Liberal party convention and has never been discussed formally in gatherings of Liberals. But the abortion laws are to be changed in 1967 "by the government". This is a serious matter.

On the 17th of April, when we were installing a new Governor General the Toronto *Star* aptly said—and I would not refer to the Governor General in the House of Commons were it not for the direct references made to him by the right hon. Prime Minister and Leader of the Opposition in the debates of parliament—in a caricature of the situation showing the installation of the Governor General there appeared the poor little taxpayer remarking to the man standing and watching all the pomp and circumstance go rushing by, with its plumes and horses and red coats: "Boy, we spend a lot of time in Ottawa keeping up with yesterday."

Mr. Lewis: How long ago was yesterday?

Mr. Cowan: Two hundred years.

Then on April 17 we had the announcement of the right hon. Prime Minister, found on page 14967 of *Hansard*:

> I would like to announce to the house the establishment of a system of honours and awards for Canada. Practically every sovereign country has such a system which it uses as a means of recognizing merit or gallantry, or distinguished public service. I believe that recognition of this kind can strengthen national pride and the appreciation of national service.

Then he says:

> The government considers that there is a need in Canada . . .
>
> It is my pleasure to announce that on the recommendation of the government Her Majesty has approved . . .

That was an interesting announcement, and I was very interested in getting the details. It was the very first we Liberals had heard of this. I am opposed to titles and honours. I should stress that many, many other Liberals are opposed to any system of titles, honours and awards in this country of Canada.

• (9:50 p.m.)

We have lived satisfactorily since 1919 under the impact of the Nickle resolution, which, of course, has been circumvented here and there just often enough to add a little spice to life. We find the Secretary of State for External Affairs writing letters asking people not to accept decorations from foreign governments because that is not in keeping with the policy of the Canadian nation. Then I have in my hand a press release put out by the Secretary of State for External Affairs announcing the award by France of the Legion of Honour to the Canadian ambassador to Switzerland. This is known as playing both

sides and keeping everybody happy; you might offend people you do not allow to take the medals but you please the ones you do.

This system of awards announced an April 17 which, as I have stated, was brand new to all those in the Liberal party, or perhaps I should say to all those in the rank and file of the Liberal party, has been given a lot of thought. There is no doubt about that. We are told there will be three types of awards. This means we shall no longer be able to talk about free and equal Canadians.

Under this system, as I say, we are to have three types of awards, which means there will be four kinds of Canadians. We are to have the companions of the order, the medal of courage, the medal of service. After that will come the fourth group—the hoi polloi. There is, in fact, a fifth, because the Governor General is now given the title of Right Honourable, this on the recommendation of the government, or, specifically, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister.

So instead of having free and equal Canadians in the future we shall have five classes. We shall have the Governor General, to start with, with the title—"title" is the word used—of Right Honourable. After that come the Companions of the Order of Canada, the holders of the medal of courage, the medal of service and so on. We shall have five divisions and we shall all be Canadians and free, but we sure won't be equal.

I liked the announcement that the method of recommendation or selection to be used is to be based strictly on merit. That is the way we appoint senators in this country.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Cowan: We all know the quality we have in the other place. The same system as is used to pick senators will be used to pick the Companions of the Order of Canada whose initials, in short, are C-O-O-C: pronounced "kook".

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Cowan: We are then told that by limiting the number of recipients it is intended to maintain the quality of these awards. That is how we preserve such high quality in the Senate. There are only 102 of them and by limiting the number we have the very high quality we enjoy in the other place.

I have mentioned these two announcements of policy, which hit us like a thunderclap from on high. If we do not automatically support these policies we are rebels, dissidents, trouble makers, disturbers, heretics and so on. One is certainly not asked in advance to give an opinion, because it may be in opposition to whatever has been decided by a few other people.

I am pointing out that the caucus is by-passed, that the party policy conventions are by-passed. And it is the simplest thing in the world to begin by-passing parliament itself. We hear a lot about unity in diversity and diversity in unity and flexibility with firmness or firmness with flexibility. Well, I am giving you a little talk on dictatorship in democracy or democracy and dictatorship, call it what you will.

We have had a little discussion in the last few days on a bill brought forward by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. This has not yet been proclaimed; it is not yet law, and any comment I might make in the next few minutes has to do only with the regulations promulgated on March 30 by order in council of the Right Honourable—no, pardon me, by the Administrator of the vice-regal office. I think it is interesting to bear in mind that interim supply was passed on March 22, the last day before the Easter vacation. We adjourned that night. March 24 was Good Friday, March 26 was Easter Sunday, March 27 was Easter Monday and on March 30 down comes a crop of regulations in connection with manpower. It has been proven in the course of able remarks by the hon. member for Prince, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, the hon. member for York South. The hon. member for Peace River and others in this house during the last few days that here we have a case of regulations being put into effect and money being spent without parliament having passed the necessary legislation.

I have here in my hand, in case anybody wants to discuss it in detail, Bill C-278, an act respecting the occupational training of adults. That is what is printed on the front of it, together with the words "First reading, March 3, 1967". Then I have here the records of our *House of Commons Debates* and I find that on March 22 we passed interim supply. The house rose, and on March 30 out came the regulations by order in council from Government House. So the cabinet goes merrily on their way, hoping that parliament will pass the legislation necessary to legalize what is being done. As I say, it has not yet been legalized since this bill is not yet an act of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. O'Keefe: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Does he object to the spending of this money to remove people from Bell Island, where they were unemployed, to other areas, as was done under this legislation?

Mr. Cowan: Not by any means. I do not know what that has to do with what I am discussing, that is, the legality of the action. I only wish they would move all those people from Bell Island to Toronto because we could do with people of that quality and ability. We have a few N.D.P. seats we want to win.

I want to point out that on Tuesday, April 25 the official record of the House of Commons tells us: "Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Marchand, seconded by Mr. Côté, that Bill C-278, an act respecting the occupational training of adults, be now read the second time." I also have a copy of *Routine Proceedings* for March 22, the day on which the house adjourned for the Easter recess, and on page 5 the top item shows the following outstanding: "Second reading of Bill C-278, an act respecting the occupational training of adults."

When the regulations were brought down by order in council the cabinet knew that the necessary legislation had not been passed by parliament. Yet they went ahead and began spending money under this heading without legal authority for so doing. They by-passed parliament completely.

I have given examples to show how the caucus has been ignored. I have shown how the recommendations of party policy conventions have been ignored. Now it has come to the point at which parliament itself is by-passed. I regret very much that situations of this kind occur from time to time. There are other examples I could mention.

There is the example of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. If he spent more time in Ottawa and less in the riding of Lapointe we might get more legality in the actions he carries on. I have been described as not being a typical English speaking Canadian. I know I am not. When the Minister of Manpower and Immigration spoke in Toronto about four weeks ago I was the only sitting member of parliament who went to hear him. There are 18 sitting members of parliament from Toronto. Seventeen did not go to hear him, and one did. That means I am not typical. If I had been typical I would have been one of those who did not go to hear him.

• (10:00 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cowan: But I would also point out for the edification of the minister that I am not a typical English speaking Canadian. I have no hesitation in going into any part of Quebec where my people have been living, working, marrying and dying since 1795. They don't have to send R.C.M.P. guards with me when I go into Quebec, nor any men in civilian clothes to protect me from my fellow Canadians when I go. I have always moved with ease among them, and always expect to move with ease among them. But that does not get around the question that hundreds of thousands of English speaking Canadians do not want to enter the province of Quebec. They don't like post office boxes being blown up in their faces. They don't like things going "boom" when they turn on the electric light in private homes. Many English speaking Canadians do not want to enter Quebec, but I never have any hesitation in doing so, never have had and never will, and so I am not a typical English speaking Canadian.

I would like to extend my thanks to another minister who went on a television network the night before I spoke in Lapointe and made the announcement to French network viewers that he would advise me not to go into Quebec. I did not know of that announcement. The trouble is, I went. I never thought to ask him for his advice. I do not think he could save me, even if he tried. I like to stand on my own two feet.

I am going to speak in Hamilton on Friday next. But I do not intend to ask, will it be O.K. with him for me to speak there. I say I can move anywhere in Canada that I wish to go, and I will go any place where I am asked by a responsible organization such as the College of Jonquière. I enjoy meeting my fellow Canadians from coast to coast, and I hope I will always be able to speak in that vein.

I have taken up as much time as I intend to speak on interim supply, but I intend to speak again on the throne speech address in about two weeks time. I would like to give you a few more details, but there are others who wish to speak tonight. However, it is interesting, and I want to leave this thought with you, that on April 21, Friday last, we had the Leader of the Opposition and the Prime Minister exchanging words over titles and referring to the title "Right Honourable."

I might state for your information that last July when I was in London I spent over four

and a half hours with the officials of the Privy Council of the United Kingdom and the Colonies, which is its proper name. There is no such thing as an "Imperial Privy Council." That name is used by, shall I say, colonials and status seekers who wish to create the impression that they belong to something super-super. I am happy to remind you that the Prime Minister, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition, referred to "the Imperial Privy Council, so-called." He did not make the mistake of referring to the Privy Council of the United Kingdom and the Colonies as "Imperial Privy Council."

The thought that I want to leave with you tonight is that my good friend, Lord Thomson of Fleet, approached the right hon. member for Prince Albert, as a matter of fact in St. John's Newfoundland, on a certain visit and asked him if he would recommend him for a title as he, Roy Thomson, was living in Great Britain. The answer he got was a straight question, "Would you accept the governor generalship"? The suppliant was somewhat taken aback by the question and after maybe some three or four seconds thought said, "Well, I would take the governor generalship." Well, that was the end of that. Having been a Conservative candidate in Toronto York Centre in 1953 Roy Thomson did not expect any favours from any other party, so he made inquiry as to how he might acquire a title in Great Britain. He was advised by the people there that because he was a Canadian citizen, under the Canadian Citizenship Act, nobody in Britain would recommend him for a title. It would have to be done by the head of the state where his citizenship was, but it was pointed out that if he became a citizen of the United Kingdom and the Colonies they would be very glad to recommend him for a title.

Therefore, on June 5, 1963, Roy Thomson, as we all know him, applied for United Kingdom citizenship which was granted to him immediately and on January 1, 1964, lo and behold, his name appeared in that list of honoured citizens of the United Kingdom and the Colonies, and he was no more a Canadian citizen.

The Nickle resolution reads, and I have it in my hand:

> We, Your Majesty's Most dutiful and loyal subjects, the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty, praying that Your Majesty may be graciously pleased:—
>
> (a) To refrain hereafter from conferring any title of honour or titular distinction upon any of your subjects domiciled or ordinarily resident in Canada—

[Mr. Cowan.]

And down further there is a paragraph at the bottom reading:

> A suggestion was made that the titles of "Right Honourable" and "Honourable" be discontinued, but the suggestion did not meet with the approval of the committee.

I asked the officials of the Privy Council of the United Kingdom and the Colonies in London how it was that when my very good friend, Lord Thomson of Fleet, accepted that title he was forced to yield his Canadian citizenship in order to be nominated by the—

The Chairman: Order. I must advise the hon. member that the time allotted to him has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

The Chairman: Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the committee to carry on.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Starr: The Liberals don't like him speaking.

Mr. Cowan: I thank the members and I won't trespass overlong—

The Chairman: Order please. The hon. member does not have the unanimous consent of the committee to continue. The hon. member for Wetaskiwin.

Mr. Moore: Mr. Chairman, I enjoyed the change of pace provided by my hon. friend from York-Humber and I am in complete sympathy with him, but I must return to the dairy policy and I would like to deal specifically with discrimination against two groups of Canadians. Those two groups are the ones who ship fluid milk and the people who drink it. This involves a lot of people, but the way things are going I am afraid both groups may become smaller.

Fluid milk shippers sell milk on a quota basis, and this quota is set by the needs of the pasteurizing plants, not by governments, commissions or what-have-you. However, they sell only a percentage of their total production. This amount varies from area to area, and it varies among shippers, even among shippers to the same plant.

I want to give an example, using specific figures which I obtained from Alberta. They happen to be figures from my district. I am interested in dairy problems all across Canada but, as I say, I have obtained these

figures from Alberta, and there might be a slight difference with respect to figures between the provinces.

These figures are based on a check for the last two weeks of March of this year. Tests of the milk in question happened to be 3.5 and since prices are based on 3.5 milk the figures give a good example. Out of a total of 15,618 pounds of milk sold by one farmer in two weeks, he received the quota price on 5,932 pounds, which was $5.60 a hundredweight. On the remaining 9,686 pounds he received the market price of $3.25 a hundredweight, making his average price $4.15 a hundredweight. This is a long way from the $4.65 that manufacturing milk shippers may receive this year.

• (10:10 p.m.)

The use of the word "may" in this case was intentional. I informed this man that he would receive no quota, having shipped some of his fluid milk. I must say that he would not believe me. He said, "This could not be possible." He said, "We got it last year and will get it this year." Unfortunately he will be disappointed. We are talking about fluid milk shippers or shippers of distribution milk; it is the same thing. They ship to a plant which pasteurizes and distributes milk on the street.

The minister states that these producers are under provincial jurisdiction. Certainly their quota portion is under provincial jurisdiction because the price is set by commissioners or milk boards or some similar body in each province. The manufacturing portion of their milk is not under provincial jurisdiction. The minister cannot show me evidence that it is or ever has been. To say that it is, is ridiculous. The minister, however, has said this in the house over and over again. Let us be kind and say that instead of being guilty of perpetrating a hoax he just does not know the facts.

If this is so, if what the minister says is so, why did the shippers receive some subsidy last year? What has happened? In other words, what arrangements have been made with the different provinces? I mean by this that each and every province in Canada then would have to pay a subsidy on the fluid milk shippers' surplus. If they did, what would the other shippers think of this? What would their neighbours think? Just consider that. The new dairy commission is to pay a subsidy by quota, and that quota will be the same as the amount on which the subsidy was paid last year. What would happen if the fluid milk shipper was forced to switch to selling manufacturing milk? I should like to know how much quota they then would have on which they would be paid a subsidy. Will it be just the amount they received last year over 120 per cent of their fluid quota? If so, it could be very very little; it could amount to just a few pounds difference.

How should one expand under this new quota system? Is any provision made? If there is, it certainly is not spelled out. I cannot find it either in the dairy policy or in the proclamation by the Canadian Dairy Commission. Fluid milk shippers are so discouraged that many are contemplating going out of business. To prove this, all that is necessary is that one look at any weekly publication in any place in Canada; but of course, I only know about the publications in my own area. In one little paper I noticed last week that there were seven dairy disposal sales. These were sales involving 31 head of cattle, 27 head of cattle and so on. I do not think this is something which is normal. However, this is the situation all over Canada. In order to stop this, the provincial boards—and I am speaking now of the boards which regulate the price of fluid milk—are increasing the price of fluid milk. The price goes up on the street, and what happens? If you do not think it is going up, read the papers. Every day you will find reports that milk is going up, that milk shippers are to receive more money, and so on. This certainly is true across Canada.

The price of beer, liquor and cigarettes can go up with no seeming effect on sales, but let the price of milk go up and sales immediately drop. We cannot change human nature, so we cannot do anything to manage this. When the sales drop on the street the fluid or distribution shipper sells less milk on quota. I believe this has been mentioned before, but I wish to emphasize it because it certainly is true. At the higher price he sells less on quota. Therefore he gains little or nothing.

A ridiculous situation is arising where a man who has more money invested and extremely higher production costs in comparison to other shippers, and who operates under very strict regulations and inspections of premises, can, and in many cases will, receive less than his neighbour who sells manufacturing milk. I am certainly in favour of additional income for the producer of manufacturing milk. In some places he may receive $4.65 per hundredweight; in other places he may realize much less than the $4.75 which is mentioned in the dairy policy. This figure of $4.75 may be taken by some to be a guaranteed price, but it is not: It is just a hope.

In comparison to this, cream shippers will not receive a better break, but they will find the increased subsidy of last year very useful, I am sure, to say the least. However, they certainly will not realize $4.75 per hundredweight on the same basis as for milk. I have a question which I should like to ask the minister in respect of the dairy commission report which was sent out I think on April 14. At the top of the second page the report reads as follows:

> The deduction for the export equalization fund will be made on all milk or cream delivered by quota holders each month, not just on the quota quantity.

I could argue with that statement, but what I should like to know is the situation in respect of the surplus milk from the fluid shipper on which he receives a subsidy. Is he supposed to pay this too? I would hope not. It says here that shippers are not eligible if any portion of their deliveries is used for fluid purposes. At the bottom of the page the report continues:

> The quotas will be determined on an annual amount but will be allocated on a monthly basis related to the average percentage of manufacturing milk and cream delivered each month. Should payments under the monthly quota not reach the annual quota allocated to a producer, there will be a reconciliation at the end of the year.

That part is fair enough but the question which I should like to ask is this: Can a quota be increased? This would not seem to be the case. If one cannot increase the quota, then I do not see how we can bring a substandard unit up to a point where it is a paying unit, or whatever the terminology is that the government uses in respect of such a unit. Farmers are always being advised to work this up.

To sum up, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that this is a discriminatory policy. I shall not presume to tell the government how much money they do have to spend in subsidizing dairies, but I do say that one group of dairymen should not be harmed. This policy most certainly does harm one group of dairymen. I might add that I hope this year the machinery for making the payments will function so that we do not get into the situation we had last year when payments in some cases were made months late. I know that the reason this happened has been explained; but the point is that it did happen and we hope that it will not happen again.

I urge the minister to have a look at the discriminatory features of this dairy policy before we lose more of our top flight dairymen, who will never be replaced. I say that there is no continuity to the dairy policy year after year. What is right in respect of the dairy policy this year seems to be wrong in the next year. No one dares follow the advice of the government to expand into an economic unit, because the policy does not allow for any expansion.

• (10:20 p.m.)

I hope the minister will consider this very important and pertinent fact.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matte: Mr. Chairman, may I make a few comments on agriculture while dwelling more specifically on the dairy industry.

I need not outline the precarious situation in which the farmer now lives, particularly in Quebec.

Everyone must be aware of the difficult conditions in which some farmers live, or as others might put it, in which they rot.

It is enough to know that the Quebec farmer earns 40 per cent less than the average income in Canada, while he has the same needs as the other classes of society.

The problem is there, but the perfect solution has yet to be found, although the government is setting up a long term national agricultural policy which doubtless will be an efficient means of development and readjustment.

We want and seek the best means to enable this working class, to which we owe so much, to have the same standard of living as other classes of society. It is essential for the farmers to share in the national economic life and benefit from it. To tell the truth, our present government has done much in the last three years but there is still much to be done. The fact that the price of manufactured milk was $2.62 three years ago and that it is $4.75 today is a practical demonstration that we are not unaware of the problem. We are the country with the highest price for manufacturing milk, including the United States, but it should not stay there.

The Canadian Dairy Commission was formed during this session and I am sure it will be very useful as will the Canadian Livestock Feed Board.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture who is totally devoted, made a statement some time ago on the new dairy policy for 1967-68. In spite of the numerous representations, we could have been more satisfied: I would have been much happier, very happy

indeed, if we could have agreed fully to the brief presented by the C.F.U.

If I had been in the opposition, I would have requested $6 and more, and even the abolition of taxes. It is so easy. But when you are responsible for the administration, you have to do with what you have and balance the budget the best you can. Every minister, every department has its objects and its requests. And every minister would like to get more. The government ought to protect the producer and the consumer.

We all know also that taxes are never very popular. However, Mr. Chairman, I must give credit to the U.C.C. for the extraordinary work it does mainly in the province of Quebec. The U.C.C. is a living force which will accomplish ever more so long as it gets support from all sides. And we must give it the greatest possible support.

Supply, Mr. Chairman, has to be passed even in spite of criticism. It is so easy. This government has shown that it has done more in the last three years than all the governments since Confederation.

We have every reason to expect that we will do even more just as long as it is possible.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, in view of the lateness of the hour, I shall cut short the remarks I had intended to make tonight. But, since my constituency is partly made up of farmers, and the dairy industry in my area holds a predominant place, I cannot but take a few minutes to join with those who made representations to the minister in favour of more sustained attention and a better share of the national income for the farmers.

Some time ago, the minister set forth his dairy policy for the year 1967-68. It is a known fact that never, since the time the present Liberal government has been occupying the treasury benches, has a policy given rise to so much discontent. When such peaceful people as farmers decide to march on the Canadian parliament, surely there is cause for concern.

And it is our duty, as representatives, to take the necessary steps in order to remedy as quickly as possible the farmers' predicament.

I have here, Mr. Chairman, an article published in *Le Devoir* on Tuesday, April 18, 1967, under the following heading:

The C.F.U. denounces Ottawa's new dairy policy and attacks violently the federal members for Quebec.

And under the signature of Mr. Gilles Gariépy, one can read in the second paragraph of that article:

At a press conference the C.F.U. and the Federation stated that they were "bitterly disappointed" by the attitude of the federal members for Quebec who with their colleagues passed the legislation of last April 1.

Here, Mr. Chairman, I think that the writer forgot a very important word. He should have referred to "the stand taken by the federal Liberal members from Quebec", because we, on this side of the house, have tried on many occasions to call the minister's attention to the problems of the dairy industry to have him amend a dairy policy that we thought prejudicial to farmers.

The same article further states:

According to the two organizations, that piece of legislation shows the "irresponsibility and the inaction of our Quebec members."

Here again, Mr. Chairman, reference should have been made to the "irresponsibility and inaction of the Liberal members from Quebec," because they did very little and if they made any representations, as they claimed and as has just said the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) I am inclined to believe that those representations failed to impress the minister, since he did not lift a finger to help the farmers.

The statements made by the leaders of the Catholic Farmers Union with regard to that new dairy policy are not very flattering for the minister.

The dairy policy set forth by the minister for the year 1967-68 is described first as inadequate, second as inconsistent and third, as unfair to the farmers. Despite that unfavourable assessment made by the representatives of the agricultural class, the minister keeps on saying that it is the best dairy policy ever given to the Canadian people and that the dairy farmers are more prosperous than ever.

However when we listen to farmers, and especially the dairy farmers, we hear quite a different version. The minister should adapt himself to the situation.

Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary to go through many farm publications to realize that the dairy policy of the Minister of Agriculture is completely unsatisfactory and unacceptable to farm groups.

I have here the "Farm and Country" of Tuesday March 28, 1967, where we find the following heading:

Interim Supply

• (10:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Ontario Industrial Farmers Must Have $5 Milk. The demand for $5 per hundredweight for milk used for industrial purposes is neither frivolous, greedy or unreasonable. As a recent resolution of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture says, even this price is still short of economic equality for producers.

This should not surprise anybody.

[*Translation*]

This is an assessment from a group which represents the farming class.

In another publication, one can read the following:

[*English*]

Canada's 1967 Dairy Policy Not Acceptable.

[*Translation*]

And in the last paragraph, this is what we read:

[*English*]

Government policy is supposed to help the people, not drive them up the financial wall.

This is a thoroughly bad, thoroughly unacceptable policy. Mr. Greene was able last summer to divert the wrath of dairy farmers toward Queen's Park and Quebec City, thanks to the unsophistication of those heading the protest movement. If he hopes this year to continue avoiding criticism by putting up another false front in the form of the Canadian Dairy Commission he is wrong. Farmers now have a little less Greene in their eyes than they did.

[*Translation*]

Here are some really harsh articles for the minister who cannot maintain that he has not been warned.

I have in hand a copy of *La Terre de Chez-Nous* dated August 9, 1964 which says:

Ottawa turns a deaf ear. The C.F.U. is continuing its representations on behalf of dairy producers.

And in it, we can see that the minister has certainly welcomed the farmers' representatives, but that the latter returned dissatisfied with their unsolved problems.

We have there, Mr. Chairman, an idea of the unfavourable conditions against which farmers are struggling, especially when we know, for instance, that they have to meet ever increasing production costs, while the price of their products is stable or falling.

I have here a price list supplied by a farmers' co-operative in regard to the prices of meal as of June 15, 1966 and February 27, 1967.

It is astonishing, Mr. Chairman, to note the extent of the price increases.

[Mr. Ricard.]

For instance, corn meal went from $3.50 per hundredweight in June 1966 to $4.05 in February in 1967. The other prices I will quote are for the dates referred to, that is from June 15, 1966 to February 27, 1967. Wheat meal, $3.55 compared to $4.00. Barley meal, $3.30 compared to $3.55. Oatmeal $3.30 compared to $3.50. Growing meal for hogs, $3.85 compared to $4.10. Dairy cattle meal $3.50 compared to $3.80. Bran meal $3.40 compared to $3.80. Shorts $3.50 compared to $3.85.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to tell the minister that the situation is serious among the farmers. The farmers came here with members of the C.F.U. to meet the minister and members of the cabinet only a few weeks ago and they have clearly established their positions, and their very difficult situation and unless the government takes the responsibility and decides to give them what they are entitled to I think it will be too late if a decision is delayed five or six months more. If we wait another five or six months, it will be too late.

If I had the time, I would like to refer the minister to the warnings we gave him in the last few months, to the criticism of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture in January last when they met in Winnipeg. I shall merely quote the first sentence of the first paragraph:

It is resolved that the Canadian Federation of Agriculture express in the strongest terms, its opposition to the suggestion of the federal Minister of Agriculture, to the effect that total subsidies to the dairy industry would be maintained at their present level.

And in the second paragraph, they say that a minimum objective of $5.10 per hundredweight of manufacturing milk is absolutely essential.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that those few remarks will convince the minister. It is high time for him to assume his responsibilities and to take the necessary steps to give the farmers a truly advantageous position.

Another topic on which I should like to dwell, Mr. Chairman, is the textile industry. As we know, this industry is the second largest employer in the province of Quebec. It gives work to some 52,000 employees at the present time, that is approximately 60 per cent of the total national labour force in the textile industry. The annual output amounts to approximately $850 million.

In the last few years, in particular, the textile industry, one of the oldest in the country and in the province of Quebec especially, has had to face the competition of developing countries which causes many problems for our Canadian workers and manufacturers.

When one reads in the paper, for instance, that an old Dominion Textile mill, the Merchants mill in Montreal, which employs 300 workers, will have to close down by next October, one realizes that the situation is really serious. On the other hand, the output of the Thor Mills of Granby has fallen off by 50 per cent and the situation is so serious that those textile workers have even decided to disregard the terms of their collective agreement in order to enter into a common agreement with their employer whereby they will go on short time so as to distribute among themselves the few dollars they can still earn through unfilled orders. Mr. Chairman, that situation is partially due to competition from developing countries that is not always quite fair. I have here a letter from a St. Hyacinthe textile manufacturer who complains that the labelling of products from an underdeveloped country is causing trouble for Canadian manufacturers. It seems that the buyer is being led to believe that the item is a Canadian product.

• (10:40 p.m.)

To clarify the thoughts of my correspondent, I shall quote part of this letter:

> This sample as you can see is labelled (I will omit the name) and anyone who is not too familiar with purchases can easily be misled, thinking he is buying Canadian goods, for the label is quite conspicuous, large and marked Montreal. However, if you unfold the pants you see on the inside a small label saying "Made in Japan".

Surely this shipper is using a method which is dishonest and detrimental to our Canadian manufacturers and workers.

I have contacted the hon. minister concerned and drawn this anomaly to his attention, so that it may be corrected.

There is also another field with which I should like to deal for a few minutes only, namely the shoe industry.

Yesterday we had a meeting with the manufacturers and the workers' representatives in this industry, which, due to foreign competition, is in the process of disappearing. I cannot help but blame the government for this decrease in the number of Canadian shoe manufacturers.

We know, for instance, that the Canadian footwear can be favourably compared with the footwear of any other country. But there are so many goods imported from emerging countries that since 1963, 29 Canadian manufactures were compelled to close. Of that number, 13 were located in the province of Quebec.

Mr. Chairman, when we think, for instance, that a manufacture such as Ludger Duchêne Incorporé, which had been founded in 1907, was compelled to close its doors. Those who are interested in the welfare of Canadian workers have every reason to be concerned. We have lost 13 such factories since 1963, when the present government came to office.

But there is more, Mr. Chairman.

Imports increased by 8,565,730 pair of shoes from 1963 to 1966, with Canada's production over the same period decreasing by 1,102,857 pair.

While shoe imports represented only 5 per cent of Canadian production in 1951, in 1966 they amounted to 49 per cent of our production.

Mr. Chairman, there is cause for concern, and representatives of both the shoe manufacturers and the workers in the shoe industry, were right in warning us that they could not wait any longer. It is absolutely essential that the government do something, otherwise, this home industry which is in the process of disappearing, will surely and quite rapidly disappear.

If I took a few minutes to bring this question to the attention of the cabinet, it is because I have in my constituency, a half dozen shoe manufactures employing at least several hundred workers.

The consequences from a municipal point of view can be imagined if the employees were thrown into the street overnight and forced to find work elsewhere.

The shoe industry employs some 24,000 workers in 220 shoe manufacturing plants spread all over Canada. To this should be added nearly 15,000 other workers employed in other plants supplying the shoe manufacturing plants.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I should like the relevant authorities to take due notice of this warning that was sounded by the shoe workers and manufacturers. I should also like to ask the Minister of Industry and Defence Production (Mr. Drury) to bring all the influence he can bring to bear to convince his colleague, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) to abolish this 12 per cent tax which hinders Canadian manufacturers in their efforts to compete with foreign products.

I know that the representations came from all sides in that field as in others where the government turned a deaf ear, but I think that the government should at last realize that unless steps are taken without delay it will be too late and our whole economic structure will suffer.

Mr. Clermont: Mr. Chairman, in this debate on interim supply, I should like to talk about the dairy industry and farming in general.

The hon. member who has just resumed his seat, the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ricard), insinuated that hon. members sitting at the right of the chair had not done anything for the dairy industry.

The minister is aware of the representations made by the Liberal members on various occasions. I thought the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot felt that the dairy industry was too important to indulge in petty politics about it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Clermont: On March 22, 1967, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene) announced to the Canadian people the dairy policy for 1967-68.

I am referring to page 2 of his press release.

> While total returns to producers from subsidy and the market will depend upon the action of provincial boards and agencies in establishing minimum paying prices, I am informed by the commission that the combination of subsidy and price supports will provide for a total milk price in the order of $4.75 f.o.b. the factory for manufacturing milk testing 3.5 per cent.

We know, Mr. Chairman, that the associations representing the dairy producers in the province of Quebec and in Canada asked in several briefs that the price support be set at $5.10 per hundredweight of milk testing 3.5 per cent butterfat, either by increasing the subsidy or the retail price.

• (10:50 p.m.)

Recently a representative of the Ontario dairy producers association expressed some concern, Mr. Chairman, about price increases. He feared that if the retail prices were too high, consumption would decline.

We had a striking example of that, Mr. Chairman, in 1961-62. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Danforth) mentioned that in 1961-62 we had surpluses—yes, I remember that in January 1962, we had more than 200

million pounds of butter or butter oil in storage and he was amazed that the present government had disposed of the surpluses and that we now had to import butter.

Everyone knows, Mr. Chairman, that the government, or the Canadian Dairy Commission thought advisable to import butter in February or March 1967 in order to have a reserve. According to members of the opposition, an unusual amount was imported.

The imported quantity, Mr. Chairman, was only 2,250,000 pounds and this was especially meant to protect our reserves in British Columbia.

However, Mr. Chairman, in 1962, we had reserves. Why? Because consumption had decreased from 18.5 to 15.5 per capita. This is why in 1960, 1962, a reserve had accumulated. Some people say among other things: perhaps the price was not the only reason why people could not afford to buy butter? However, you know, Mr. Chairman, that in 1962, we had around 1 million unemployed in Canada. And who ruled the country in 1961, if it was not the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker)?

Mr. Chairman, I also wish the dairy farmers to get the amount they are asking, that is $5.10 per hundredweight of milk and the Liberals had promised $4 per hundredweight in their program during the 1965 election.

Last year, dairy farmers obtained the price of $4. I admit that, in some areas, dairy farmers could not get 4 per hundredweight and that, in 1967-68, in some areas of the province of Quebec, for instance, they will fail to obtain the amount of $4.75 per hundredweight, less 11 cents for export. However, Mr. Chairman, according to an agreement entered into last fall, the province of Quebec, as of April 1, 1967, withdrew from the dairy products assistance plan. Since the contribution, I believe, was on an average 25 cents per hundredweight, this will have the Quebec treasury some $8 million. And why is it that the province of Quebec does not use this amount of $8 million to assist the areas which will not be in a position to benefit from the price of $4.75?

Mr. Chairman, I am also worried about quotas in the new policy. In an announcement made on March 22, 1967, by the Department of Agriculture, and in another announcement made by the Canadian Dairy Commission on April 14, 1967, the regulations under the new dairy products policy were made known.

And among other things, starting in 1968-69, I believe, any producer who has not delivered a minimum of 50,000 pounds of milk in 1967-68, will no longer be eligible for subsidies in the future. And I think reference is made also to certain limits.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the commission will consider special cases, such as that of the young farmers wanting to set up an agricultural establishment, who have no cattle on their farm and who cannot get a quota so as to benefit by this subsidy.

But I have confidence in that dairy commission. That is another promise to the agricultural class which the Liberal party has fulfilled. In the 1965 program of the Liberal party, we had promised to set up a dairy commission and the Canadian parliament, in this session has established a three-member Canadian Dairy Commission. I am pleased tonight, Mr. Chairman, to mention that one member, the one acting as vice-chairman, is one of my fellow citizens from Thurso who represents the producers.

I was surprised when the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Danforth) with whom I sat on the committee on agriculture and colonization used the kind of language he used about a possible general strike by dairy farmers.

May I refer him to the article written by P. E. Grandpré as published in *"La Terre de Chez Nous"*, on April 19, 1967, and I quote:

> Until now, we have read many statements, but no one has kicked up a shindy. Only veiled allusions from the minorities, and nothing for the immediate future. Apparently, serious people will continue to exert pressure, to negotiate in an orderly fashion, which seems preferable. In similar cases, there is always the danger of spoiling things by going too fast.
>
> The present situation—

Mr. Chairman, here is a very important passage—

> —has grown difficult and touchy because of what might be called a sin of omission: the increase in the price of industrial milk started two or three years ago—

It is not the Liberal party, nor the Minister of Agriculture, nor the member for Labelle who mentioned that, Mr. Chairman, but Mr. Grandpré in an article published in *La Terre de Chez-Nous* of April 19. And here is something about the strike in the United States mentioned by the member for Kent. What were its results, according to Mr. Grandpré? It entailed for dairy producers a substantial loss of money. The member for Kent mentioned some other figures, certain subsidies and support prices on farm products in Canada. He mentioned some but he did not say that in 1961-62 the support prices for the dairy industry only amounted to $16,481,000. Then we see that $100 million will be allotted in 1966-67. I too, Mr. Chairman, share the ideas expressed by the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) when he says that our friends are not serious when they claim that nothing has been done to help the farmers, the Canadian dairy industry.

If the government grants subsidies of over $120 million to help our dairy producers, in the final analysis, neither you nor I, Mr. Chairman, are getting those $120 million.

Every month, the Department of Agriculture—from here on it will be the Canadian Dairy Commission for the stabilization board —sends cheques to the manufacturing milk and cream producers. I do not know whether the new or the 1966 policy applies to the cream producers.

And, every month or every three months, the cheques are sent out directly to the producers, and they are the ones who benefit from those subsidies.

The hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) said that the Minister of Agriculture should be ashamed to look at us or to look at the farmers. Personally, I say to the minister that he should not be ashamed to meet the farmers because the Liberal party has kept most of the promises it made them in 1965—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Clermont: —and you proved it, Mr. Minister. You did not follow the policy applied by the previous government. And I am not the one who says this.

• (11:00 p.m.)

In fact, as reported on page 15061 of the French version of *Hansard* in reply to a question asked by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Béchard), the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin) said that the previous government had done better than yourself and that at least it had listened. He was right, this is precisely what the previous government did, it merely listened. In fact here are the prices which farmers were receiving: in 1960, $2.78; in 1961, $2.77; in 1962, $2.68; in 1963, $2.74.

Now in March 1967, they were receiving $4 and this amount could reach $4.75 in 1967 and 1968. This means, Mr. Chairman, that the present Minister of Agriculture did not take the advice of the previous government, that is to listen, but that he acted and

assisted the farming industry and the dairy producers.

My colleagues and myself, not only those of the province of Quebec, but also those from the other provinces, will continue to insist and make representations to the Minister of Agriculture, or the Minister of Finance and Receiver general (Mr. Sharp) in order that our dairy farmers may get what they are asking for. But I do not agree with the statement made by the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ricard) and some other members, to the effect that this government has done nothing for the farming classes—

Mr. Ricard: I have never said that.

Mr. Clermont: The present government has done much more than the previous one, because if I recall a statement made by the former minister of agriculture during a banquet held in 1962, in honour of the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm, he is reported as saying on that occasion: "Now, we will take care of the eastern producers." Now, what did he do between 1957 and 1962? I think he had followed the advice of the hon. member for Charlevoix, he had listened to the grievances, the representations of the agricultural class, but he did not do anything for the dairy farmers.

As I said, sir, do not be embarrassed, do not be ashamed to meet the agricultural class, you have improved their lot. You did not fulfil their demands 100 per cent, but you are finally going forward and I hope you will continue to help the agricultural class, the dairy farmers. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that my colleagues in the province of Quebec and in other provinces will not listen to the advice of the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) when he said that he was not afraid to vote against the government to overthrow it.

Let us be serious. Most farmers would be loathe to return to the former government's policy.

Then, Mr. Chairman, again I assure the dairy producers that the Liberal members, as well as the other members from the province of Quebec and the other provinces—and I am much more open-minded than the previous speaker—that all the Quebec members, whatever their political label will keep striving to obtain for the dairy farmers the price they ask, that is $5.10 per hundredweight, for milk containing 3.5 per cent butterfat.

[Mr. Clermont.]

[*English*]

Mr. Peters: Would the hon. member permit a question? Has he any information about the price the government paid for the butter which the dairy commission imported?

Mr. Clermont: The hon. member should address his question to the Minister of Agriculture who will have all the figures at his disposal.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, I know what price was paid, but I am not the Ministed of Agriculture and the hon. member should address his question to the person responsible for the Department of Agriculture.

[*English*]

Mr. Kindt: I shall only take a very few moments.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Kindt: I am delighted to hear members on the government benches applauding that remark, because we have heard speeches tonight from down in that corner extending half an hour and more, leading one to the conclusion that those who made them were all vaccinated with a gramophone needle. We want to get out.

However, I have a problem to which I must call attention this evening. I would defer doing so if it were possible. I bring it up now because of the telegrams I have received. It is a joint matter which concerns the Minister of Industry, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Transport. Let me lay the groundwork. Out in the west for a period of years farmers have been buying surplus airplanes and using these aircraft for crop spraying, weed control and similar purposes. It is a new industry and that is why I am addressing these remarks to the Minister of Industry. It is something that fills an economic need. Farmers have been trying to build it up. They can economically spray crops and grasshoppers from the air, more cheaply and more efficiently than by using any other method.

• (11:10 p.m.)

They have bought these machines. Some are large, others are small. Some are surplus war material. The people concerned at Blackie and at Vulcan have given themselves the name, "The Flying Canadian Farmers." They are trying to perfect this new industry for the benefit of agriculture. The Minister of

Agriculture should be interested in it, and particularly the Minister of Transport.

Some time ago the Department of Transport issued a regulation and recently the Air Transport Board issued a circular based on it. Under the regulation these machines are not permitted to fly over a radius greater than 25 miles. Any man with one of these machines does not spray just his own crop; he does custom work. It is similar to the old threshing machine in the west, which threshed different crops.

The people who own these machines have a big investment in them and they should not be hindered from doing custom work. Now they are going to be put out of business or seriously curtailed because of the restrictions placed upon them by the Air Transport Board. I do not think that was the intention of the Minister of Transport, and it certainly would not be the intention of the Minister of Industry or of the Minister of Agriculture. I ask that action by taken by these three ministers to look into this problem immediately and take the matter up with Mr. Westersund of Blackie, Alberta. He is a darned good Liberal, but he is a man who has always stood behind me and co-operated with me. I like him, and I got a telegram from him this morning about this matter. He is the executive secretary of the Flying Farmers Association at Blackie, Alberta.

I am talking not only for this organization at Blackie but also for the one organized at Vulcan. I hope the three ministers will look into this problem and will take up with the Air Transport Board to see if they can get these stupid rules and regulations eliminated, and let these people operate this new spraying business without government red tape.

Mr. Johnston: I would like to intervene briefly in this debate to state some arguments on behalf of the dairy farmers of British Columbia.

The debate has been interrupted by the introduction of one or two other topics. I really do not think that the hon. member for York-Humber interrupted the discussion of the dairy policy. Certainly he poured a great quantity of cold skim milk over the members of his own party. When his time was up, in perhaps what could be characterized as true Liberal policy, they decided he had had his quota and they cut off his subsidy.

The question of the new national dairy policy and the dairy industry in British Columbia is a most urgent one. The bargaining system in the industry there is one which is unique in Canada. I am sure it will defy all the ability of the minister, his officials, the officials of the provincial government and the minister there, to separate the fluid milk producer from the commercial milk producer in any way that will make sense or be of any assistance to the industry in that province.

I should like to point out the breakdown in respect of the subsidy figures by province for last year. I note that in Quebec $33,208,000 was paid in terms of federal payment. In Ontario the amount was $22,429,000 and in British Columbia $1,054,000. The policy which has been announced is one which was designed with the provinces of Ontario and Quebec in mind, not particularly the province of British Columbia. If the policy is to be implemented as announced, I should think that this year the subsidy for British Columbia will be less than it was last year. Yet, this is a province in which the agricultural problems are great. This is a high cost province. Particularly in respect of the cost of labour, the farmer of British Columbia faces a problem which is greater than that faced by the farmers in other provinces.

I should like to draw to the attention of the minister and all hon. members a series of papers which we have received recently in respect of a national food and farm price policy from the Farm Conference Week, University of Manitoba. This is a very useful set of papers and provides a great deal of important information for anyone who is interested in either food prices or agricultural policy. In the paper, by Mr. C. Gilson of the Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Manitoba, the case for increasing farm production is put very very well. It speaks in terms of encouraging efficiency in the industry, in terms of Canadian farmers being dependent on international markets for the sale of their products, and mentions the importance of efficiency in terms of the world food supply where no nation, Canada included, can lag when the world situation in that regard is so precarious. He goes on to say that food consumers can rightfully expect farmers to produce efficiently. I believe, however, that the efficient farmer should expect reasonable compensation for his efforts. He says that a farm price policy should not penalize the farm innovator, the pace setter, the man who is willing to spend the time and take the risks

associated with the development of a highly productive farm business. This is particularly true of the dairy industry in British Columbia.

• (11:20 p.m.)

I was invited to speak to the largest dairy co-operative in my constituency and I did not realize how completely the minister's announcement of March 22 had failed to convey any information to the farmers in Canada in respect of exactly what the national dairy policy was intended to do. I thought I was explaining some of the aspects of this policy but found myself to be the purveyor of disheartening news. I am sure the minister has felt the repercussions resulting from the realization of what this loss of federal subsidy will mean to that area.

This whole problem can be reduced to an individual thing. Farm innovators, pace setters and young men have expanded their production on the basis of the policy initiated a year ago by this government. Having faith in this government they have borrowed heavily and carried out those things expected of them by the inspectors of dairy farms. In this way they have brought their operations up to the standards required for fluid milk production. They have built up great surpluses of production at great cost. In this way they obtained small fluid milk quotas as registered fluid milk shippers. They are now faced with the possibility of receiving no subsidies at all, in spite of having done all those things we expect young, energetic and conscientious Canadian farmers to do. If their farm capitalization runs to $20,000 or $25,000, which is about what is required to bring a dairy farm up to standard today, the loss in income in some cases will be several thousand dollars. This will put these people in a very serious situation—almost a crisis.

I urge the minister to pay careful attention to the representations from British Columbia, to consider the unique position of that dairy industry and its organizations, and to clarify for the dairy producers of that province the new national dairy policy.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Allard: Mr. Chairman, I represent a riding where the vast majority are workers, industrial and commercial people. Consequently, some member may be surprised to hear me speak, this evening, on the federal government's new dairy policy. I do so because I feel that agricultural problems and the dairy industry, are part of the economic

[Mr. Johnston.]

mosaic of the province of Quebec and Canada; they must not rank second they deserve every consideration from the governments if we want to develop some equilibrium between Quebec and Canada as a whole.

Last Sunday, at 11 o'clock in the morning, I was invited to meet the officials of the Catholic Farmers Union, eastern townships section, and I must tell you, Mr. Chairman, that they were there in great numbers from all parts of the eastern townships. I must also tell you, even if it displeases the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Clermont) who praised earlier the recent dairy policy of the Liberal government, that those representatives and delegates from all parts of the eastern townships were extremely disappointed by the dairy policy announced in the house last March 22.

That disappointment was accompanied by a strong displeasure. And the hon. member for Labelle, who said earlier that he was not afraid to meet the farmers, will shortly have an opportunity to prove his mettle, as will his Liberal colleagues, because it seems that following the disappointment of the farmers and the dairy producers a monster march on Ottawa is being organized. Face to face with the representatives of the farmers and the dairy producers, I wonder if he will have the courage to talk as he did here earlier and to praise so freely the dairy policy which so greatly disappointed our farmers and dairy producers.

But what is that policy announced by the Liberal government last March 22? The farmers were asking for $5.10 per hundredweight and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene) gave them $4.75 and from that price support of $4.75 must be deducted the 10 cent premium to pay for the export subsidies.

And as the provincial subsidy will be dropped this year, in the province of Quebec, the increase to the producers will be an actual 15 cents. That raise is still less because subsidies will apply only to milk produced within quotas prescribed by the government. The quotas were arrived at without any consultation, on the basis of last year's production. Finally the government has distorted the dairy policy by fixing an objective that would not cost more than $120 million to the government. That is an ill-assorted policy, a patch-up policy which does not settle the problem of eastern farmers and of dairy farmers.

The main grievance expressed by the representatives of the eastern agricultural class and of dairy producers is that the present

government refused to establish a true agricultural policy, in consultation with experts on the matter, namely those who can explain to the government the real needs of the agricultural classes. And, in its ivory tower, the government keeps on preparing and introducing inadequate policies which as not based on real needs, which do not correct troubles, which do not alleviate the hardship that continues in eastern Canada's agricultural class.

Their demands, Mr. Chairman, have been fully explained by the different associations, including the C.F.U., and the Federation of Manufacturing Milk Producers. Those requests were fully explained to the federal government, which ignored them believing that government members, such as the hon. member for Labelle, were quite satisfied.

The hon. member for Labelle said that this policy is better than the previous one. We are not saying that nothing was done; we are saying that too little was done, that not enough was done for eastern agriculture—

Mr. Clermont: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. In concluding my remarks, I said that both government members and those who represent Quebec and Canadian ridings, will work together so that dairy farmers may obtain what they are asking for, that is, a price of $5.10. I did not say I was fully satisfied, but that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene) should not be ashamed of his accomplishments up to now.

Mr. Grégoire: You shower fulsome praise and flattery on the minister. That is all you can do. Stop praising him. Stand up to him instead of kotowing to him.

Mr. Clermont: If I were like the hon. member for Lapointe, I would be asking for $10 per hundredweight, because he is totally irresponsible.

• (11:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

The Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member for Sherbrooke has the floor. Perhaps he will continue now.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Allard: Mr. Chairman, I am happy to hear the hon. member for Labelle say tonight that the Quebec members will now work towards the solution of agricultural problems, but it is too late. They should have done so and listened to representations a long time ago, because being members of a political party, they should be able to get more results, which would show that they have influence in their party. However, the attitude of the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) gives a clear indication that in the Liberal party now, members have no influence, and that the minister remained in his ivory tower to develop policies which are not based on the actual needs of the various classes of society.

When I say that the eastern farmers and the dairy producers are not satisfied, I am not making it up all, and I say so to the hon. member for Labelle.

A while ago, in my opening remarks, I said that the representatives of the eastern townships, of the C.F.U. and of milk producers knew as much about this matter as the hon. member for Labelle. They are extremely disappointed. They will probably bring their grievances before the federal government, and I do hope that, on this occasion, the hon. member for Labelle will be there and will not be satisfied with shaking hands, but also say that he is not yet entirely content with this policy and demand, before the authorities concerned and the entire farming society, that the needs of the farmers be met; in short, I hope he will support their representatives by saying so and doing so, and not merely by arranging meetings behind the scenes.

Mr. Chairman, I can see that there is a response and it is a good sign. When there is a response, Mr. Chairman, it is because there is some unrest within the Liberal party.

When there is a response among the farmers and the members of the C.F.U. it is because there is dissatisfaction and discontent with regard to the Liberal policy of the Ottawa government which refuses to help eastern farmers. And we shall never say loud and eloquently enough that in this house there are some who for too long now have been drawing up policies in their ivory tower.

And often those decisions are not even taken by the minister but by the experts, the deputy ministers, and the poor minister must be satisfied to read them out in this house.

The other day, the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) said that the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) was reading newspapers.

Well, there are too many ministers who read and not enough who are doing anything

in respect of the needs and requirements of the agricultural class and the dairy farmers.

The needs expressed by the members of the C.F.U. and the federation of manufacturing milk producers, could be summed up in the following manner:

It would be very easy to the hon. members, in considering requests and plights of the agricultural class and of the dairy farmers, to compare the recent position taken by the federal government on this matter to find differences existing between the needs and the requests of the dairy farmers.

What do these people want, Mr. Chairman? They asked:

1. To guarantee milk producers a minimum price of $5.10 per hundredweight including an export subsidy of 10 cents per hundredweight for each of the various categories of milk products based on a butter fat test of 3.5 per cent and for all manufactured milk including surplus fluid milk, these being defined as including all milk that was not paid for at the Class I rate for the period between April 1, 1961 and March 21, 1968;

2. To guarantee a minimum price of $5.10 per hundredweight, including a 10 cent subsidy for export per hundredweight of milk by increasing market prices on the one hand, by support prices and the appropriate export subsidies and, on the other hand, by including the direct subsidy for each of the main product categories more specifically:

(a) by fixing the support price of cheddar cheese at 45 cents per pound, by increasing the market price to a minimum level of 47 cents per pound through the appropriate export subsidy and by paying a direct subsidy to the producers of $1.40 per hundredweight of milk;

(b) by supporting through purchases the price of butter at 63 cents a pound and of powdered skim milk at 20 cents per pound, and by adding an appropriate export subsidy for powdered milk, and by the payment of a direct subsidy to the producer of at least $1.35 per hundredweight of milk processed into butter and powder;

(c) by increasing through the appropriate export subsidy the market price of casein at 57 cents a pound and by paying a direct subsidy of $1.50 per hundredweight of milk processed into butter and casein;

(d) by granting an additional subsidy of 22.6 cents per butter fat pound to the cream producers;

(e) in the case of casein and butter, by providing adequate funds at the earliest possible time to allow for the quick and rational updating of plants processing milk and cream into butter and casein, such amounts not calculated as integral parts of direct or import subsidies.

Mr. Chairman, I interrupt this list to emphasize how disagreeable it can be to hear the Quebec Liberal members mutter when I am listing the requirements of milk producers. I hear the Liberal Quebec members muttering and mocking the list of needs I am presenting. And the representative of those various movements asks the government to protect fully the dairy producers against such imports as might be liable to compete unjustly with domestic products; to resort to imports only in case of need and, finally, to see to it that the activities of the Canadian Dairy Commission are co-ordinated with those of the provincial marketing organizations, and that the act establishing the Canadian Dairy Commission does in fact take into consideration special provincial legislation on marketing and marketing organizations.

Mr. Chairman, that is the list of the requests and grievances of the representatives of the CFU and the Canadian Federation of Dairy Producers.

When those requests are considered, it is easy to note the difference and the lag between the shabby dairy policy set forth by the government March 22 last. In my opinion those dairy farmers are justified in crying out loudly that they are faced with pressing needs and that their poverty will not be relieved by the present Liberal government whose policy is not geared to the people's needs, but who dreams and spends its time beating around the bush behind the scenes in ivory towers.

In the past year and a half, legislators in this parliament would gladly have discussed constitutional reforms, but what has just been announced? The right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) has just announced in his complacent way that a high official of the justice department will be appointed, probably upon the advice of the new Minister of Justice and Attorney General (Mr. Trudeau), to study the constitutional, fiscal and political reforms, while it is the responsibility not of a clan playing hide-and-seek, blind-man's buff, but of the legislators of this country who gather within these walls and are elected by the Canadian people "from coast to coast" from Halifax to Vancouver.

Mr. Chairman, it is our responsibility to direct the policy of this country; this does not rest with the officials at all, or with the bureaucrats who lead this country for too long a time and who in the field of dairy policy, have established standards which in no way answer the needs of the western farmers and of the milk producers of Quebec and Canada.

Mr. Chairman, the federal government has complete authority in that field, according to section 95. Indeed, pursuant to section 95, the central government and the provinces have a

concurrent responsibility in the fields of agriculture and farming and in that concurrent responsibility, it is provided under the constitution and according to judgments passed by the Privy Council that the central government has the priority.

This is precisely a field where the central government, which likes to claim that it must be strong and powerul, that it must have all possible authority to legislate and solve problems, should exercise its authority.

This is precisely a field, agriculture, where there is a constitutional and legal priority, and instead of exercising its responsibility adequately, according to the needs of our farmers and dairy producers, the present government prefers to keep all the money in Ottawa. It wants to intrude in fields under the provincial jurisdiction instead of exercising its full authority, its absolute discretion in fields placed under its jurisdiction by the constitution.

Thus, the present government prefers to establish education allowances for students, a field under the exclusive jurisdiction of provinces. The government prefers to set up retirement pensions, municipal loans, when such areas are within the exclusive jurisdiction of provincial governments. They would rather make loans to university students, when this is a field directly related to education, which is a matter of exclusive provincial jurisdiction under section 93.

The present central government would rather get into the field of hardship and poverty, infringing upon provincial responsibilities, paying old age security pension supplements which are already beginning to cause dissatisfaction among senior citizens and provincial governments. Again this afternoon, to the great satisfaction of Liberal members from Quebec, it pushed through legislation concerning the occupational training of adults, a field which falls, directly or indirectly, within the scope of education. It handles enough money to play the role of Croesus, to get in every nook and corner of the Canadian house when it does not behove him to do so. But when times come for it to use its authority, to legislate, to step in directly into the field of agriculture, to implement a policy aptly expressed by the representatives of the farmers and milk dairy producers, oh no. It would rather set an objective of $120 million. No one knows why. No explanation is given. I am quite convinced that the hon. minister does not know himself. It was probably set by some bureaucrat or other, on the third, or eighth floor of the building. It was set at $120 million.

And that is called agricultural planning in Canada. Setting an objective of $120 million without knowing whether it meets adequately the needs of the eastern farmers and dairy producers.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, which gives much pleasure and satisfaction to the Liberal members from Quebec who are looking at me, I say to the hon. minister, hoping that he is not asleep at this late hour, that it is time to convene the representatives of the C.F.U. and the Federation of Dairy Producers.

• (11:40 p.m.)

Let him not wait for the abcess to fester. Let him call them and set up a true agricultural policy on a short and a long term basis but through consultations with the organizations concerned.

Thus, when he announces the agricultural policy, either a comprehensive or a particular policy for industrial milk, he will be in a better position to meet the needs of the population.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Allard: Surely.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, in view of this new agricultural vocation discovered by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Allard) who might deserve congratulations, if it were real, and in view of what he has just said a few minutes ago, I should like to know, when he was a member of a very strong party between 1958 and 1962, what great influence, what major role he played, particularly as far as dairy policy is concerned, as a member of a government which at the time was in a position to do much more, while he was one of the pillars of such an ivory tower or possibly a monument with feet of clay, what influence did he exert at that time, at a time when he was a member of an important party?

Mr. Allard: Mr. Chairman, I am most pleased to reply to the hon. member.

All he has to do is what some ministers are doing now, that is read *Hansard* all the time. Let him search through the index in the parliamentary library and he will see the numerous interventions I made to help solve the various problems of our people and those of the province of Quebec in particular.

So it is quite easy to reply—

Mr. Berger: What result did you achieve for the dairy industry?

Mr. Allard: You just read *Hansard* from 1958 to 1962. In so doing, you will be in good company, with those who spend their time reading instead of doing something to solve the problems of Canada.

An hon. Member: Did you ever call a meeting of the U.C.C.?

[*English*]

Mr. Bell (Carleton): The hour of 12 minutes before midnight, in my experience and belief, is one for action and not words. At such an hour anything that cannot be said in capsule form is not worth saying.

This is my one minute submission on what I hope is the last night of the first session of the twenty seventh Parliament of Canada.

The dairy policy of this government has been monstrously inadequate, continues to be flagrantly defective and simply must be altered to bring justice and fair play to the most oppressed group of Canadian citizens and their families—the dairy farmers. The injustices visited upon the dairy producers of Canada simply cannot be perpetuated.

I speak from bitter knowledge. Milk at 80 cents a hundred in the 'thirties educated me away from the farm. In this day, the same discriminations which required me to leave the farm are working against young men and women of farm background. The price has not relatively improved. The most significant task for Canada in centennial year is to bring justice to farm people—a fair and reasonable share of the national income. The dairy farmers of Canada ask no more: They cannot be expected to settle for less.

I appeal to the Minister of Agriculture to act—and to act now. Nothing less than $5.10 per hundred for industrial milk will be reasonable or adequate.

Mr. Greene: Mr. Chairman, at this late hour of midnight in the longest session in the history of the Canadian parliament I think that, even though it is late, it would be less than proper if I did not answer some of the inquiries which have been raised here and attempt to satisfy some of the doubts which appear to be in the minds of members with regard to the current dairy policy.

First, the charge has been made that insufficient progress has been achieved in solving the problems faced by the dairy farmers of Canada. I think we should make the needs and the problems clear. We should find out where we have been and how far we have progressed, for only then will we know whether our policy has been satisfactory or whether it is tending in the right direction. I do not propose for a moment to indicate to the committee or to the dairy farmers that this policy and this program is the perfect or ultimate solution to the problems of Canadian dairy farmers.

• (11:50 a.m.)

I quite concur in many of the remarks made here tonight, that there are very grave problems in the dairy industry, that from the standpoint of income in particular vis-à-vis the income of his industrial counterpart the dairy farmer has a long way to go to achieve economic justice in this country. However, I beg to submit to the house that the program of this government and the direction in which it has been going are attempting forthrightly to put the dairy industry in good shape.

I think it might be most pertinent to put before the house something of the nature of the problem. I know it is very easy to see pat solutions when one does not have responsibility. I note that those who have had responsibility for this problem in the past and have met it to the best of their ability—not completely, and certainly with still a long way to go—were not those who were most critical. Those most critical were those who know very little about the problem or about the program. Those were the loudest, the most vociferous and, as ever, the most certain in their solutions. But if they knew something more of the program and understood a little of it they might not be so ready with their pat solutions to all the problems that beset the dairy farmer.

First of all, I would like to point out that with respect to the dairy farming business, as with any other phase of agricultural production, there are two basic problems. One is price and the other is volume. I think the wheat farmers of western Canada quite appreciate these problems. World wheat prices are one of their concerns, but they know full well a high price with little volume of sales would not be of great benefit to them. This again is the basic problem of the dairy farmer.

It is all very well to suggest $5.10, or $6, or $7 for manufacturing milk, but if these prices are set or fixed, if our support program is engineered to set this kind of price, it will shrink the markets of the dairy farmer to the point where he has no sales, or his sales diminish by a half or three quarters, and the

fact that he is getting a good price is not going to be of much use to him.

I think the former administration, I am sure with the best intent, tried this method of raising the price through the support program when it raised the support price of butter to some 74 cents a pound. But this shrunk the market of the dairy farmer to the point that his situation was critical, and I hope to lay before the house evidence of the fact that in the minds of members of the former government, including evidence from the mouth of their own minister, they found this was not an adequate policy, that in fact it caused a very difficult situation in Canada where there was a surplus, to the point that all of the money that government could afford, indeed the largest sum the previous administration every spent in respect of the dairy industry, went to move a product into world markets at sacrifice prices from which the dairy farmer did not benefit in the slightest.

I merely point this out to indicate that price alone is not the question here. The question here is the maintaining of the dairy farmer's market in an adequate sense, along with a respectable price, and looking to that position so that the day will come, as the hon. member for Medicine Hat indicated, when the dairy farmer, the manufacturing milk farmer of Canada will get a good income, an adequate income from the market place, at prices people are willing to pay for his product. I think this is the basic concern of the dairy industry and the manufacturing area of it. There is no use in producing a product that people will not pay for at a rate commensurate with the investment and labour of the dairy farmer.

If our own people will not pay for it, and the farmers have to put it into world markets, I think we know full well that the Canadian dairy industry is not one that can compete in world markets. There are other countries better geared for world markets by reason of longer seasons, more grass, etc., to produce dairy products for those markets more economically than we can do here.

Surely therefore the basic need of the Canadian dairy industry is to produce sufficient product for our domestic consumption at prices that the people of Canada are willing to pay to give a just return to the dairy farmer. When I speak of volume, I think the figures I am about to give might be of some help to the house in trying to come to a rational conclusion as to the problems and the needs of the industry.

I think it is singular that something like 18 per cent of the dairy farmers in the manufacturing segment of Canada produce less than 23,999 pounds of manufacturing milk, some 65 per cent produce less than 95,000 pounds, some 82 per cent produce less than 144,000 pounds and only 9 per cent produce more than 200,000 pounds of milk. In other words, we have only 9 per cent with more than 200,000 pounds, 200,000 pounds being the production of 20 efficient cows or, on the national average, a production of less than 30 cows.

We can see therefore that surely the fundamental and basic problem of the Canadian dairy industry in the manufacturing field is that the units of producers are far too small. When we find that 82 per cent have less than 144,000 pounds and 65 per cent have less than 100,000 pounds—the producer with ten cows—it becomes evident that it just is not feasible to have any form of dairy policy, short of sheer welfare which I am sure the dairy farmers of Canada do not want, which will ensure a good income to a man with only ten efficient producing cows.

There has been much discussion here concerning consultation with the various groups which represent the dairy industry of Canada. This consultation, of course, has been held, and I believe I can safely say that it is their view that we must have larger units and must have a policy which ensures a good income to the efficient dairy producer. I do not think the dairy farmers of Canada, any more than the general public, want a policy which will perpetuate an inefficient industry. I know that the farmers have been moving in this direction. I believe it was the hon. member for Okanagan-Revelstoke who mentioned Professor Gilson and some of his views in respect of Canadian agriculture. Not too long ago, I believe when he was speaking in Winnipeg, Professor Gilson indicated that some $450 million had been poured into the dairy industry of Canada in the past decade or decade and a half, and that this very vast contribution had not contributed toward making the lot of the farmer better, or the industry more efficient. He said he thought the farmer was just as badly off today as he was before this money was poured in.

I do not pretend that this is the final answer, but we have here, for the first time, an attempt at an approach which will put this industry in shape so that some time in the not too distant future the day will come when we will have put this industry in shape and that

the men who earn their livelihood in it are earning a good livelihood. We have not just accepted the situation and continued to perpetuate it as it was. When one attempts to rectify any ill of the past he cannot find an immediate answer for all segments of the industry. Surely, however, it is better to attempt to solve the problem than perpetuate it by continuing policies which we know will never provide a decent livelihood for those who are in it.

I should like to point out some of the approaches taken by the previous administration so that we will know where we started four years ago, know how far we have come, and know whether or not the progress in that period of time has been a responsible progress. First of all I should like to read from *Hansard* of April 23, 1959 at the time when the dairy policy of that year was announced.

• (12 midnight)

In that year the then minister, at that time the hon. member for Calgary North, announced the policy as recorded on page 2694 of *Hansard* for April 23 as follows:

> The support price on cheese will be 32 cents per pound first grade f.o.b. warehouse in Ontario, 31½ cents per pound delivered Montreal for Quebec cheese. In addition, cheese producers will receive a payment of 25 cents per 100 pounds of milk delivered for the manufacture of cheese on the same basis as other milk delivered for manufacturing purposes. The support price, plus 25 cents per 100 pounds for milk, will provide an effective support price for cheese of 34.8 cents . . .
>
> The support price on skim milk powder will be reduced from 15 cents per pound to 10 cents per pound—

We all know that the support price for cheese together with the support subsidy amounts to some 45 cents. Milk powder is being supported at 20 cents per pound today with a reduction of 10 cents to 13 cents as in 1959.

The hon. minister at that time then stated:

> —after which date the support price for powder will be discontinued. In lieu of the reduction in the support price for powder the stabilization board will make a payment to producers of 25 cents per 100 pounds of milk for all milk delivered for manufacturing purposes, with the exception that no payments will be made to producers who sell a portion of their milk within the fluid milk market.

I am rather surprised that so many members on the opposite side of the house, who sat with that government and apparently supported that policy at that time, now take exception to the fact that fluid milk will no longer be supported. Presumably they supported that policy during their entire tenure as members on the government side.

[Mr. Greene.]

The then minister said:

> The net result will be to reduce producers' returns by approximately 15 cents per 100 pounds on milk used for manufacturing purposes.

He then summed up the policy as follows:

> The total effect of the change in the dairy price support program will be:
>
> 1. The farmer who delivers cream for butter only will get the same return as last year.
>
> 2. The farmer who delivers milk for cheese-making will receive a small increase in his return.
>
> 3. The farmer who delivers milk for manufacturing into products other than cheese will receive a small decrease, about 15 cents per 100 pounds less than in 1958.
>
> 4. The farmer who delivers to the fluid milk market and who has been receiving a price in some cases of up to $5 per 100 pounds for this milk, will not be paid any subsidy for the milk which he diverts into manufacturing. Thus the returns to the dairy farmers who have been delivering to different types of markets will be brought closer together than they have been in the past.

That was the policy of that time. The basic principle enunciated was that as fluid milk producers were the greatest earners in the industry there would be no attempt to help them, and that any government funds available would be paid in the manufacturing area in order to bring up the income of the manufacturing milk farmer to something closer to that of his counterpart in the fluid field.

Again in 1959 the then Minister of Agriculture stated at page 3022 of *Hansard* for April 24, 1959:

> As far as people delivering milk for general manufacture are concerned, rather than a loss of 40 or 50 cents a hundred pounds the biggest reduction they should get in any circumstances should be 15 cents per hundred pounds, and in many cases there should be no reduction at all.

That was the accomplishment of that year. Most would have a reduction of 15 cents per hundred pounds, and the others would be in the very happy position of not having any reduction at all.

I do not wish to refer only to that year. Let us see what the support program for dairy farmers was the next year. Let me quote from *Hansard* for May 6, 1960 at page 3656:

> I think that is as plain as English can make it. Anybody who sells a portion of his milk in the bottled, fluid market is not entitled to the 25 cents. That has been made absolutely clear—

That was the subsidy being paid then as compared to the $1.21 today.

Then he said:

> That has been made absolutely clear, and there should have been no confusion at any time in connection with it.
>
> The reason for that provision is, of course, that by and large the people who sell their milk in the fluid milk market—to the bottled trade—receive much higher prices than those who sell milk for manufacturing purposes. The idea of paying this 25 cents subsidy to those who sell milk for manufacturing purposes is in order to bring about to some extent an equality of price levels and to help to equalize the returns to the dairy farmer who sells to a cheese or butter factory.

That was the policy, apparently, of the Conservative party at that time. Perhaps it has changed; but if so, today is the first notice I have received of the fact that it has changed. What of 1961, when the hon. member for Qu'Appelle was minister of agriculture? What was the policy at that time?

I quote from *Hansard* of April 20, 1961, page 3826

> Mr. Speaker, the government has authorized the agricultural stabilization board to continue the present level of price support for the dairy industry for the period May 1, 1961, to April 30, 1962.

They were going to hold their own from the previous year when they had had a cut-back of some 15 cents. I now quote from *Hansard* of March 10, 1961, page 2901. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle, then minister of agriculture, answered question No. 122 asked by Mr. Boulanger in these terms:

> The subsidy of 25 cents per hundred pounds of milk used for manufacturing purposes is payable only to milk producers. The factory or factories receiving milk for manufacturing purposes, acting as agents of the agricultural stabilization board, pay the 25 cent subsidy and after proof of payment are reimbursed by the board. No subsidy has therefore been paid to the condensed milk processing firms referred to.

There again, we continue the subsidy at 25 cents. What was the picture in gross with respect to the subsidies that had been paid and the supports that have been given and are now given to the dairy farmers of this country? First of all I would point to the statistics as to prices received. Remarks have been made, and I think quite properly so, about the plight of the dairy farmer caught in the cost-price squeeze, as are all areas of the agricultural community, and the increasing costs the dairy farmer must bear for the goods which he buys in the marketplace. There is only one way in which we can enable him to meet those increasing costs and that is by increasing the price of the goods he sells in the marketplace.

I should like to quote the statistics in that regard. In 1961-62, with all the subsidies, the manufacturing milk dairy farmer received $2.86; in 1962-63 the then government "improved" his position by decreasing his return from $2.86 to $2.62; in 1963-64 it was $2.86; in 1964-65, $3.16; in 1965-66, $3.52; in 1966-67, $4.00; and in 1967-68 with the 11 cents off—this is his net position—it is $4.64.

• (12:10 a.m.)

In the four years that we have been in office the price that he is receiving has been increased by some 70 per cent. I suggest there is no other segment of the economy whose returns during this time have been increased by so great a percentage. I do not claim that this is the whole answer to the problem, but I do say that an increase of this kind very clearly shows the concern of this government for the plight of the dairy farmers. It shows that we have not stood still, as the previous administration did during their tenure of office. It shows that we have recognized the need and have moved responsibly and quickly, and at a very considerable cost to the taxpayers of this country, to try and meet the problem.

We will be here until dawn if we have to, but the story of the dairy farmers and what has been done for them will be laid before the house to the best of my ability, just as the criticisms, some of them responsible and others completely irresponsible, have been before the house. In so far as trying to get us out of here because it is late is concerned, I can assure hon. members that when it is a matter of telling the story as best as I see it and as truthfully as I see it in respect of the problem of the dairy farmers, I will stay here as long as anybody else who wants to stay.

Mr. Churchill: Will the minister answer a question?

Mr. Greene: I will answer questions when I have finished.

Mr. Churchill: When will the minister finish?

Mr. Greene: It might be quite some time.

Mr. Churchill: Is the minister not interested in interim supply for the government?

Mr. Greene: With respect to the actual payments made in toto to the dairy farmers during the time of the previous administration, which now is so critical of our program, as compared to the period when we were in

office, in 1966-67 some $19 million were paid to dairy farmers. During the coming year our contribution to try and put this industry in shape, as hon. members know, will be some $120 million. As compared to this, in 1962-63 the contribution of the previous administration to the solution of this very grave problem, which I am sure was as grave then as it is now, was some $42.3 million in respect of the stabilization board subsidies and another $13 million in respect of the payments made at that time on butter. In 1959-60, it was $9.8 million; in 1960-61, $11.4 million. I cite these figures to show how we have dealt with the problem and in what degree as compared to the previous administration.

We heard criticism from the hon. member for Kent (Ont.), to the effect that our dairy production was decreasing. I am sure the hon. member for Kent (Ont.) would not want to mislead the house, the country or the dairy farmers. I know very well he is interested only in the truth and in facts, so I think we should lay those facts before the house. In 1957 the total dairy production in manufacturing milk was 17,000 million pounds, going up to 17.7 in 1958, 17.6 in 1959, 17.7 in 1960, and 18.3 in 1961. Today that production it at 18.4 thousand million pounds.

Some concern was also expressed with regard to the total income of dairy farmers. Let us take a look at that. In the six years from 1958 to 1963 the gross income of dairy farmers in Canada increased from $479 million in 1958 to $509 million in 1963, an increase during that six year period of $30 million. From 1964 to 1966 it has increased from $509 million to $581 million, a $72 million gross increase during a period of three years.

We also have some concern with respect to the consumption and production of butter. During the period between 1958 and 1961 the consumption was down by some 30 million pounds by reason of the policies then in effect. Consumption from 1962 to 1966 has gone up some 60 million pounds, thus increasing the volume of the market and improving the income of the dairy farmers to that extent.

With regard to the policies which were in effect when we came into office, so that we may determine whether or not satisfactory progress has been made I should like to cite one or two articles current in the newspapers of that day. I refer to the *Globe and Mail* for November 15, 1962, which contained the following paragraph:

> Since May 1, butter consumption has gone up but so has output and agriculture minister Hamilton has warned that price support cuts seem inevitable. In turn, Ontario milk producers have asked for a national dairy industry royal commission.

On November 12, 1962 the Ottawa *Citizen* had this to say:

> The federal government will go into 1963 with 237,000,000 pounds of butter in storage, 40,000,000 pounds more than a year ago, and no immediate plans for preventing further growth of the butter surplus in the year ahead.
>
> This was the dismal picture presented today as federal and provincial authorities gathered for their annual conference to review agricultural developments over the past 12 months and the outlook for the year ahead...
>
> The minister indicated the government has not yet come up with an answer to the problem of butter surpluses.

We have had lots of answers tonight, however.

> Mr. Hamilton denied that the buildup of surpluses was caused by the 64-cents a pound butter support price established by the federal government. This is equivalent to $2.50 a hundredweight for milk, less than the price at which a farmer could make a living, he asserted.

So that is what the farmer received in 1962, according to the then federal minister.

> The Canadian Federation of Agriculture, major spokesman for the farmers of Canada, also indicated it has no answer to the problem of growing butter surpluses.
>
> "Dairy industry policy is a vexed question and it is no secret that at the present date neither this organization nor any other agency responsible for carrying out the recommending policy has a ready answer to it," it said in a brief presented to the conference by its president, H. H. Hannam.

I suggest that that statement was a responsible one.

> The brief called for the formation of a national policy that would provide for an increase in demand and a contradiction in supply of butter stocks...
>
> At the same time, the federation said the 12 cents a pound consumer butter subsidy established by the government earlier this year to counteract the sharp fall in demand should be followed by the establishment of some form of quotas to tailor production to demand.

The Chairman: Order. I must advise the minister that the time allotted to him has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

The Chairman: Does the minister have unanimous consent to continue his remarks?

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for York-Humber did not have unanimous consent earlier this evening so I do not think the minister should.

The Chairman: The hon. member for Rosthern.

Mr. Greene: Mr. Chairman, do I have unanimous consent to continue or not?

The Chairman: There is no unanimous consent.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I want the minister to have the opportunity to continue his remarks because this is a very important subject. Therefore I will say a few words.

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Rosthern has the floor.

• (12:20 a.m.)

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the house has heard as much old straw threshed over for a long time as we have heard during the last few minutes from the Minister of Agriculture. He was the minister who was to take the farmers of eastern Canada out of the wilderness into which they had wandered during the years of the Tory government. He is the minister who represented a party that went to the peoples of eastern and central Canada with the election slogan: "Elect us and we shall do for the farmers of eastern and central Canada what Diefenbaker did for the farmers of western Canada." Now this minister comes before parliament with his swan song—because it can be nothing else. He has admitted that he can do no better than the government of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition, during the period it was in office—all this despite the fact that more than double the subsidies today are paid to the dairy industry. I shall have more to say about that as I go along.

What has been the result of this government's policies? The result is that we have to import butter and cheese, and the farmers have been forced out of business. I wondered, listening to the minister's speech, how many dairy farmers went out of business as he talked, as he tried to tell us why his policies of the last three or four years had failed.

When Hon. Harry Hays was minister of agriculture he said, "If you have six cows you can make a living." "This minister tells the people, "To make a living now you must have ten cows." The minister's thinking shows why the dairy industry in Canada, under this government, has declined. Imagine, Mr. Chairman, you need ten cows to make a living under this government's policies. Those words the farmers of the country understand very well.

We could forgive the government if they had not the answers, but time after time, on platforms across Canada and in the House of Commons, they have claimed to have the answers. I see the Minister of National Health and Welfare is present. He was one who thought he had the answers for all these problems. Yet this government failed to do for the farmers of central and eastern Canada what the right hon. Leader of the Opposition had done for the western farmers.

The minister gave us figures. He said that in 1962-63 the subsidies had amounted to approximately $42.3 million and $13 million, making $55 million approximately. The government of that day had a 40 million pound surplus of butter, but that butter represented something tangible in return for the $55 million which had been spent supporting the dairy industry. This government spent $90 million, and our people have to buy butter from the other markets of the world, and our farmers disperse their herds. The minister has the audacity to come to the house and say, "You are not a dairy farmer unless you have ten cows."

I challenge the minister to say that in Quebec, to say that in the maritimes, in Ontario, in British Columbia or on the prairies. What kind of mockery have we today? Does the minister not realize that the small farmer is still the bulwark of agriculture in this country? Where are the promises and the answers which this party had to offer in two election campaigns? Today, in this debate on the eve of the ending of this session, we saw Liberal members rising to discuss the dairy question. Why? Because they realized, perhaps for the first time, that this government has failed miserably to solve the problems which face the dairy farmers of this country. The minister could not keep them quiet and the whip could not keep them quiet.

We think of what the hon. member for York-Humber had to say. It is all out of the bag, now. They have not had these discussions in caucus, of which we have heard so much during the last four years. This is the ministry which was supposed to bring the brass and the grass together so that the Canadians might have a better future. This is the ministry which was supposed to give all those engaged in agriculture in eastern and central Canada the equity and justice which is their right.

Tonight we heard the Minister of Agriculture giving his swan song—it cannot be described as anything else. As he admitted so

freely, this government has failed to bring before parliament the type of legislation which would protect the dairy industry. I think he said the dairy farmers had not stood still. I believe those were his words. I agree that the dairy farmers of this country have not stood still: They have gone back while this government has been in office. Why else would they want to come to Ottawa en masse to place their case before parliament and the Canadian people?

These are reasons which justify the debate which has taken place in the last few hours. The neglect of a government which would not listen to the opposition in this house cannot be justified. Time and time again members on this side have asked that this question be given the consideration it deserves, before a crisis develops. But we have a Prime Minister who seems to want crises, a Prime Minister who revels in this type of thing, a man who never does anything until a crisis is upon us.

I sympathize with the Minister of Agriculture; I think he tried. But he had to contend with the Minister of Finance. He had to contend with the Prime Minister and others of his colleagues in the ministry. As a result, the dairy farmers find themselves facing the difficulties which they are encountering today. In these circumstances we cannot but wonder whether the government deserves the supply for which it is asking at this time. What we heard tonight was an admission that the government has no policy for the dairy farmers. This is very disappointing to me, because I had almost succeeded in convincing myself, after listening to members opposite saying so often that they had some of the answers, that such a policy did exist. But now we know they do not have the answer.

• (12:30 a.m.)

In view of the late hour I do not wish to take up any more time, but I feel we reached a milestone in agricultural history tonight when we heard the minister make the admission, passively accepted by his backbenchers from the dairy areas of Canada, that there has been defeat in meeting the problems that they came to parliament to solve.

Mr. Peters: Had the minister started his description from the 1950's he would probably have found a great similarity between the program in force at that time and the present program taking into consideration that the earlier program was designed to take care of surpluses rather than shortages. The simple fact is that the senior officials of his department are exactly the same people now as then, and the surprising thing is that the minister tonight admitted he is not making the policy, that it is his officials who are making it.

There has really been no change in policy at all, and it is not hard to understand why fluid milk shippers are not being supported. Can the minister explain why for the first time last year surplus manufactured milk coming out of fluid milk was covered by subsidy, but it has now been placed back under the old system? Members should note that the minister has not taken control of his department, that policy is not being designed by him but by the senior officials who are doing now exactly what they have done for many years.

The time may have arrived to take a further decision, which must be a political one, to arrange for the pooling of all milk so that it may all be brought under one control with no difference in respect to fluid milk and manufacturing milk. This is a decision which the minister will have to take, not his officials.

It was interesting that in the figures the minister gave us he mentioned that the domestic price for spray powdered skim milk was 25 cents a pound in 1957-58. Now the price in the support program is 20 cents.

Mr. Greene: Five cents.

Mr. Peters: Then I misunderstood that, but I repeat that in the near future the minister will have to make a decision on total pooling. Also in the near future the minister should call a conference that all farm organizations have been seeking. When the agricultural committee was out in western Canada we heard the same plea in each province, that a conference should be called of provincial and federal officials at which the whole problem could be discussed by the various agricultural ministers, the farm advisers and the officials of the various departments. We should not be comparing one period with another. This only indicates that although we sometimes think we may be making some policy decisions, we are not really making any decisions at all.

All we are doing is rearranging the small changes which take place. When the minister refers to the Conservative legislation, this is one reason that I find no difference between that policy and the policy of the Liberal government, because really it is not the minister who makes the policy decisions. it is the senior officials in the department. This, probably,

will be amusing to the farmers who have known this for a long time. I believe this places all members who are interested in this problem in the position of perhaps being more sympathetic to the minister, who may have difficulties which we do not know anything about. Perhaps we should be more sympathetic toward the minister and provide more constructive criticism so that we all can help accomplish what I believe is inevitable; that is, an arrangement whereby all the milk can be pooled so that the discrimination will be removed. In this way the whole industry from coast to coast could be handled under the auspices of the national dairy commission. This should remove many of the anomalies.

We should be able to accomplish something in this manner and probably this would give the minister some encouragement to go forward from the present situation to one which, with the pooling of milk, he could arrange a meeting with the provincial officials as well as the farm organizations so that the matter could be clarified to the satisfaction of all parties concerned, and so that finally an arrangement could be arrived at whereby the duplication may be eliminated. I hope the minister will ask for the co-operation of the various departments of the provincial governments which will have to be involved in this, so that in the near future a policy may be arrived at which will provide for the pooling of all milk no matter which market it is geared to.

Mr. Greene: Mr. Chairman, I think this theory in respect of the pooling of all milk in a single pool certainly is something which should be aimed at. When the manufacturing milk industry is in good shape and when the proportion as between fluid and manufacturing milk is such that it is in the interests of the fluid and manufacturing milk producers to pool, I think undoubtedly this will be the solution. I believe most people in Canadian agriculture would agree with this principle.

I do not believe, however, that this will be achieved overnight. Some of the people in the dairy organizations have indicated that they look forward to a period of possibly ten years before this can be achieved. I think we should move in this direction. I believe that manufacturing milk, on a quality basis, should be brought up to the standards of the fluid milk before this could be possible. The questions which were posed in respect of the removal of fluid milk from the support policy are valid. I should like to point to the arguments made by prior ministers which I think were valid at that time, and probably still are valid, to the effect that economically the worst circumstances by and large in the dairy industry were in the manufacturing segment. I believe such probably is still generally the case.

When government funds are available in respect of the manufacturing industry, historically the federal government has taken the responsibility to see that everything possible is done to improve the standards in the manufacturing milk industry and the income of the manufacturing milk producer. As both the ministers I quoted earlier stated, we must attempt to see to it that their income position is brought closer to that of the fluid producer generally.

• (12:40 a.m.)

You might well ask why we paid a subsidy to fluid milk producers last year. In the announcement at that time it was made clear and manifest that we were paying a subsidy to fluid milk producers of over and above 120 per cent of their quotas, because we foresaw that there might be a shortage and we wanted to increase production. It was made very clear that this might be a temporary thing because production was needed last year. I think the views of the experts were borne out by the fact that last year the consumption and production very nearly matched. Surely that should be the object of the game. There was no great surplus accumulated. We disposed of the product and we were not in a situation such as that which existed in 1961-62, where the price structure created such a great surplus we could not dispose of the product. Clearly that was the right thing to do last year.

This year, with the added incentive of the higher price, the best estimate we can get is that production will be adequate without encouraging further production of surplus fluid milk in order to meet the required need. I think it was made clear last year that the policy announced then was for one year to encourage production and that it would not necessarily be continued. This year it is not deemed that we will need an additional supply of fluid milk to meet the demand of our manufacturing milk market. Let me point out that the policy as envisaged, and to be carried out by the Canadian Dairy Commission, is that the support program will be applied to a global quota to meet the domestic market. In other words, the whole plan is that we will support and pay subsidy on the basis of the estimated requirement to meet domestic needs. I think most Canadians will agree that

this is the proper approach, and quotas are set accordingly.

Some questions have quite properly been asked in respect of quotas and their purpose. The purpose of quotas is, of course, to arrange things so that we may do what has been done previously in the fluid milk industry. The complaints which have been voiced about the fluid milk producer and his position in respect of quotas can be answered by the fact that he is in exactly the same position as the manufacturing milk producer, and always has been. The manufacturing milk producer cannot get a quota in the fluid industry. We are providing quotas in the manufacturing industry in order to create a situation in which the supply and the domestic demand are as close as possible, and quotas will be established on that basis.

Let me point out further that the entire idea, which I suggest in the long run will improve the situation in the industry, is to use quotas economically to rationalize the industry. Quotas will be used to help the small producer. The hon. member for Rosthern chose to make light of the situation by cracking jokes about the fellow with ten cows. I do not think there is anything funny about this at all. The small producer is the man we want to help the most and that is what this policy is intended to do. It is intended to bring that small producer up to a position where he will ultimately have some 200,000 pounds of quota which will give him a decent income. I think the announcement makes it very clear that the quota will be used for the purpose of bringing the small producer to the point where he has a larger quota and can make a decent income. This has not been possible, as indicated by the figures I cited, when some 65 per cent of our producers today produce less than 100,000 pounds.

I realize that some of the very big producers probably are not too happy about this program because it is not meant to encourage further production or the establishment of huge corporate entities such as those which produce more than 300,000 pounds, as announced by the commission.

The quotas as they become available will be used to encourage the small producer to get bigger, so he can get the kind of income we would like him to have. I know this has never been tried before but I suggest that the experience in other countries and our own experience indicates that this is the best way, by the use of quotas, to bring the small producer into the economic areas.

[Mr. Greene.]

Then there is the question of the value of quotas. I think this point was very properly made. I want to assure the committee, because I thought it was a very valid point and one that should be answered, that the question of making the quotas the property of the commission rather than the property of the individual is to prevent this trafficking in quotas. This value in the quotas themselves, which in some areas of the fluid market has merely upped the price of getting into the fluid business and has ultimately upped the price of milk to the consumer, and the only person who benefits is the quota holder who gets the cash value of the quota.

The purpose is to have the commission deal with quotas at their discretion in the event of dispersal or sale, apart from the immediate family as pointed out in the release. The quotas will be used not to enable the person selling the product to get an extra buck for his quotas but to enable the small producer to become bigger and get himself in a position where he has an economic unit and can make a good income.

There has been some criticism that there are fewer producers. Of course, the dispersal of the herds is quite obviously, again, in large measure due to other producers becoming bigger and creating economic units. The cattle have not dissappeared or been shot. The fact that gross production has been maintained for the country quite clearly indicates, I think, that dispersal has largely been carried for the creation of larger and more economic units than has been the case in the past. With regard to the question of fewer producers, I know no answer to this problem. I do not know any way in which we can have just as many or more people than are in the industry today and still have them all making the kind of income we want them to make.

I think it is an immutable law of agricultural economics that the more prosperous a nation becomes, the higher becomes its standard of living, the more we expect to have in income return, the smaller is the percentage of the population producing the food for the rest of the country. The agricultural producers become more efficient; it is as simple as that. The agricultural producers in Canada in the past decade have been increasing their productivity by some 5.6 per cent per year, which is something like double the rate of increase in productivity in the industrial sphere, and even there it has been very good.

If one wants to go back to having more and more producers or just as many producers on

the farm as were there in the past, we have only to look at the situation in less developed countries which have a far lower standard of living than ours. In those countries 30 per cent or 40 per cent of the people are on the land producing the food for the rest of the population, but I do not need to tell hon. members that the standard of living for the farmers and others in that type of economy is far lower than ours. So if we are to have a higher standard of living and a better income, there will be a smaller percentage of the people in the dairy business, with larger units, and making the kind of income we want them to make.

You cannot make this kind of transition painlessly. You cannot make it without the price of change. I think that price should be nullified to the greatest possible degree in those areas where people are going out of the industry. We must do everything possible by way of ARDA programs, manpower training programs and location of secondary industry in those areas where a smaller percentage of the people will be concerned with dairy production. But I do not think we can ever attain the kind of progress we want by saying we have to leave things just as they are and keep the money pouring in and have no incentives or encouragement to create the kind of economic unit which will by its very efficiency give the kind of income to dairy farmers that we want them to have.

I think it is only fair to deal with the criticism of the price structure itself. I believe it is certainly the duty and responsibility of farm organizations to fight, as they have done, for higher prices and returns for those who support their organizations. Farm organizations must have a lobby, just as trade unions. They must work to improve prices for those who are their members and whom they are representing. Our farm organizations have done just this.

• (12:50 a.m.)

I would point out that it is quite proper for them to try to approach the $5 level, which is what they are after. I certainly do not think it is in any way irresponsible. When one considers that I have stated as an objective to be worked for in the very near future that the economic unit will have some 200,000 pounds per annum. This is the production of, say, 20 to 30 cows. Even at $5 that is only a $10,000 a year gross income, and when one takes all the expenses, taxes, cost of feed, fertilizer, and the capital cost of the establishment, surely this is not too high a figure for which to strive, and it is not irresponsible to say that the efficient dairy farmer should have a gross income of $10,000 per annum. However, this cannot be achieved overnight. It is something toward which we should work.

Someone asked what happened to the 11 cents. Again, this being a responsible program as I have said, it is geared to pay a subsidy and to support the dairy farmer for the domestic consumption. Canadians, by the price they pay on the marketplace, and by the subsidy they pay through their taxes, would I am sure want to see that the dairy farmer received a just return for what he sells domestically.

What is sold in world markets must be sold at prices less than our farmers can get in the domestic market. It is a two price system, if you like, and the 11 cents are used to dispose of that surplus product in world markets. It is the farmer's money. As you know, this year we did the same thing. According to my information it was not necessary to spend the whole of the hold-back this year, and there will be a return to the farmer of the portion that was not spent in putting the product in the world market. I would point out that the dairy organizations asked for $5.10. We have achieved $4.64 net, or $4.75 with the export subsidy. In the industrial area we see very sophisticated and highly skilled workers seeking parity of wages with their counterparts in the United States.

Let me point out that the price received by the American producer of manufacturing milk is less than $4 per hundredweight. According to my information prices have dropped even below that. This is why there is trouble in the United States in respect of manufacturing milk prices today.

Again I do not claim that we have achieved the millenium, but it is surely an indication of the fact that we have achieved a responsible price structure in Canada when the price received by the Canadian producer of manufacturing milk is 75 cents higher than that received by his counterpart in the United States. Some of those in the New Democratic Party who laugh should realize that they have not been able to achieve this for some of their industrial workers who are fighting for parity with their American counterparts. Here we have done better than parity in respect of our manufacturing milk farmers.

I do not deny for a moment that there is a great deal to be done, and there is much to be achieved. I suggest that what has been accomplished in four years is an improvement

of some 70 per cent in the gross returns to the farmer. Certainly this far outstrips his increased cost of production in that time. I do not think anyone would suggest that his costs have gone up by an equivalent 70 per cent. The fact that our prices are higher than United States counterparts is surely an indication that we have moved a long way toward bringing the manufacturing milk farmer into the economic position he deserves. However, we should strive to do more.

I have great hopes for the dairy commission, though there are those who criticize it editorially. This commission was formed as a result of just the kind of conclave that hon. members have suggested—provincial people. Dairy organizations formed a committee which suggested a dairy commission of the type we have set up. To my knowledge all farm organizations support the idea of quotas. They appreciate it is the only way to bring stability to the industry.

In addition to this we are attempting to bring the industry, which obviously has been in bad shape, into better economic condition and adopt new approaches to maintain incomes during the period of transition. I suggest we have taken a very responsible step in this direction, and that this program brings the manufacturing milk farmers into a sounder position than ever before.

I admit there is more to be done. I hope we will shortly have a middle or long term plan to lay before the dairy farmers in Canada in conjunction with this year's program in order to show where we are going within the next five years. Our general direction is toward larger units where a decent income can be had. A better price must be offered in the marketplace. The dairy farmer wants a fair return from the marketplace, as does everybody else, and this policy is geared to that end.

In the meantime, while we are rationalizing the industry through the use of the dairy commission and quotas, we have put the dairy farmer into a far better position than he was when we took office. We have improved his income, his returns and his way of life in considerable measure.

Mr. Olson: Could the minister tell us whether there is any way that a producer just commencing operation can enter the market under the quota provisions either by establishing a dairy unit or the purchase of an existing one, other than from a close relative? There does not seem to be any provision made for this in the statement of the dairy commission, and I am wondering whether any provision is made.

Mr. Greene: My understanding of the administration of the quotas by the commission is that they will be used at the absolute discretion of the commission. The point they made about sale to immediate members of the family, and so on, is to assure the dairy farmers that in those situations quotas will be transferred automatically. You must still go to the commission, but the quotas will be transferred automatically.

• (1:00 a.m.)

In other cases quotas are used to rationalize the industry and to ensure that after the quotas have been in vogue for a reasonable period a large proportion, if not all, of the people in the industry have the kind of unit which will give them a good income. They have absolute discretion in this regard. I feel certain if someone were selling out and two producers, who had been too small, were living next door, that those producers would have the priorities in the quotas. The commission would have absolute discretion to grant them any excess quotas there were, always bearing in mind that the total, global quotas available to the commission are based on the domestic consumption in Canada. That determines the quotas available for distribution from time to time by the commission.

The general purpose of what is done and the general idea is to put the industry in good shape so that 65 per cent of the people do not have less than 100,000 pounds five years from now. The commission has wide authority, and the transfer of quotas will be at the discretion of the commission.

Mr. Coates: It is my intention to move from discussing the dairy industry to discussing questions of legitimate concern to all Canadians. This week and in the days ahead Canadians will feel a true sense of achievement as they visit Expo '67, taking note of what has been accomplished in the creation of a world exposition, the equal of which must come in the future, as our expectations and the expectations of countries hosting similar expositions have been exceeded. I hope that Expo '67 will be tremendously successful financially and in developing a better understanding between Canadians of various races as they join together at St. Helen's island to see their tremendous agricultural and engineering achievement.

Much credit is owing to the many people who laboured long and hard to make certain

that the schedule was met. I earnestly hope that the citizens of Montreal and of Quebec will do their part to make sure that when visitors leave Expo '67 they will not have a bad taste in their mouths, with a feeling that they have been "taken" by the people of the area. The exhibition can help to develop national unity of purpose in the minds of Canadians but it can also do much damage, should English speaking Canadians visiting Expo and Montreal discover that every opportunity is taken to "take them", and should they be discriminated against because they speak English only. I hope such things will not happen, and I think the citizens living in the exhibition area must be careful to see that the right image of Canada is portrayed during the fair's existence.

Many visitors to Expo will visit the national capital. We are preparing ourselves for the visits of many heads of state. They will be impressed with what they see in Montreal, but I feel certain that they will be unimpressed and shocked and bewildered when they visit Ottawa.

For many years there has been talk about setting up a federal district encompassing Ottawa and Hull. Never has it been more evident than today that such action must be taken. After 100 years of nationhood our capital has little of which its citizens can be proud and in which they can express their identity.

I want to make crystal clear that I do not complain about the municipal government of Ottawa. The elected officials of this city have done their very best within the limits of their budget.

Mr. Peters: Of their mental capacity you mean.

Mr. Coates: No, within the limits of their budget. The members of this house have not had the mental capacity to make certain that we do not see those things in this city we ought not to see. The streets of the capital are continuously being torn apart, as can be seen from the situation at this very time. Our parliamentary buildings are located in the most aesthetic and strategic position in the capital, but it is made almost impossible for visitors to see them. The Minister of Public Works has decreed that cars may not be parked on the hill—a laudable objective if there were alternative parking available nearby. But such is not the case. So we can thank the minister for making it impossible, or next to impossible, for visitors to see what is really the only beautiful area in the city.

There are other areas under development at a very slow rate by the National Capital Commission. If the present pace is continued, maybe if we are still a nation by 2067 we shall be able to say something kind about our national capital. But at the present pace it will not be before that date, and no doubt the potholes, the rough streets and the temporary buildings put up by the Department of National Defence on the corner of Elgin and Laurier will still be in existence.

It is evident that the government of Ontario has reached the point at which it realizes something must be done if we are to develop a national capital which will attract visitors. But the federal government continues to procrastinate. A great deal is said about a national identity and about national unity. Yet as a people we have little or nothing to point to by way of monuments in our capital to those in all walks of life who have made contributions to the building of our country. We have a government which is set upon destroying one tradition after another, showing quite obviously that it takes no great pride in our past achievements and is willing to substitute the symbols of our past for what it hopes will become the symbols of our future.

Surely, if we expect Canada to prosper and grow in its second hundred years we must begin by providing examples for Canadians which will develop within them a sense of pride which is not evident today. It is my hope that Expo '67 will assist in doing so. It is my further hope that the centennial commission will assist Canadians to relive pleasant memories of the past and develop in the minds of our young people a sense of pride, a sense of history and a sense of belonging which we did not take time to stress in our first hundred years.

I believe the small celebrations which will be held during 1967 in almost every community in Canada will do more than anything else to make Canadians aware of past accomplishments and anxious to maintain momentum in the years that lie ahead.

When one visits the city of Washington he is immediately impressed by the planning which has made such a large area so beautiful, despite its heavy population. It is not hard to understand why Americans feel a great pride in being citizens of the United States. The many areas set aside for parks, intermingled with residential and business areas, are a measure of the kind of foresight which American leaders displayed. In the

Ottawa-Hull area we have the potential for a capital which would give the same sense of pride to Canadians.

• (1:10 a.m.)

We will have proven when Expo '67 opens that we are not pikers. Indeed, many may say we are penny wise and pound foolish when they discover the bill that must be met to put on this kind of world exhibition. We have never been willing to spend that kind of money on building a capital for Canada, and until we do we will never really develop that sense of Canadianism but will continue from a base that produces the misunderstandings and dissension so much in evidence at the present time.

Our end objective must be to have our citizens accept the simple word "Canadian" with no additions of any kind attached to it. This should be the final objective of every person who is born in this country and the ultimate objective of every person who comes to live in this country. It cannot be that I am a French Canadian, or English Canadian, or Italian Canadian—just Canadian—and we will only do that when we assume the obligations of a nation to produce a capital city that will give pride to its people.

It is my hope that the government will realize this fact as this year goes forward and will not spend time on petty politics, but take the initiative to set up a federal district, established in a non-partisan way, to honour the men who helped us get where we are now, and give the citizens of the future the kind of objectives that will make them want to build and not tear down—want to be Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Godin: Mr. Chairman, just a few words for the minister. I should like to insist on the 70 per cent increase. In giving this figure, the minister was taking a chance because it is a figure that may prove false one day.

The minister should know that the farmers who have stayed on the job are honest workers. They know what to give their stock and how to build up their herd. Supposing the weather is helpful, an increase of 25 per cent can easily be achieved within one year. At that time, the quota which is suggested, that is 70 per cent, would be reduced to 55 per cent.

If this happens at the rate of 35 to 40 per cent, as it may automatically occur, the prices would be reduced to 40 per cent. The minister should not lead us to believe that the Liberal party or the government have given $400 million to the farmers in ten years. The minister should not try to have us believe in such an enormous gift because $400 million is only one quarter of what national defence is costing us this year.

Four hundred million dollars for a period of ten years? That is a mere trifle compared to the amounts of $1 billion 600 million, spent on national defence in the 1967 budget.

With regard to taxes, the hon. minister would have us believe, once again, that there is danger in digging too far into the workers' pocket-books where he finds the money to pay subsidies to the farmers. I should say that there has been some improvement since last year. I must congratulate the hon. minister.

Last year, we had a budget of $146 million, of which contributions, allowances and subsidies represented as little or $30,370,201.

The remaining $115 million has been spent for administration. This year with $250 million we will have $133,582,000 for the farmers.

On the other hand, for the information of all taxpayers—because that is often overlooked—the figure which is given most often in the newspapers, on the radio and on television is the total budget for agriculture, that is $250 million.

I should like to say here that $72,052,500 were spent on salaries and wages paid to civil servants.

Professional and special services: $3,050,-700. It means that we already have another amount of $75 million, which represents again 25 per cent of the budget for agriculture.

A little further one finds: office stationery, supplies and equipment: $1,941,900. Practically $2 million. I am not against well organized offices but I want to tell all the taxpayers that the offices of the Department of Agriculture are very well organized and that they do not lack anything because during the year about $2 million was spent on stationery, supplies and equipment alone.

With regard to the amount of $133,592,100, I should like the minister to tell us where exactly are those allowances, grants and contributions going? Will part of this money be given to sugar beet producers? Will another part be given to some wheat growers? And what about the dairy industry?

For the information of all Canadian taxpayers, I should like the minister to give us the above details.

[*English*]

Mr. Leboe: Mr. Chairman, I should like to apologize to the committee for rising at this early hour in the morning. However, I do have a very definite grievance.

Mr. Knowles: Don't we all.

Mr. Leboe: Someone said, "Don't we all". Perhaps the biggest grievance is the fact that we are still here at this late hour. I should like to refer to the Alaska highway and give a little of the background. I will not take very long.

Back in 1957 the then minister of national defence saw fit to let contracts for the paving of some 83 miles of the Alaska highway. Since that contract has been completed not one shovelful of pavement has been placed on that highway. That was ten years ago. I do not think that we can deal with this matter in terms of dollars and cents. When we speak of this highway and the paving of it, it is a matter of priority. Surely, with a budget of $11 million, we should be able to squeeze enough money by way of priority without raising taxes or budgeting for it so that we would be able to do something about this very important link with the northern part of Canada, namely the Yukon Territory.

On April 1, 1954, the transfer was made from the Department of National Defence to the Department of Public Works. I brought this matter forward on September 11 and 12, 1963 at a conference in Whitehorse. The then minister of labour was present at that time and spoke to this conference. At the end of the conference I had a long talk with Congressman Rivers. We knew the attitude of the government at that time. Basing our calculations on the plan of the government at that particular time, we concluded that it would be seven years before anything would be done on the Alaska highway.

Four of those seven years now have gone by and there is no sign of anything happening on the highway. As a matter of fact, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has said that it is very, very low in priority on the list of government business. I do not understand this, because the same minister was provided with a letter which was written by the minister of highways of British Columbia on November 13, 1963, in which the minister agreed that on the British Columbia section the province of British Columbia would take up one third of the cost if it was a three way split or half the cost if only Canada and the province of British Columbia were involved in the paving of the highway.

• (1:20 a.m.)

I notice, in a letter from the former minister of northern affairs, Hon. Walter Dinsdale, that he quoted the estimate as being $112 million. Now, in 1967, I would imagine that the price has increased to about $150 million or perhaps even more. Even at a cost of $150 million over a ten year period, with a three way split among the United States, Canada and British Columbia, the total amount required would be about $3,350,000 to $4 million per year. When comparing that amount of money to a budget of $11 billion, considering the amount of good this expenditure would do for the people in this part of the country—and we hear a great deal these days about the importance of development in the northern part of Canada—surely it is not too much to ask the government to reconsider its whole policy in connection with the priority to be attached to this project.

The economic survey which was made certainly does not indicate a very good picture from the point of revenue in dollars and cents which will be derived immediately following the reconstruction of this highway. When is it ever possible to develop a country on the basis of considering the exact dollars and cents revenue to be received immediately from a project?

The Roads to Resources program was developed under the Conservative administration. Surely that name indicates a vision in connection with the north country. What we should be doing is reconstructing a portion of this highway each year. I have before me a wonderful little brochure put out by the travel bureau. It tells us about the fine things to be seen along the Alaska highway. It states that on a dry day it might be a little dusty. Let me tell you that on dry days you cannot find yourself on that highway. Many individuals have passed vehicles on the highway only to find when the dust has settled that both vehicles are stopped within 50 yards of each other waiting for the dust to clear. It is very easy to find this highway when flying over it. You can see it for hundreds of miles because of the continuous cloud of dust. People are being killed on the highway because of dust conditions, and traffic is slowed down to almost a walk on many occasions.

Surely we could improve and pave those parts of the highway which meet alignment and grade requirements. If this were done

travellers could pass long lines of trucks which use the highway very extensively. This is the only highway which can be used to move heavy equipment and material to Alaska. We should have a careful look at government policy in connection with the development of this project.

In closing let me say that Canada should construct this highway in co-operation with the province of British Columbia. We could then make an arrangement with the United States for the payment of its share of the cost. We need not put all our aces on the table. Some day the United States will want a right of way or rail outlet from Alaska. There is only one area through which such traffic could go and that is British Columbia. If the government of the United States would not play ball in connection with the development of the Alaska highway then we could say we will not play ball regarding a rail outlet. Under those circumstances I am sure the United States would go along with us. The correspondence I have received indicates that we have no problem with the United States. The problem is with Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, before starting my remarks, I wish to thank the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Coates) who mentioned earlier the tremendous and sensational things that people from every country will be able to see and admire at Expo '67 which is opening today in Montreal.

The hon. member for Cumberland expressed the wish that Canadian citizens from whatever province they come will not suffer any discrimination or inconvenience even though they do not speak English when in Montreal.

Mr. Chairman, I can assure him that Expo '67 is an international event, that some visitors will speak Spanish, Italian, English, German, that all will be most welcome and that nobody, whether from Cumberland, Toronto, Vancouver or Winnipeg will suffer for not being able to speak French.

Quebec and Montreal hospitality is well known. I am convinced that visitors from wherever they come in Canada, whether or not they speak French, whether they speak English only or both languages, will have a friendly reception. I think we showed in the past that we were able to receive our visitors, whatever the language they use.

The hon. member for Cumberland also expressed the wish that visitors will not be exploited. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think precautionary measures have been taken to prevent that. There will probably be abuses in some cases; then, if the hon. member for Cumberland has knowledge of some, it will behove him to report them. But I think that the necessary steps have been taken to prevent abuses and, at all events, I can assure him that the Quebec and Montreal hospitality will be shown to all Expo visitors.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to come back to the requests of the milk producers. I believe that at least some of us, the member for Labelle (Mr. Clermont) or the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene) took the wrong approach to the way of dealing with the problem of milk producers.

We have too often used the argument that the present government has achieved a better job than the preceding one. We too often quoted the figures of 1960, 1961, and referred to what was done then.

Mr. Chairman, it is not by trying to compare two parties or two governments that we will solve the problem. The fact that the previous government did not succeed in solving the problem is no excuse for the present government.

The fact that the previous government did not assist farmers sufficiently is no reason why the present one should sit back in self-satisfaction and self-contemplation.

Problems are never solved this way. I heard the Minister of Agriculture tell us over again, going back to 1958, 1959, 1960, what was done at that time, and I could not help thinking that farmers will not care to hear what the minister has to say about what happened in 1960.

Farmers and milk producers want to know what the minister can do in 1967 and 1968 for those we produce milk.

I could also hear the member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) and the member for Labelle saying: we will work to get what the farmers are asking. In the same breath they vied with each other in showering the minister with flattery.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to tell those hon. members that flattering the minister will get them nowhere. Congratulating him for what has been done will not get the farmers what they ask. Let the two members who were showering the minister with praise go and see him tomorrow, let them go and ask him what the farmers want.

The minister will have but one thing to do, namely get out today's *Hansard* and tell them: Are you serious, look at what you said in the house last night about the dairy policy. See how much you congratulated me. And now you are telling me it is not enough.

And the minister, will merely have to quote *Hansard* and what you have said today, and then you try and ask something of him. The minister will burst out laughing and tell you: Gentlemen, make up your minds. Are those mere compliments you are making or what?

Mr. Chairman, the minister admits that everything is not perfect. Well, that is what counts. When the minister is ready to admit that the farmers were not satisfied and that their income is much below that of any other class in Canada, then it is important not to rest on one's laurels and to help the farmers to get a certain amount of justice in this Canadian society.

The minister admitted that the farmers do not get a fair share. Well then, it is not a question of sitting but of finding a solution. And we are asked for this solution, we are told: you criticize a lot, have you got a solutions?

We are told: you criticize, you ask for more, you ask for 30 million more. Where is the money to be found? Will more taxes have to be levied?

Well, I have a solution. I would have a solution to offer to the Liberal members who agreed that the Minister of Agriculture was not offering enough.

If you take the estimates for the year ending March 31, 1968, about half way down page 318 you will see that the government will buy bombs. I repeat, bombs. $26,086,000 worth of bombs to drop on whose head? I wonder. Whom do we want to kill? That is discussed in 1967-68, $26,080,000 worth of bombs.

• (1:30 a.m.)

I will ask the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) to tell on what heads we will drop that. To the hon. for Labelle, I ask: On what country are we going to drop our bombs? Where? Then, we will not need those bombs, we will not need those bombs we will buy; we have been storing them since 1945 and we never drop them on anyone. The solution is there.

Next year we should try that. We should stop buying bombs and help the farmers, the most maligned class of society in our country; we should help them to catch up with the other classes of society and we will have some money left.

Moreover, do we know how many ships we will buy? For $61 million? Do we know how many tanks and armoured vehicles we will buy? For $14 million. That is a lot of tanks.

It is proposed to purchase $95 million worth of aircraft. Very well. Let them buy planes if they want to, but we do not need any bombs. Is that clear enough?

The hon. members for Champlain and Labelle congratulated the minister and hold him that was not quite enough. Let them go and see the minister to tell him: This year, instead of buying bombs, let us settle the farmers' problem. It would be very simple, with $26 million being available. They will tell me that this is $4 million short. Mr. Chairman, if I refer to the previous page, I find that $18,773,000 will be paid for telephones, telegrams and other communications during the year. If national defence officials kept their hands off telephones and stopped clasping hands across telephone lines, they would be spending $4 million less.

With the $26 million saved by not buying bombs, it will make up $30 million for farmers and then they will be given what they want. Is it not a solution?

If I suggest a free vote in this house, either to buy bombs this year, to-morrow or the day after, in short, bombs which will not be used, but will rust, or to pay $5 per hundredweight of milk to farmers, I would ask the hon. member for Champlain to tell me how he would vote. For bombs or for farmers? Would he be able to answer? For bombs or for farmers?

Mr. Matte: Bombs are not bought just for fun.

Mr. Grégoire: He does not answer; I am surprised. And as for the member for Labelle—

Mr. Matte: Bombs are not bought for the fun of it.

Mr. Grégoire: The member for Champlain tells me that bombs are not bought simply for the fun of it. Why are they bought then?

Mr. Chairman, I will ask the member for Champlain on whom he would drop those bombs? On whom? I am asking him a good question. How are those bombs going to be used? I will ask the member for Bonaventure

(Mr. Béchard) what he would rather do: help farmers or buy bombs?

This is an embarrassing question!

Mr. Béchard: Mr. Speaker, could I put a question to the hon. member?

Mr. Grégoire: If the hon. member answers my question, I will allow him to ask me one. If the member for Bonaventure says whether he would rather buy bombs or help farmers, I will answer his question. Is he ready to answer mine?

Mr. Allard: Answer.

Mr. Grégoire: He remains seated.

Mr. Langlois (Chicoutimi): This is silly.

Mr. Grégoire: Of course it is silly. That is obvious. I myself have no hesitation. Leave the bombs where they are, and let us help the farmers. The answer is obvious, and I do not hesitate. But you, you buy bombs. Hurrah for bombs! And where will we drop these?

Could the Minister of Industry and Defence Production (Mr. Drury) tell me on what country we are going to drop the bombs? On what country? On whom, Mr. Chairman?

For twenty years—

Mr. Matte: On your yacht.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, there is no need for $26 million worth of bombs; for $26 million, I shall sink my boat. If that is all that can prevent the Liberals from helping the farmers, I shall sink my boat myself. But they need not worry, it will not cost them one cent for bombs.

But it is obvious, it is clear. And I could quote numerous such examples. We have the choice of either buying bombs or helping the farmers.

So, let the Liberal members tell the minister they have found the solution. They have the solution as far as they are concerned and that is the astonishing part.

As you stand, you know, hon. Liberal members, that the bombs we are buying for $26 million this year will not be used. That is the stupidity of the whole deal. They will not be used because there is not one among us willing to throw bombs on other countries. You know that. We have been building up a stockpile of bombs for 22 years and those we have bought ten years ago are rusty. Let us stop it this year—

[Mr. Grégoire.]

Mr. Lewis: We need a little bomb for the member for Lapointe.

Mr. Grégoire: That is right. It might be a good thing but when the hon. member wanted to speak, I let him speak. If he has no farmer in his riding, we have some.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the question is very simple. Some comparison might be drawn. When it is said that the government subsidizes gold—gold is the subject of subsidies—we know that an ounce of gold, once taken out of the ground, costs about $70 or $72. However, the selling price is $35. Who pays for the difference? The government, at the rate of $35 per ounce. Figure this price per hundredweight. The result is $56,000. Imagine, $56,000 in subsidies from the government for some hundredweight of gold. And the farmer asks a subsidy of $1.25 per hundredweight. Well, this is too much. As concerns gold, my friends, you take it and bury it in vaults, in a hole in the United States. On that score, you will supply $56,000 in subsidies. Are you serious? Is this your policy? And after that, you dare ask us where the money will come from? Did the government ask where to find the money to apply subsidies to gold? No, not at all. You did not even say a word for anybody, you fell silent and you paid subsidies so that you might go to the United States to bury gold in caves and in holes. If only you had helped one of these dairy farmers, but nothing is done. I hear the member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Allard) say that it is discouraging. True: it is discouraging, and I agree with him. It is discouraging, Mr. Chairman, to see how our governments can respond. The Minister of Agriculture raises his arms and says: "The dairy farmers belong to a class of our society which is not treated justly."

A solution is given to him: stop buying bombs and help farmers. No, nobody wants to follow the suggestion. I have the solution. There is no question of taxation. And if necessary, let us vote here to see what you will choose: bombs or farmers. Well, it is up to you to make your choice. I will tell you a fact: farmers are human beings; bombs are engines for the destruction of other human beings. The choice is there.

I think that these few remarks should convince the Liberals. I will agree with them that the price of milk per hundred pounds has increased; I will agree with them that the subsidies have increased; I will admit all that. They admit it. So much the better. The minister has admitted that farmers are not fairly

treated today. Economically, it is the most ill-treated class in Canada, the most pitiful social class in Canada. Now that all that is admitted, now that praise has been cast your way because you accomplished something, now, you will ask us for a solution. I will give you one: let us vote supply not only those for agriculture but also those for national defence.

Refuse to pass item 15 on page 318, refuse to pass vote $26,086,000 for bombs. That is all I ask of you. Refuse to pass that and tell the minister to put that in for dairy production, at the service of dairy producers and your problem will be solved. I trust that consideration will be given to this and that the members will take the necessary steps to change the credits so that bombs will not be bought which will never be used, but that instead the most unjustly treated class of society will be helped.

The Liberals tell us that they bring their pressure to bear in caucus, well—

Mr. Laniel: With the Créditistes, money is no problem.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, we realize that the hon. member for Beauharnois-Salaberry (Mr. Laniel) is not serious, when we are precisely trying to give him the answer to the problem. He and others in his group asked us to put forward solutions. We give him some, but there, you see that they are not serious. That is the big problem, Mr. Chairman, there are too many members in this house who are not serious, who are not ready to take and envisage realistic solutions.

• (1:40 a.m.)

There are too many here who serve their party first when they should serve their electors first. There is the problem and the hon. member for Beauharnois-Salaberry (Mr. Laniel) has just given us a striking proof of it.

His question was most stupid, especially when it is about such a serious matter as this one.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that if the people in Quebec were aware of the attitude taken here at times by those hon. members, in short if they were aware of the submission, the bowing and scraping of several hon. members, they would get rid of them quickly.

Mr. Chairman, it is time that the Quebec people knew that the members they sent to Ottawa have not been representing them properly for too long and that they are here to serve their political party rather than the national interest. That is what is discouraging and disgusting on the part of some members and I realized it. I was not afraid to speak out for my constituents, to speak my mind on their behalf, and I am convinced that my constituents, as well as those of Beauharnois, of Champlain or of Labelle fully endorse my request, that is, that the purchase of bombs be stopped in order to help farmers.

I challenge the hon. member for Beauharnois-Salabery to gainsay it.

[*English*]

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Chairman, I shall not talk about the farming problem, coming from a constituency not concerned with it. Other members know more about agriculture than I do. However, I am reminded of a remark the minister made not long ago in Charlottetown on being questioned about the merits of being a lawyer and also being the Minister of Agriculture. As I recall his reply it was: "You need not be a farmer to be minister of agriculture; after all, in Ottawa we have a lawyer who is Minister of Justice." He was referring to Mr. Cardin, and added: "You can see the mess they are in." That may illustrate the minister's approach to the farm problem.

On several occasions I have tried to bring a question before the house on the late show; consequently I am taking this opportunity to talk about problems of development in Cape Breton. Some important questions ought to be answered. After the Prime Minister's statement of last Thursday about the urgency of getting on with the country's business, I am surprised to see that four cabinet ministers, three of whom have recently been appointed, should be present tonight. All evening the debate has been going on in the absence of ministers who are supposed to be responsible.

An hon. Member: That is not true. Where were you? You have just arrived.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Members opposite are saying it is not true. Last week the house was exercised because the unparliamentary word "lying" was used. I would ask the Minister of Public Works, who has been present for the last two hours, though he has not been with us, to get up and make an issue of the fact that the Minister of Agriculture made a mistake and did not realize his microphone was open. Let him make an issue of the four-letter word which was used by the Minister of Agriculture when speaking to the Minister of Public Works. I know no other example of

such a thing happening between two ministers of the crown, taking it out on each other because they were not satisfied with the way the debate on interim supply was going. I am telling the truth. The minister opposite me to my left has just come into the house.

Mr. Sauvé: Mr. Chairman, I have been here since 8.30 this evening.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I will put a question to the hon. gentleman I see on the government front bench over there. I say to the Solicitor General: You have just come into the house.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I would ask hon. members to deal with the subject before the committee, which is interim supply.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): With all due respect I had the impression that the question before us was the question of the truth, and it was raised by members on that side of the committee. The minister of health and welfare, and this is to his credit—he represents a riding in Cape Breton—has been sitting here all the evening along with the Minister of Industry. The Minister of Public Works was in a back seat. As I said before, he was present but not with us. The Minister of Forestry and Rural Development said he had been here since 8.30. I say that is not the truth.

Mr. Sauvé: Mr. Chairman, I have been in this house since 8.30—not always sitting in my place but elsewhere in this house. Other members will testify to this. The hon. member should mind his own business.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I was talking about being in this chamber. There are probably another 50 or 100 members in the house. We were discussing those who were present in this chamber.

An hon. Member: Call in the members. Say something intelligent.

• (1:50 a.m.)

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): If there are many more interruptions my time will run out, but I shall have an opportunity to rise again. The Minister of Agriculture set that example tonight. He took two half hour periods, to the agitation of the Minister of Public Works, and I could use the same privilege if members opposite push me to it.

[Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South).]

There are only two ministers present on the government benches, and this is the government which said only last Thursday that this, this, and that must be passed by parliament, urgently. It said the unification debate had to be cut off in order to get on with the urgent business of the house. But once the unification bill was passed it was announced that we would be given a couple of days off, and those days off have now been extended despite the fact that the Prime Minister said he wanted to deal with urgent business.

Under the rules, if a member is not satisfied with the answers given him by a minister, the member has an opportunity to come on in the late show and discuss his question. I was given one such opportunity and I was provided with answers that were most ridiculous by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Following that I raised my question again during the question period, but again unsatisfied with the answer I referred it to the ten o'clock adjournment period. However, I was refused this despite the fact that the answers were unsatisfactory. Not only were they unsatisfactory but they were far from accurate, and so I now take this opportunity to mention the lay-offs at the Fortress of Louisbourg.

The minister responsible has indicated that 44 men were hired recently. This is a lot of nonsense because last November 58 men were laid off. Those men were returned to the job after a lot of pressure was brought to bear, and in fact the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development said it was because of the representations made by the Minister of National Health and Welfare. I asked the Minister of National Health and Welfare about making further representations and to look at the statements made by the minister of Indian affairs and northern resources during the adjournment debate. That minister said that the funds were exhausted, but 13 lines further on in his speech he said they were staying within their budget.

It is important that every bit of help that can be given should be given to Cape Breton. I am surprised that the Minister of National Health and Welfare has not informed the government as to the facts. The facts are that a minister of the crown indicated to the people of this country that the government is paying subsidies to the coal industry to the extent of $7,000 per year per man. That is a lot of

absolute nonsense, but I was denied the opportunity to question it. I was given an unsatisfactory answer and I was denied the privilege of discussing it at ten o'clock.

We are grateful that the government has introduced a 15 year phasing out plan for the coal mines of Cape Breton, with guarantees of ultimate employment to be provided for each and every miner before he is displaced from the mines. This removes the uncertainty and makes the position of the Cape Breton miner more satisfactory than the situation under which he has been labouring for years gone by. It is a good move.

However, I would say to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, who does not know what he is talking about, that if it were costing the federal government $7,000 per year per man, in the interests of good business the government should make a flat offer to the Cape Breton miners of $5,000 per year, and close the coal mines out now.

The statement made by the minister was silly, but if they want to save $3,000 per man, why do they not close the mines and pay the miners $5,000 a year until other work is provided? This makes as much sense as the argument advanced by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Let us get back to the basic fault in respect of this problem. There is no reason why the Minister of National Health and Welfare should not make the Prime Minister aware of this. The minister has made the mistake. I do not see why he does not take a look at this question, so that he will not make the same mistake of referring to subsidies in respect of the Cape Breton coal industry. The minister should make his colleagues aware of the fact there is no subsidy paid to the Cape Breton coal industry.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): They do not know the difference.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): We realize that the government has provided aid by making provision for the marketing of coal outside of Cape Breton. Without this, it would be impossible to keep any mine in operation. We realize that this assistance is directly beneficial to the Cape Breton coal industry. It is time, however, that this government became aware of the fact that these are not subsidies; they are subventions paid to the carriers. In other words this money is paid to the transportation industry, whether it is the water carriers or the C.N.R. We can break this down and see what this subvention which is paid to the carriers means to the miners of Cape Breton. In any circumstances one could not arrive at the $7,000 figure mentioned by the minister. If we break it down and apply it to the number of people employed by means of the employment which is provided on the railway lines of the C.N.R.'s operation, or by the other carriers, we would find that the subsidy which has been referred to actually is a subvention from which we benefit greatly, but which nevertheless does not provide the answer to the fact that there are lay-offs at Louisbourg.

I am quite happy with the end result; that is, that the miners today, because of the policy announced, will be ensured of employment until other employment is provided through legislation which will be forthcoming. I can assure the minister now—and I think I speak for the other Nova Scotia members—that we will be only too happy to co-operate to the fullest extent when this legislation is brought forward. If there is anything we can do in the way of liaison between here and Cape Breton, we will be only too happy to do it. But, stop raising the bogeyman.

I might mention here that the area which the Minister of National Health and Welfare represents holds a great potential for Cape Breton. When something is good for Cape Breton, it is good for Nova Scotia, and when it is good for Nova Scotia it is good for Canada. Why in this area, where the need is the greatest, has there been this cut-back? Why was the money which was spent down here for almost two years for a hole in the ground not spent above the ground?

• (2:00 a.m.)

This project has cost about five times its originally estimated cost. It was originally suggested to help offset unemployment created by the closure of mines in Cape Breton. This government can dig up money for its own pet projects but it cannot find money for projects of this kind. If the Minister of National Health and Welfare is as strong in the cabinet as the image he likes to project in Nova Scotia, why does he not support this project in his own constituency. Why does he not make representations to his colleagues, particularly the misinformed Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, to continue this project in order that the miners who have been layed off can be rehired? Apparently he has abandoned that end of his riding, but why does he not support his own end of the constituency? After all, anything of value that is done for one part of Cape Breton is of

benefit to the whole island, the entire province and Canada.

I think if I set out the total amount of subventions paid in respect of my own province the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development would be very surprised, indeed. It is not surprising that he does not know about these things, but when I tried to raise a question today I was told that I was out of order. In my opinion any wrong that is done to a constituent is a reflection upon the member who represents that constituency in this house. I suggest that what the Minister of National Defence said regarding the question I raised today was a reflection upon me as the representative of my constituency, and I believe I had a legitimate question of privilege. The rules of this house apparently do not mean a great deal because one can always find six or seven interpretations for each rule. By my own interpretation I believe I raised a proper question of privilege.

During the last several weeks we have heard a great deal about unification. If we follow the suggestion of members of the New Democratic party, that each member of this house should be entitled to speak for half an hour, we would require 182 hours to consider every piece of legislation placed before the house. On the basis of the hours we sit each week, we would only be able to pass seven pieces of legislation each year. In spite of these figures, members on the government side have accused us of carrying on a filibuster in respect of unification. According to the formula suggested, hon. members in the Conservative party are entitled to 143 hours. We did not spend 143 hours in total during the debate on unification.

I think it is important to change our rules. Important issues come before this house and every member should have the right to use whatever time he has available to bring his views to the attention of the government. We do not require seven weeks to debate each issue which comes to our attention. But let us get back to the minister, and the erosion that has been going on in respect of Canadian traditions.

I am reminded of historical events. In August, 1914, when the Germans thought they could conquer Europe in about 39 days and were approaching Paris, which they thought they could take very easily, they decided they would have to violate the neutrality of Belgium. They therefore decided they would just cut across the corner, and excused themselves by saying, "Well, this is a violation, but it is a small violation." The Germans thought everybody would forget about it because it was a small violation. I now come to the hearings of the defence committee. In those hearings a similar type of statement was made by the chief of defence staff, General Allard, who said the measure being discussed was only a little error. Is not there a similarity between those two statements?

Today I raised a question with respect to another tradition, one that provides that when a ship is decommissioned, if it has been named after a community in this country the bells of the ship are presented to the community after which the ship was named. The house may have thought this was not an important matter. The ship in question was the *New Waterford* and it was definitely named after the town of New Waterford, Nova Scotia, which as I said this morning has provided this nation with more volunteers, on a per capita basis, than any other community in the country.

When the ship was decommissioned tradition called for the bells to be presented to the town of New Waterford. Suddenly we find there is a town called Waterford in Ontario with which the Minister of National Defence has a very close association. As I said this morning, my knowledge of Waterford and whatever water surrounds it is only that it comes through the tap. It has no association whatsoever with the navy which is situated on the east coast. This ship was definitely named after the town in Nova Scotia but the minister, because of his close association with Waterford, has made available to that town in Ontario the bells of this decommissioned ship which rightfully belong to the town of New Waterford, Nova Scotia.

I received some sort of explanation in this regard. I accused the minister of breaking another tradition. There is in this matter a similarity between what General Allard said to the defence committee and the excuse given by the Germans that their action in 1914 was just a small violation. The chief of defence staff said before the defence committee that the action being contemplated was only a little error. Now we have the Minister of National Defence defying traditions. Can hon. members not see the similarity in these two approaches? We have had examples of small errors and defied traditions. This type of thing has been going on for the last two years under this Minister of National Defence. Unification got the axe. There were some

really priceless arguments put forward in defence of unification.

• (2:10 a.m.)

A member of the New Democratic party used the argument that any sailors to whom he had spoken about unification first asked what was the admirals' stand on this issue, and when they were told the admirals were against it the sailors' reply would be to the effect that in that case they are for it. The implication was that as long as the top brass in the service was for something, the rank and file would be against it. Suppose we accepted that approach. We know very well that General Allard and his staff are in favour of unification, but if we used the same approach would it not follow that in that case everybody in the army would be against unification? If we took a poll on this there is no doubt we would find that unification would not be accepted by the forces. However, as I said, this is a silly argument in the first place.

The Minister of National Defence has not accomplished that which he set out to accomplish without giving any thought or consideration to the evidence placed before the committee. Again I will point out that a colleague of the minister who saw fit to agree with the point under clause 6 later voted against the amendment put forward by this party.

At the time we also heard the silly argument advanced by a member of the New Democratic party who did not believe in giving the service personnel the opportunity to opt out. It is quite all right to give them the opportunity to opt in. So a form is put before a member of the services and he is told that he has the opportunity to opt in. If he does not opt in he has automatically opted out.

Again a silly argument was put forward by a member who made a flat statement with regard to this problem. He told the minister the kind of answers that were required or otherwise he would vote against the bill. He never got the answers but the government got his vote.

I think it is a well known fact that the Minister of National Defence is looking for a way out. Come fall, it is his ambition and his hope, so the story goes, to occupy another cabinet position. If this government is bent on suicide, this is all they need to do. Things are bad enough in every department of the government and there is only one way to make them worse, that is to transfer Hellyer around from one department to the other. That will sink them for sure.

Now we come to the Minister of Public Works. I know he is annoyed and agitated, although I may say he is sitting more quietly than he was when the Minister of Agriculture was speaking. At that time his agitation was great. Yet the government still finds some way of accusing hon. members of keeping this debate going. Will there be any publicity of the fact that the Minister of Public Works attempted to put the Minister of Agriculture down? Will there be any publicity regarding the remark made by the Minister of Agriculture to the Minister of Public Works when the latter tried to make him sit down? No, the Liberal propaganda will be spread out that the Tories are this and the Tories are that. The government has been given the opportunity on several occasions by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre who proposed that we get on with the nation's business.

We sat here and listened to the plea made by the Prime Minister last Thursday. He outlined a program which will keep us here, if we are interested in the nation's business. Mind you, last Thursday we were very interested in the nation's business. There was nothing more important than the urgent business which we brought before parliament in order to keep this nation on the tracks.

But how long did the government's interest last?

The Deputy Chairman: I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted to him has expired.

Shall the resolution carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall I rise, report the resolution and request leave to sit again?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I should simply like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, an amendment which reads as follows:

That the resolution be amended so that the two-twelfths of the amount of $26,086,000 provided for vote No. 15 of the Department of National Defence, for the purchase of bombs, be reduced to $1.

[*English*]

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The resolution was carried. Having been carried, it is not now amendable. It was after Your Honour asked the committee whether it should rise and report the resolution that the hon. member rose to take part in this debate and move this amendment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: On the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Rinfret): I would ask the hon. member for Lapointe to kindly resume his seat.

[*English*]

With regard to the point of order raised by the Minister of Public Works, I had started to ask whether I should report the resolution but failed to see the hon. member for Lapointe. The hon. member had risen so I now recognize him. I understand he wishes to move an amendment to the resolution.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Allard):

That the resolution be amended so that the two-twelfths of the amount of $26,086,000 provided for vote No. 15 of the Department of National Defence, for the purchase of bombs, be reduced to $1, in order to enable the Minister of Agriculture to meet the just demands of the Canadian dairy producers.

[*English*]

Amendment (Mr. Grégoire) negatived: Yeas, 7; nays, 48.

The Deputy Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS

INTERIM SUPPLY

Hon. C. M. Drury (for the Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of ways and means.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Batten in the chair.

Mr. Drury (for Mr. Sharp) moved:

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending the 31st March, 1968, the sum of $1,034,689,911.16 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

• (2:20 a.m.)

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. Drury (for Mr. Sharp) thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-293 for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the fiscal year ending the 31st March, 1968.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the said bill be read a second time?

Some hon. Members: Now.

Mr. Drury (for Mr. Sharp) moved the second reading of the bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: I object, Mr. Chairman, and until the minister has given satisfaction to the farmers, I will object to that bill, until the end, to third reading.

[*English*]

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Batten in the chair.

On clause 2—*$1,034,689,911.16 granted for 1967-68.*

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Would the minister give the customary assurance that the bill is in the standard form and contains nothing that is not usual in such a bill?

Mr. Drury: I shall be glad to give such assurance.

Clauses 2 to 5 inclusive carried.

Schedules A, B, C, and D agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

On the preamble.

Mr. Knowles: Can the minister tell us why in the preamble the administrator is referred to, since we now have a Governor General?

Mr. Drury: Without being too certain I think that the message in fact came from the administrator, prior to the appointment of the present Governor General.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the said bill be read a third time?

Some hon. Members: By leave, now.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Grégoire: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gauthier: No, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

I am asking to defer the third reading to the next sitting of the house, Mr. Speaker, in order for the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene) to have sufficient time to give satisfaction to farmers.

As I said when I spoke this evening, I will fight up to the end and farmers will no longer be treated with indifference and contempt. The minister should stop talking and start acting. Let him take action, and we will then give our approval. There will not be any unanimous consent this evening, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. Drury: I would like to say a word. I think the Minister of Agriculture did make a very sincere effort, as one of the hon. members who spoke pointed out, to provide a long and detailed explanation for the benefit of the house and also of the farmers, particularly those in eastern Canada, and I would ask the hon. member whether, rather than uphold consent now, he would not take the time to read *Hansard* at his leisure tomorrow or the next day and allow the house to proceed with the passage of this bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, to answer the minister's question, I will tell him that I do not have to read *Hansard*. I have been here all day. I have listened to the minister, to his attempts to comfort the farmers; it is only an attempt, as he stated it so well himself. Now, we do not want words but action. We want him to act. If farmers have asked for $5.10, let him give it to them. It is only on that condition that we will agree to third reading tonight.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the bill be read the third time?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. You are fully aware, Mr. Speaker, that to proceed immediately tonight with the third reading of the bill, the unanimous consent of the house is required.

The hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) has withheld his consent. My question of privilege is as follows: standing orders cannot be disregarded. The Speaker is supposed to be here to see that the rules are applied. I would ask you to take into account the objection raised by the hon. member for Roberval and his refusal to grant unanimous consent.

If an objection has been expressed so categorically, Mr. Chairman, I do not see why you should move that the bill be now read a third time, especially when the unanimous consent of the house is required and the hon. member for Roberval refused to grant it.

[*English*]

Mr. McIlraith: On the point of order raised by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) I should like to call attention to the fact that unanimous consent is not required for the third reading of this bill in circumstances as they are tonight, which are extraordinary circumstances.

Standing order No. 75 states:

> Every bill shall receive three several readings, on different days, previously to being passed. On urgent or extraordinary occasions a bill may be read twice or thrice, or advanced two or more stages in one day.

This is an extraordinary occasion having regard to the special order of the house made yesterday at eight o'clock under which the sittings were extended sharply for a specific purpose, and that purpose was indicated. This is not an ordinary occasion. It is an extraordinary occasion affecting this interim supply bill at this particular time. Perhaps the extraordinary nature of our consideration of this bill is indicated by the time of sitting.

• (2:30 a.m.)

Perhaps it could be demonstrated more directly by that than by any other fact. We are now sitting at 2.30 in the morning when, in the ordinary course of events, the house would have risen at six o'clock last night, so that we have been sitting some 8½ hours since the normal time of adjournment. I would also point out that this morning the house met at eleven o'clock instead of 2.30, the normal time of meeting. I could develop the argument but I think it is clear it is an extraordinary occasion, just such an extraordinary occasion as that rule is intended to cover.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, may I just say that the other day the hon. member for Mégantic (Mr. Langlois), representing the party

to which the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) belongs, gave a firm assurance to the meeting of the house leaders that this session would come to a conclusion on Wednesday night and that interim supply and the other items that were mentioned would be passed. Now the hon. member for Roberval, if he is refusing to give consent, is unfortunately, perhaps not realizing it, breaking the word given by the house leader of his party.

When that word was given it was accepted by the rest of us as binding on our various parties. I gave my word for this party consisting of 96 members and we are attempting to meet our part of that bargain. I think all this goes to show that this is an unusual and extraordinary occasion. If we cannot make these arrangements and have these honourable agreements kept, then of course the institution of parliament cannot run in this way. My understanding was that all parties would abide by the decision reached by their representatives who attended that meeting.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, the speaker who just resumed his seat said that I have broken an agreement. I think that the first one to break up an agreement is the minister and I will give my consent on the understanding that the minister accepts our request, that is the request of farmers.

If the minister agrees tonight to grant $5.10 to farmers, especially by not increasing taxes, I am ready for unanimous consent and I will give my consent right away. But something new occurred tonight, the minister did not move from his seat and has not changed an iota to his dairy policy. Because of that, Mr. Chairman, I honestly cannot—I am speaking sincerely—give my consent.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, the point of order raised by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McIlraith), concerns only a question of procedure.

In regard to the point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill, this concerns the party of my colleague from Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) and I have nothing to say about that. However, the Minister of Public Works quotes section 75, which reads in part as follower:

> On urgent or extraordinary occasions, a bill may be read twice or thrice, or advanced two or more stages in one day.

[Mr. Churchill.]

Mr. Speaker, I shall now ask the Minister of Public Works to read Standing Order 42, which says:

> A motion may, in case of urgent and pressing necessity—

This is the point which the minister intends to raise—

> —previously explained by the mover, be made by unanimous consent of the House without notice having been given under Standing Order 41.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under those two standing orders, the house cannot proceed with more than two stages on the same day and the motion for third reading cannot be accepted now unless it is an urgent matter. And if this is an urgent matter, standing order 42 requires unanimous consent.

So, standing order 42 is a very good complement to standing order 75. If it is true that standing order 75 recognizes that there may be urgent cases which would set aside the general rule that no more than two stages may be proceeded with on the same day, then third reading would constitute the fourth stage.

Therefore, as a rule, third reading should not be proceeded with. Standing order 75 says that it can be done if the occasion is urgent; but standing order 42 provides that it may be done in cases of emergency, subject to unanimous agreement.

I merely wish to rectify the point of order the hon. Minister of Public Works raised. I believe standing order 42 is very clear for it completes standing order 75. I admit there can be third reading in a case of emergency but in that case order 42 stipulates that there must be unanimous consent of the house.

As for the agreements which may have been reached, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the point of order raised by the member for Winnipeg South Centre, I was not aware of them and neither was the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Allard). We knew nothing about them because we did not attend the meetings of the house leaders. We were not even invited. Consequently, we did not know what might happen in the house seeing we were kept in the dark. The two of us, we are the white niggers of parliament. So we are not told when anything happens. The house leaders may decide that the house will sit tomorrow morning at seven o'clock but we would not be here; not having been invited at the meeting, we would not attend.

So, Mr. Speaker, I should like to protest against such methods of decision between

house leaders meeting and forgetting the Independents. In the future, if decisions are to be taken, let us be invited and we will be pleased to attend. Then your decisions may be respected.

I should like the government house leader to know one thing: True, there are only two of us. But we are here and we are here to be taken into account. We are only two but, as the hon. member for Sherbrooke said a while ago, we are worth many Liberal members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The point of order raised by the hon. member is quite clear and I not think it is necessary for him to speak at greater length on the subject.

[*English*]

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I think the point of order which has been raised by the Minister of Public Works and house leader is well taken; that is, it is possible for the house to pass through more than one stage on an urgent or extraordinary occasion. Citation 424 of Beauchesne's fourth edition reads as follows:

"It is occasionally the custom to pass bills through their different stages at one and the same sitting. That course, however, is never taken except in cases of extreme urgency and with the general assent of the house."

This, Mr. Speaker, is a precedent taken from 1880. Since that time the word "extraordinary" has been included in standing order 75. Therefore, I should like to suggest that the precedent applies to the word "extraordinary" as well as the word "urgent". It does not say there must be unanimous consent by the members of the house that it is an extraordinary occasion. It says there must be general assent of the house that it is an extraordinary occasion.

Therefore, sir, I believe it is quite proper within the rules for Your Honour to determine whether there is general assent that this is an extraordinary occasion and that it is possible to pass bills through more than one stage at the same sitting.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In order to give the Chair an opportunity to consider this very interesting point, I wonder whether the house at this time might consider it advisable to go on with the next item of business. Is it agreed that we revert to motions?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Ways and Means

HOUSE OF COMMONS

CONCURRENCE IN FIRST REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PROCEDURE

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved that the first report of the special committee on procedure of the house, presented to the house on Monday, March 20, 1967, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

CONCURRENCE IN SECOND REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PROCEDURE

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved that the second report of the special committee on procedure of the house, presented to the house Monday, March 20, 1967, be concurred in.

• (2:40 a.m.)

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving concurrence in the second report of the special committee on procedure, I wish to express my appreciation to members of the committee for the way in which they carried out the assignment given to them by the House of Commons. I do not propose at this stage to make an extensive review of the reasons parliamentary reform is such an important issue both in this house and in the minds of the general public. All I want to do is sketch, as briefly as possible, the nature of the report so that hon. members will have in *Hansard* at least a skeleton outline of what is involved.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted I should like to suggest that we dispense with a discussion on this report, it now being 2:45 in the morning, following a very long day. Surely we could hold this discussion during the next session of the house.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to allow this motion to pass without discussion if that is the general wish of the house.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

APPROPRIATION ACT NO. 4, 1967

Mr. Speaker: We shall now revert to the point we had reached a moment ago.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, as far as this problem is concerned, and since the Acting Speaker was in the chair, a while ago, when I presented my argument, would you like me to repeat it

Mr. Speaker: I do not think it is necessary. Although I was not in the chair, I had the privilege, the pleasure, and the advantage to hear the hon. member behind the curtains.

Mr. Grégoire: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your kindness.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that someone is trying to aggravate the present circumstances, but I am wondering if, after a whole day of discussion on agriculture, that is considered as an extraordinary circumstance to accept a point as important as this one.

We have been considering interim supply since noon and we have dealt with the matter of milk. Mr. Speaker, I believe that three or four days' discussion on this point is not too much, in my opinion, since a way was found to debate the unification plan for our armed forces for three weeks. And the house would not take the time to discuss this matter at leisure, for two or three days?

I find the circumstances really extraordinary on account of the discussions I have heard.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether I may be allowed to say a word or two for the benefit of the government house leader in respect of the problem which confronts us. I do not know how long the house intends to debate this procedural point. But it is after 2:45 in the morning, we have put in 15 or 16 hours in a day that makes this the longest session in our history, so if there is a problem, why should we not meet on Friday morning at eleven o'clock to give third reading to the interim supply bill?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Knowles: I was a member of the group of house leaders that reached the understanding that we would finish the business tonight, and the motion that was passed at eight o'clock the night before last seemed to imply that. But it is not crystal clear. It said we would continue to sit in an effort to dispose of certain business. We knew what that was supposed to mean, but if Your Honour rules otherwise, you are the one who makes the decision. But I suggest that rather than our going on to discuss a procedural point for an hour or so, we might consider taking Thursday off, as was planned, meet on Friday morning at eleven o'clock—there will be enough of us here to give third reading to the bill—and then carry on with the plans the government has for the rest of the session.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, there may be one thing that has been missed so far, in the discussion on this point of order. I should like to read *Votes and Proceedings* so that the house will know exactly what was ordered. The following appears at page 1752 of *Votes and Proceedings* of Tuesday last:

> It was ordered (1) that the house continue to sit this day beyond 10.00 o'clock p.m.; (2) that prior to the adjournment of this sitting, private bills shall be considered; and (3) that the house meet at 11.00 o'clock a.m. tomorrow, Wednesday, April 26, 1967 and, subject to consideration of a probable suspension for luncheon and dinner periods, continue to sit in an effort to dispose of certain specified business before adjournment.

The specified business included the item of interim supply. I respectfully suggest that there having been a special order of this house, it becomes an extraordinary matter within the meaning of standing order 75 and we therefore, as of right, may proceed with the three readings on the one day.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, if you would allow me to comment on this question of procedure, there is a point which has not yet been settled by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McIlraith).

I should like you to note that I do not want to oppose him, but merely to express my point of view on that procedure on which we are now basing a precedent.

In the first place, in the motion brought in and read by the minister the provision: "Notwithstanding the sections of the standing orders which could be against the motion" does not appear. This has always been the custom and the Minister of Public Works has always complied with it, when bringing in a motion contrary to the standing orders of the house.

So this is the first point which contradicts the minister's argument.

Second, as the minister said: no item has been mentioned, and the minister says that items would be implicitly recognized. But this was only recognized during a meeting of "house leaders" where we were not called and where the majority of the members of this house were not admitted.

Third, Mr. Speaker, the motion states clearly: an effort will be made. This does not show that it is a direct order of the house. So I think that in view of these arguments, there is no other solution than to abide by rule 42 of the Standing Orders which was not set aside in the motion put forward by the Minister of Public Works, a few moments ago.

• (2:50 a.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, I rise at this particular hour to urge you to consider the position in which the house finds itself. We have now reached the time of eight minutes to three in the morning of April 27. I am sure all of us want to adjourn. I would dearly love to make a speech, particularly with regard to the fact that the government has failed to answer questions put to it in this session concerning agriculture. We have to come to the point at which we should consider the completion of the 1966 legislative year. I urge you to rule that we proceed to third reading and adjourn for the year 1967 at this late hour. Regardless of whether there is a justification for a continuation of this debate I urge you, Mr. Speaker, to rule in accordance with the desire of the house so that we may proceed with the legislation for the 1967 legislative year. I say that advisedly, realizing that we are now well into 1967 although we are still considering last year's legislation.

If the house, and particularly the government, had proceeded with the business of the 1966 session in an orderly manner, which of course everyone realizes they have not, we would not be in the position in which we are now. Mr. Speaker, I urge you that we end the 1966 session and proceed to the year 1967.

Mr. Speaker: I thank hon. members for their advice on the interpretation of the rules. I might assure hon. members that from the very moment this debate started on the point of order I had no doubts on the rule which applied. The hon. member for Acadia has made a very honest and eloquent speech in which I think he expressed the feeling and desire of practically all members of the House of Commons. Unfortunately the standing order is very specific, and I do not think the order of the house to which the government house leader referred is sufficiently clear or strong to allow me to say that we should dispense with the provisions of standing order 42.

The Minister of Public Works read the order of the house to the effect that we should continue to sit in an effort to dispose of certain specified business before adjournment. Obviously the effort has been made. It has been a very laudable and generous effort on the part of all hon. members, but it has not been successful. I regret to say that I have no alternative but to rule that there is a standing order which requires the unanimous consent of the house to go on to third reading after having had the second reading a moment ago.

In view of the circumstances I must rule that we cannot go further with the consideration of this bill than we have until now.

When shall the said bill be read a third time?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I say no. As I have explained a while ago, we waited all day long to have the minister think the case over and reconsider his decision. I repeat: as long as he will not reconsider his own decision, I shall not reconsider mine. I am as stubborn as he is.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I wish I could allow the hon. member to deliver a third speech on this point, if his conclusion were to give his agreement on third reading, but as he does not intend to do so, I shall not allow him to continue his argumentation.

[*English*]

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I move that this house adjourn until April 27 at 3 a.m.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, there is a rule in the standing orders, I do not remember which one, saying that there are specific hours, I think it is at the beginning, rule No. 2, concerning the sittings of the house.

(1) The House shall meet on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays at 2:30 o'clock p.m.—

Tomorrow is Thursday, April 27. Therefore, under the standing orders, rule No. 2, paragraph (1), the house meets at 2:30 o'clock p.m. Should someone want to move a motion to change that, it would require a 48-hour notice. I would if the minister gave a 48-hour notice.

As for me, personally, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[*English*]

I suggest that the government house leader try another motion.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, if I may—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not recognize the hon. member, because the motion has been ruled out of order.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I should like to say that the motion may be ruled in order with the unanimous consent of the house. Personally, I am ready to accept the motion, but I think the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) has sound objections.

Then, I say that the minister should ask the unanimous consent according to standing orders.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[*English*]

Has the minister unanimous consent of the house to move the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Peters: No.

Mr. Speaker: I hear a dissenting voice. Therefore there is no unanimous consent to proceed with the motion proposed by the Minister of Public Works.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: If you allow me two minutes, Mr. Speaker, I may find a solution to suggest to the minister.

[*English*]

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): May I make an observation which was made some time ago, Mr. Speaker. It is the interpretation that really matters.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fairness and impartiality with which you have tried to rule and tell the house what are the rules, it seems to me that unless there is unanimous consent we should not now try to get around your ruling in some devious way. Again I make the suggestion I made earlier, that it was generally accepted that we would take Thursday off, and that more than 20 of us could be here on Friday morning to give third reading and get the bill to the Senate.

Mr. McIlraith: It is quite impossible to meet in this way on Friday morning, Mr. Speaker. We made an arrangement in good faith and with a firm commitment by the Ralliement Créditiste given in very clear language, as a result of which the house made an order. That order may have been badly drafted, but it was an honest attempt by the house to interpret the arrangement. The house having acted on that commitment, reinforced by an order of the house, I am not prepared to accept any such proposal such as the one now put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

I believe that a parliament of free citizens elected by their constituents in a free country works on the assumption that when men come here they will act reasonably and honour the commitments made to each other in this house in good faith.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McIlraith: When the house acts upon such commitments it has the right to expect that they will be carried through.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I hope that the Minister of Public Works, who used my name in the remarks he has just made about being unable to accept my proposition, was not including me in the suggestion that there had been any bad faith on my part as far as these arrangments were concerned.

• (3:00 a.m.)

Mr. McIlraith: No.

Mr. Knowles: May I suggest to the minister, since Your Honour has ruled on standing order 75 and on the minister's motion, that if the minister is not prepared to accept my suggestion, he ought to come up with another one. Let us be reasonable, as the minister himself suggests.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, to reply to the house leader who said that he entered into an agreement, it seems to me that one of our members, I do not know which one, entered into an agreement during the meeting. I do not know which one; I should like to know the name of that member, but I will say to the house leader that I have only one obligation, and it is towards my constituents, and I made the the promise to have amended—

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: It is obvious we will not reach agreement and I wonder whether hon.

members wish to continue on the point of order or adjourn.

Mr. Leboe: We have been here all evening. It is now three o'clock in the morning and we stayed, men and women that we are, to do a job that needs to be done. If there be any who do not like what the minister has done or not done, said or not said, that is no reason to thwart the efforts of the rest of us, who have sat faithfully until this hour of the morning, to do the job we were sent to do.

I appeal to those resisting third reading to reconsider their actions. I can come on Friday; I am a 15 cent bus ride from parliament hill. Others have made plans, thinking they were dealing with men. All this is a pack of nonsense. Somebody is trying to make headlines and carrying on—and for what, I do not know.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I feel as keenly about the situation of the dairy industry as does the hon. member for Roberval. I think he would be doing a grave disservice to those dairymen he represents and that I represent by acting at cross purposes with those representing other people in Canada. I suggest to the hon. gentleman that if he will consider carefully what he is doing he will realize that he is doing a disservice to the very people he ought to be serving. I shall fight the battle in the next session on the point of view the hon. member has expressed here. Many on the other side of the house will battle the Minister of Agriculture.

If the hon. gentleman persists tonight he may lose some of the support he has and some of the sympathy which has been extended to the dairy industry of the country. The hon. gentleman might be responsible for the dairy industry not being treated as fairly as it ought to be treated.

Mr. Churchill: I have a very special interest in this matter because I proposed the scheme which, with modifications, was adopted these last two days. I proposed that the Conservative party would forgo further debate on the unification bill. I proposed we should take a vote on that bill immediately orders of the day were called—was it yesterday or the day before?

Mr. Knowles: Tuesday.

Mr. Churchill: I further proposed we should deal with interim supply and with the subject of rules and procedure. I went so far as to say this would be done without debate, or by one spokesman per party with a limitation of 20 minutes. I agreed with the suggestion of the house leader that we should deal with the adult training bill and the bill in the name of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp). This was a firm house leaders agreement that the present session would stop at midnight on Wednesday.

I would never have consented for the Conservative party had I imagined for one minute that this agreement would be broken. I was prepared to discount the period from midnight to 3 a.m. or 6 a.m. in the morning—I do not care how long. But there was an agreement that this session would end on Wednesday. I would never have committed our party to that agreement had I not placed faith in the word that was given at that meeting by the government representative, the representative of the N.D.P., the representative of the Social Credit party and the representative of the Créditistes.

Never would I have consented, because we had it within our power to carry on a debate for several days, as everyone knows, with regard to the bill then before us on adult training, the bill presented by the Minister of Finance, and the interim supply measure. That discussion could have gone on for perhaps a week or longer. All of this our party gave up in response to the general agreement which was reached at that house leaders meeting. We have heard much about house leaders agreements and about business committees. The whole thing is now being destroyed by what is going on tonight. I think we should settle the matter now.

I make one further appeal to the gentlemen who have opposed settling this matter, on that basis. I make a special appeal to the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) who is a really active member of this parliament. Having done so much to expedite our work during the last two days, will these gentlemen not yield on this point now and make this small concession?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I will frankly admit that I believe that if many were in my position, and especially if all the members cared for the amendment that was asked for during the all day, they would act a little as I do tonight. I do not know whether it would be possible to take one more day. I am not well enough acquainted with the rules of the house to try to

postpone the question to another meeting of the house, even after the holiday. I would simply suggest that third reading be adopted as soon as we come back, so as to let once more the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene) reflect on his old sins.

• (3:10 a.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if there is an understanding, but it would mean because it is interim supply, which we need, that we would have to proceed with debate on it tomorrow. I am wondering if the hon. member fully appreciates that the first item of business in the new session is the address in reply to the throne speech and that this whole debate on milk prices, and the dairy situation, is a perfect example of a subject that could be debated on that very first item of business in the new session. I wonder if that is understood well, because it would be the same point of time as he has called for in the suggestion he has just made, if I understood his remarks correctly. In view of this I wonder if I might ask for unanimous consent for the third reading.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, after listening to the leader's explanation, I understand that we shall surely have the opportunity, right after the opening of the next session —and I am taking his word for it—to discuss the matter and move a vote of non-confidence against the government. I understand that our representative at the leaders' meeting had given his word. I wanted to know his name and I now know it. Somebody told me. I do not want my party to be accused of not keeping its word. I am also taking the house leader's word to the effect that the first item to be considered after the opening of the session will deal with the dairy policy, which will enable us to move a vote of non-confidence against the government.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, must I conclude from the minister's statement that if third reading is passed tonight, he will allow, at the opening of the next session, a debate which could end up with a motion of want of confidence if the dairy policy of the government is not changed? Will the minister give us this opportunity at the very beginning of the next session?

What conclusion should I draw from the statement of the minister?

[Mr. Gauthier.]

If it is yes, Mr. Speaker, then we will joyfully agree to go on with third reading, all the more so since we did not give our word to anyone on this matter.

[*English*]

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, what I had said was that the debate on the address in reply to the throne speech was the first item of business in the new session, and that in the throne speech debate this was a subject that in my understanding came within the rules and could be debated fully on the address. I also pointed out that if I understood the hon. member's remarks correctly, that was at the same point of time as he was indicating we should take for the third reading stage of the bill. The opposition is free, under the rules applicable, to move amendments. I do not think that after tonight I should seek to interpret the rules, but the opposition have full rights under the rules.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, you will agree with me that I made an effort to achieve a new agreement. I think you will admit that the agreement or at least the undertaking, given by the minister is not an undertaking at all. Obviously, there will be a speech from the throne.

Mr. Speaker, if we come up with an amendment on the constitution, obviously if the hon. member for Roverval also comes up with an amendment on agriculture, he will be declared out of order. Everybody knows that.

The undertaking of the hon. minister consequently is worth nothing. The minister could introduce the estimates of the Department of Agriculture immediately after the speech from the throne. That would be a better undertaking—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Perhaps the hon. members would agree that we have discussed the point of order long enough. The hon. member for Roberval, after consultation and reconsideration, is satisfied. I understand he is the one who originally objected to our moving third reading immediately.

In answer to the point of order raised by the member for Lapointe, if the Chair may do so, I can tell him, and I have no doubt that he knows it himself, that it is permissible to discuss any topic whatsoever when the address in reply to the speech from the throne comes up, regardless of the nature of the amendment proposed. I am sure that the hon.

members will be willing to have me move the motion at that time.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I am willing. However, I wish to point out that I do not believe for a single moment what the house leader has just told us, because on March 22, following the question raised by the hon. member for Chapleau (Mr. Laprise), he was told: Wait a few minutes, then we will be able to discuss it. A little later, on April 11, the hon. member for Villeneuve tried to discuss the matter. Always the same answer: On interim supply you will be able to discuss that and settle the matter once and for all. We are now on interim supply and still we are asked to wait. It means that since March 22 five weeks have passed and our farmers will lose a month and a half, maybe two. Finally, I desist, like the hon. member for Roberval. I wish to say in the house that again we were sold a bill of goods.

[*English*]

Mr. Drury (for Mr. Sharp) moved the third reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

Business of the House

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ADJOURNMENT TO MAY 8, 1967

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works) moved:

That, when this house adjourns at the end of this sitting, it shall stand adjourned until Monday, May 8, 1967, at 10.30 a.m. provided always that if it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker, after consultation with Her Majesty's government, that the public interest requires that the House should meet at an earlier time during the adjournment, Mr. Speaker may give notice that he is so satisfied, and thereupon the house shall meet at the time stated in such notice, and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time; and

That in the event of Mr. Speaker being unable to act owing to illness or other cause, the Deputy Speaker shall act in his stead for the purpose of this order.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE SITTINGS DURING PERIOD OF ADJOURNMENT

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works) moved:

That during the adjournment of the house from April 26 to May 8, 1967, the standing and special committees of this house shall be empowered to sit and transact such business as may stand referred to them.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I move that the house now adjourn.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 3.20 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, May 8, 1967

The house met at 10.30 a.m.

THE ROYAL ASSENT AND PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following communication:

Government House, Ottawa
May 2, 1967

Sir:

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Gerald Fauteux, puisne judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber at 11 a.m. on Monday, May 8th, for the purpose of giving royal assent to certain bills and of proroguing the first session of the twenty seventh parliament of Canada.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,

Your obedient servant,
A. G. Cherrier
Assistant Secretary to the Governor General

VACANCY

Mr. Speaker: It is my duty to inform the house that I have received from the hon. member for Jasper-Edson (Mr. Horner) a written declaration of his intention to resign his seat in the House of Commons.

Pursuant to section 6 of the House of Commons Act, chapter 143, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1952, I have addressed my warrant to the chief electoral officer for the issue of a writ for the election of a new member for the said electoral district.

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Ninth report of special joint committee on the public service of Canada—Mr. Richard.

Fifteenth report of standing committee on public accounts—Mr. Hales.

Sixth report of joint committee on consumer credit and cost of living—Mr. Allmand.

• (10:40 a.m.)

[*Translation*]

Third report of the special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on immigration—Mr. Haidasz (for Mr. Klein).

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT—SIXTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I table herewith the sixth report of the standing committee on agriculture, forestry and rural development. I have received a letter from the president of the Winnipeg grain exchange concerning the committee report. Time does not permit consideration of this letter, but I am sure that in the new session the new committee will give it the necessary consideration.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

TABLING OF INSTRUCTIONS TO MANPOWER CENTRES RESPECTING ANTI-DISCRIMINATION POLICIES

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table two copies in English and two copies in French of administrative circulars issued on December 4, 1966 and February 27, 1967, in accordance with written question No. 2,922 standing in the name of the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow). These will be tabled later today.

Mr. Speaker: Has the minister leave to table these documents?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

FINANCE

TABLING OF TARIFF BOARD REPORT RESPECTING IRON OR STEEL USED IN SHIPBUILDING

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am tabling today copies in English and French of a report by the tariff board in respect of reference No. 139 relating to iron or steel products used in the shipbuilding industry.

I am also tabling a transcript of the evidence presented to the board at its public hearings. I assure members of the house that the government will give detailed study to this report and that representations from interested parties wishing to comment on the report will receive careful consideration.

Questions

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

REFUSAL OF ENTRY TO IMMIGRANTS FROM FRANCE

Question No. 2,524—**Mr. Thompson:**

1. During the past five years, how many citizens of France have been refused entrance to Canada for immigration and other purposes as a result of R.C.M.P. investigation?

2. How many of these were because of active association with communist or other 'extremist' organizations?

3. In view of the Department of Manpower and Immigration dropping investigation procedures, will such undesirable individuals now be permitted to enter Canada?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Departments of the Solicitor General and Manpower and Immigration as follows: 1 and 2. In the public interest and for the sake of the privacy of the individual, the reason a person is not admitted to Canada is not normally identified.

3. Immigration procedures for citizens of France will now be the same as those for British subjects. In all countries, the examination of applicants by Canadian visa officers is intended to ensure that people who are prohibited under the Immigration Act will not gain entry to Canada.

CENTENNIAL MEDAL

Question No. 2,532—**Mr. Brand:**

1. What is the purpose of the proposed centennial medal?

2. Who will receive the medal?

3. How will they be chosen?

4. For what purpose will the medal be awarded?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): 1. A commemorative medal struck to mark the centennial of conferedation.

2. Eligibility is restricted to persons who are Canadian citizens and who have given especially valuable service to Canada.

3. The Department of the Secretary of State will solicit nominations through public and official channels and from national voluntary organizations whose aims are deemed to be consistent with the purpose for which the medal is created.

4. Answered by 1.

[Mr. Sharp.]

MONUMENTS OF FORMER PRIME MINISTERS

Question No. 2,613—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

1. Has the government commissioned the design of any monuments of former prime ministers of Canada?

2. If so (a) what sculptor or sculptors have been so commissioned (b) what former prime minister has been commissioned to each such sculptor?

3. Have any designs (a) been accepted (b) been rejected and, if so, what ones and for what reasons?

4. If any designs have been rejected, when is it anticipated that new designs will be completed?

5. When is it anticipated that each of these monuments will be cast and ready for erection?

6. In what place or position is it proposed to erect each such monument?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): 1. Yes.

2. (a) Messrs. Marcel Braitstein, Raoul Hunter, Elford Cox and Elek Imredy.

(b) Arthur Meighen (Braitstein); W. L. Mackenzie King (Hunter); R. B. Bennett (Cox); Louis St. Laurent (Imredy).

3. (a) Yes.

(b) Yes—designs received for sculptures of R. B. Bennett and Arthur Meighen because these were judged not to bear sufficient resemblance to their subjects.

4. By approximately June 30, 1967.

5. The monument of W. L. Mackenzie King is expected to be ready by approximately September, 1967. No date can yet be set for the others.

6. On the basis of professional advice, a number of possible sites for public monuments have been selected. Professional opinion favours the choice of each specific site in relation to the characteristics of the monument, and the sculptors are, therefore, to be consulted before a final decision is taken.

DETENTION OF IMMIGRANTS

Question No. 2,684—**Mr. Enns:**

Since the designation of certain institutions as immigrant stations by the minister in 1964, how many immigrants have actually been detained in such designated quarters, and (a) how many have been detained in penitentiaries (b) how many have been detained in provincial jails (c) how many have been detained in police stations (d) how many have been detained in mental hospitals?

Mr. J. C. Munro (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 134 to March 1, 1967, (a) 3; (b) 45; (c) 81; (d) 5; an additional 188 immigrants were detained in immigration detention quarters which are located at Halifax, Quebec and Vancouver.

SCULPTURE MOCK-UPS OF FORMER PRIME MINISTERS

Question No. 2,688—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. What sculptors were asked to prepare mock-ups of statues of former Prime Minister Arthur Meighen and R. B. Bennett?

2. Were these mock-ups appraised by an advisory committee of persons proficient in sculpture and allied arts?

3. What was the personnel of such committees?

4. Did said committees submit to any government department any opinion on these mock-ups?

5. What was the nature of such opinions?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): 1. Marcel Braitstein (Arthur Meighen); Elford Cox (R. B. Bennett).

2. Yes.

3. Ursula Hanes, Past President, Society of Sculptors of Canada, Toronto; Clement Paté, Director of Studies, Ecole des Beaux Arts, Québec; Peter Thornton, Architect, Vancouver; Yves Trudeau, Past President, Société des Sculpteurs de Québec.

4. Yes.

5. The advisory panel considered the maquettes to be artistically worthy and recommended their acceptance.

PREVAILING LABOUR RATES, HALIFAX

Question No. 2,745—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. By government departments, what are the current rates paid for labour classifications in the Halifax and Dartmouth area?

2. What is the prevailing rate in the area for this classification?

3. Is there more than one rate for this classification among Department of National Defence employees and, if so, how many different rates are there and where do they apply?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the President of Treasury Board as follows: (a) All departments except the Department of National Defence dockyard and certain employees at CFB Halifax and Department of Transport marine agency —$1.90. (b) Department of National Defence: (i) H.M.C. Dockyard, $2.21; (ii) Canadian Forces base Halifax, $1.90 and $2.00. (c) Department of Transport Dartmouth marine agency, $1.88.

2. Prevailing rate for labourer in the Halifax area, $1.90.

3. See (1).

BIDS FOR REFIT OF "BONAVENTURE"

Question No. 2,746—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Which firms submitted tenders for the half life refit of H.M.C.S. *Bonaventure* and in what amounts?

2. Who was the successful bidder?

3. Have any adjustments been made in this contract which affect the total cost of this refit?

4. If so, what were these adjustments and what is the total dollar content of each?

5. What has been the total cost of this contract up to this date?

6. Are any further changes in the total cost expected?

7. What has been Canada's total investment in this ship since purchase?

8. When will the refit be completed?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): 1.

	Known Work Firm Price	Unknown Work Estimated	Total Bid
Saint John Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. Ltd., Saint John, N.B.	$7,473,606.00	$1,099,322.00	$8,572,928.00
Canadian Vickers Shipyards Ltd., Montreal 3, P.Q.	4,784,789.00	1,078,552.00	5,863,341.00
Davie Shipbuilding Limited, Lauzon, Levis, P.Q.	4,913,541.00	855,141.00	5,768,682.00

2. Davie Shipbuilding Limited.

3. Yes.

4. Additional costs attributable to late delivery of government supplied material 47,947.16
New requirements 113,959.26
Work arising from examination of ship and equipment 3,258,483.68

5. Total cost of contract to date $8,333,931.10

6. Yes—additional work arising $1,390,230.90

7. D.N.D. states that Canada's total investment for maintenance and repair costs (including alterations and additions) since purchase for H.M.C.S. *Bonaventure* has been $7.39 million prior to commencement of the current refit. These costs when added to the

$9,724,162 ship allotment and the $2,045,838 component allotment for the current refit, will bring the total cost of maintenance and repair to $19.16 million.

8. September 1, 1967.

*UNIVERSITY STUDENTS EMPLOYED BY EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Question No. 2,762—**Mr. McKinley:**

How many university students and university graduates have been employed during 1966 and 1967 by the Department of External Affairs and (a) how many of those employed were bilingual (b) how many were not bilingual?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Insofar as the Department of External Affairs is concerned: Summer employment; 1966, 8 Students, 13 Graduates; (a) 0 Students, 10 Graduates; (b) 8 Students, 3 Graduates; 1967 none as yet. Permanent employment; 1966, 74 Graduates, (a) 17; (b) 57; 1967, 12 Graduates; (a) 5, (b) 7.

DISTRIBUTION OF STATEMENT BY DEFENCE MINISTER

Question No. 2,764—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. With reference to paragraph 4 of the answer of the Minister of National Defence to question No. 2,565, how many of the 8,070 referred to were "interested individuals", and who compiled such a list of "interested individuals"?

2. What will be done with the undistributed copies?

3. Was the printing cost of $5,397.92 determined in advance?

4. Why did the minister reject the alternative of purchasing $2,262 worth of copies of *Hansard* of that day?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): 1. Approximately 2,250 copies were distributed to individuals who had written in at one time or another to the defence department, indicating their interest in the reorganization of the services or in defence matters generally. Names of these individuals are held on numerous files at national defence headquarters and no special list was compiled for the purpose.

2. Undistributed copies will be used to fill requests which are continuing to be received.

3. Yes.

4. It was considered that the format used was preferable for a reference pamphlet.

BREAKWATER REPAIRS, PARRSBORO, N.S.

Question No. 2,772—**Mr. Coates:**

When will tenders be called for breakwater repairs at Parrsboro, Nova Scotia, and what will the repairs in question involve?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Tenders are to be called about May 30, 1967. Stone is to be placed along 900 feet of the seaward side of the breakwater.

NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION GRANTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

Question No. 2,775—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

1. To what municipalities does the National Capital Commission make grants in lieu of taxes pursuant to section 15 of the National Capital Act?

2. What was the amount of such grant to each such municipality for each of the fiscal years ending March 31, 1964, 1965, 1966, and 1967, and the estimate for the year ending March 31, 1968?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): 1. The National Capital Commission makes grants in lieu of taxes to the following municipalities: Township of West Hull. Township of Masham. Township of South Hull (Lucerne). Township of Onslow. Township of Templeton. Township of Eardley. Township of Gatineau. Township of Deschênes. City of Ottawa. Village of Deschênes. City of Hull—for Macdonald-Cartier bridge approaches.

2. The figures shown on the attached schedule do not include grants in lieu of taxes on rented properties, as these are deemed to be assumed by the lessees as part of their rent paid to the N.C.C.

The estimate for the year ending 31 March, 1968 totals $390,000.

Gatineau Park	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
Township of West Hull	$12,332.72	$15,531.83	$18,667.20	$17,713.79	
Masham	11,338.77	11,508.35	11,804.87	14,863.86	
South Hull (Lucerne)	14,475.58	16,390.07	20,008.91	24,319.88	
Onslow	4,403.96	4,471.93	4,845.05	5,299.04	
Templeton	180.00	190.08	190.08	40.32	
Eardley	3,122.39	3,098.00	3,217.82	3,182.67	
Gatineau			280.60	216.07	
	45,853.42	51,190.36	59,014.53	65,635.63	
City of Ottawa	66,553.78	120,236.22	195,584.69	145,883.37	
Local improvement charges	7,760.57	16,272.23	51,325.70	48,616.53	
Industrial subdivisions					
Belfast road	25,907.76	22,150.00	23,294.47	18,095.51	
Tremblay road	6,746.71		6,015.29	5,189.41	
Coventry road	13,454.64	13,542.55	12,967.74	8,085.60	
Sheffield road			8,651.09	7,567.07	
Walkley road				17,590.98	
Township of Nepean		12,182.93	10,920.06	28,879.87	
Township of Gloucester		31,387.66	31,999.19	40,400.02	
Deschênes Village		850.88	11,405.15	2,305.15	
City of Hull		16,855.32	—	—	
Township of West Hull			644.78		
Total	166,276.88	284,668.15	411,822.69	388,249.14	390,000

COST OF CANADIAN HIGH COMMISSION IN INDIA

Question No. 2,792—**Mr. Nugent:**

1. What was the total cost of operation and maintenance of the high commission in India in each of the years, 1962 to date, including the estimate for 1966-67?

2. In addition to the above amounts, how much has been expended or is intended to be expended in the estimates of 1966-67 for capital expenses in each of the said years?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): In so far as it concerns the Department of External Affairs 1. The total cost of operation and maintenance for each fiscal year from 1962 to date was as follows: 1961-62, $337,355; 1962-63, $409,175; 1963-64, $382,194; 1964-65, $467,979; 1965-66, $535,269; *1966-67, $506,000. (estimate)

*It is expected that expenditures for the fiscal year 1966-67 will be approximately $447,600.

2. The amount expended for capital expenses during each fiscal year from 1962 to date was as follows: 1961-62, $17,668; 1962-63, $30,926; 1963-64, $54,999; 1964-65, $30,736; 1965-66, $49,366; **1966-67, $226,000. (estimate)

**A major construction program on a site acquired by the Canadian government in 1958 is now in the planning stage. This is a phased program because of the high cost involved. Phase 1, for which $200,000 was provided in 1966-67, consists of the construction of a chancery, servant's quarters, garage, parking facilities and landscaping. Phase 2 will provide a number of houses and apartments for Canadian staff. Phase 3 will involve construction of additional staff quarters. Because of delays in completing drawings for phase 1 of the construction project, approximately $57,000 only of the amount provided for capital expenditures in 1966-67 estimates will be required.

Questions

FRASER RIVER TRIFURCATION PLAN

Question No. 2,799—**Mr. Prittie:**

1. Which company has been awarded the contract to carry out the piling and timber inspection on phase 2 of the Fraser river trifurcation plan?

2. Were competitive tenders asked for before a company was chosen?

3. If the answer to part 2 is no, on what basis was the company selected?

4. Did the department ascertain if the company selected had sufficient personnel experienced in carrying out inspections in Pacific coast and Fraser river water conditions?

5. What are the rates for the following services on phase 2 of the Fraser river trifurcation plan (a) treated piling, as specified (b) untreated piling —plan inspection, Vancouver area (c) untreated piling—bush inspection?

6. What will be the estimated total cost of phase 2 inspection services based upon the rates referred to in part 5?

7. Did Miller Inspection Services Ltd. of Richmond, B.C., submit a letter offering certain rates?

8. If so, what were those rates?

9. Based upon the rates of Miller Inspection Services Ltd., what would the total estimated costs have been?

10. Have Miller Inspection Services Ltd. completed any assignments for the Department of Public Works?

11. If so, were their services satisfactory?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): 1. Coast Eldridge Co. Ltd., 125 East Fourth Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

2. No.

3. The value of inspection is based on quality of work and time spent on site and the department has established rates against a standard of work required. Assignments are given to companies which have qualified staff and facilities for the type of inspection required and the jobs are rotated between such companies.

4. Yes.

5. (a) Treated piling—.03¢ per linear foot; (b) Untreated piling—plant inspection, Vancouver area—.02¢ per linear foot; (c) Untreated piling—bush inspection—.02¢ per linear foot.

6. Estimated $23,000.

7. Yes.

8. Treated piling—.02¢ per linear foot; Untreated piling—plant inspection—.01¢ per linear foot; Untreated piling—bush inspection —.015¢ per linear foot.

9. Estimated $15,030.

10. Yes, Miller Inspection Services have completed several assignments for the department at the standard rates.

11. Yes.

AREA DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, ATLANTIC PROVINCES

Question No. 2,803—**Mr. Crossman:**

1. What was the total amount committed for development grants under the area development program in each of the Atlantic provinces from 1964 to date?

2. What was the total amount paid by the federal government to each of the Atlantic provinces under the fiscal agreements for the years ending March 31, 1960 to 1967?

3. What is the total amount committed for the year 1967-68?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Department of Industry and Finance as follows: 1. Formal commitments to pay development grants under the Area Development Incentives Act of June 30, 1965, to date in each of the Atlantic provinces are as follows: Newfoundland $10,652,151; Prince Edward Island $648,500; New Brunswick $9,052,333; and Nova Scotia $7,880,330. Conditional commitments to pay under the act, pending receipt of additional information from applicants and completion of processing of applications, have been made as follows: Newfoundland $10,558,886; Prince Edward Island $338,658; New Brunswick $772,020; Nova Scotia $5,918,741.

2. Payments under the Federal-Provincial Tax-Sharing Arrangements Act and the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act to the Atlantic Provinces for the following fiscal years:

	1959-60	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67
	(in thousands of dollars)							
Nfld.	27,517	27,960	27,577	32,418	33,761	37,349	41,848	48,519
P.E.I.	6,890	7,402	7,280	6,726	7,393	9,123	9,678	10,942
N.S.	39,445	39,743	39,817	33,795	31,842	40,271	47,657	54,033
N.B.	33,798	34,249	33,733	27,338	27,916	35,865	43,114	47,927

3. The total amount committed for the year 1967-68 cannot be estimated at this time. The level of commitments will depend upon the volume of applications approved throughout the year.

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

COMPENSATION TO LAND OWNERS, THAMES RIVER CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

Question No. 2,804—**Mr. Nesbitt:**

1. What was the total amount of compensation paid to land owners whose properties were either purchased or expropriated for the construction of the Gordon Pittock dam, reservoir and recreation area, being part of the upper Thames river conservation authority at Woodstock, Ontario?

2. What were the individual amounts of compensation paid to each land owner to date?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): 1. This compensation is paid by the province of Ontario. We are informed by the province that the total amount of compensation paid to date to land owners whose properties were required for construction of the Gordon Pittock dam project, Woodstock, is $702,045.77.

2. The individual amounts of compensation paid to each land owner to date are listed hereunder:

Owner	Final settlement $
Chester, Mary	1,439.00
Down, Stanley	78,000.00
Gibson & Thompson	1,320.00
Goodwin, Wm. Gordon	40,130.45
Griffin, W. A.	11,400.00
Hook, A. J.	73,966.69
Howell, James	11,792.43
Lockhart, James	2,200.00
Smith, William	3,925.00
Murray, John Alexander	21,485.89
Tabor, C. H.	23,750.00
Thornton, John	24,000.00
Werkema, J. C.	17,382.14
Birtch, Chas.	23,584.23
Dunn, Grace	10,175.00
Dunn, Rose	30,450.00
Dunn, William	12,205.34
Gardhouse, Wm.	18,854.85
Harwood, Gordon	18,900.00
Hewitt, Teddy C.	10,800.00
Hewitt, W. Ross	10,750.00
Holmes, Chas. Smith	10,000.00
McKay, Wilfred	18,448.39
O'Connor, Alice Maria	10,212.55
Symon, Robert	55,853.62
Van Emden, Peter	37,517.79
Windgrove, Doris & William	21,459.36
Boughner, Stanley	8,878.49
Brickwood, Alvin	9,512.90
Gofton, Glen	19,950.00
Julian, Fennel & Eleanor	1,650.00

Korevaar, Arthur	14,863.65
Marman, John	2,250.00
Neabel, Grace	2,450.00
Sitter, Lloyd & Mary	15,755.00
Kristensen, Margretta	678.00
Porter	12,000.00
Woodstock Go-Kart Club	6,500.00
Raper & Waugh	4,350.00
City of Woodstock (Lot 18 only)	2,700.00
Van Den Berg & De Haan	505.00

DEFENCE PRODUCTION EXPENDITURES, WESTERN PROVINCES

Question No. 2,806—**Mr. Schreyer:**

Of the total expenditure by the Department of Defence Production in the last fiscal year, what proportion of this amount was expended in (a) the three prairie provinces (b) British Columbia?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): The departmental record of prime contracts is maintained in accordance with the mailing address of the contractor. In a great many instances, the address of the contractor does not reflect where the actual work is carried out or the delivery point of the goods ordered by the consumer department or agency. Futhermore, such addresses do not reflect subcontracts or the sources of raw materials for the work involved.

Accordingly it is not possible to provide the statistical information.

*PERPETUAL LEASES IN NATIONAL PARKS

Question No. 2,814—**Mr. Woolliams:**

Will the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development take the appropriate action to have referred, pursuant to the provisions of section 55 of the Supreme Court Act, to the Supreme Court of Canada, the questions (a) whether the so-called perpetual leases in the national parks were legally granted by the crown (b) whether the government of Canada, acting through the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, has the power to refuse to renew the said leases in accordance with their terms?

Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): The answer to this question is as follows: (a) I am advised with respect to so-called perpetually renewable leases granted by the minister of the interior prior to the enactment of the National Parks Act in 1930, that the minister of the interior did not have the power to grant a right of renewal in those terms and therefore that portion of the leases was ultra vires his power and authority and cannot therefore be enforced.

Questions

(b) I am advised with respect to so-called perpetually renewable leases granted by the minister of the interior prior to the enactment of the National Parks Act in 1930, that the government of Canada, acting through the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, does not have the authority to renew the said leases so as to grant a lease of land which, in effect, would be renewable in perpetuity.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND NATIONAL PARK

Question No. 2,815—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. What was the total expenditure for the Prince Edward Island national park in each of the years ending March 31, 1955 to March 31, 1967?

2. In each of these years, what was the total number of prevailing wage-rate personnel employed?

3. When is it intended to enlarge the Prince Edward Island national park?

4. What is the location and extent of the areas to be added to the present park?

5. When is it intended to open an additional national park in Kings county, P.E.I.?

6. What is the area and location of the new park?

7. Has the Prince Edward Island government made available land for a national park in Western Prince Edward Island?

8. What is the location and extent of such a park?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):

1.

Year Ending	Operation & Maintenance	Capital
March 31, 1955	85,725	35,123
" " 1956	93,237	58,148
" " 1957	96,767	52,086
" " 1958	105,569	50,518
" " 1959	115,203	187,009
" " 1960	125,753	314,877
" " 1961	156,850	335,393
" " 1962	179,309	482,274
" " 1963	177,171	267,200
" " 1964	207,728	337,102
" " 1965	243,885	504,200
" " 1966	279,017	473,403
to Feb. 28, 1967	299,522	58,697 (to Feb. 1967)

(March figures not available)

2.

Year Ending	Total Number of Prevailing Rate Personnel Per Year (Seasonal and Project Employees)
March 31, 1955	54
" " 1956	63
" " 1957	59
" " 1958	90
" " 1959	130
" " 1960	120
" " 1961	169
" " 1962	224
" " 1963	157
" " 1964	158
" " 1965	147
" " 1966	100
Feb. 28, 1967	93

3. Consideration is being given at this time to enlargement of Prince Edward Island national park, but no specific date has been set.

[Mr. Haidasz.]

4. The areas under consideration cannot be defined specifically until studies and surveys of the area are completed later this year.

5. The matter of an additional national park is under discussion with the Prince Edward Island provincial government.

6. Details regarding the area and location of any proposed new national park cannot be released until discussions have been completed and approved by the federal and provincial governments.

7. No.

8. Not applicable—see number 7.

DISCUSSIONS PRECEDING PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT REGULATIONS

Question No. 2,819—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

1. Were any discussions or consultations held by the public service commission with staff associations or other representatives of the employees in the public service before the promulgation of the public service employment regulations?

2. If so (a) with whom were such discussions or consultations held (b) what, in detail, was the nature of the discussions or consultations?

3. If not, why were such discussions or consultations not held?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I have been given the following information by the Public Service Commission: 1. Yes.

2. (a) On January 30, 1967, the commission forwarded the draft public service employment regulations to the following staff associations, asking for their comments on the draft: (i) The Public Service Alliance of Canada, (ii) the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada, (iii) the Canadian Union of Postal Workers, (iv) the Letter Carriers Union of Canada, and (v) l'Association des fonctionnaires fédéraux d'expression française. (b) The Public Service Alliance of Canada, the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada and the Canadian Union of Postal Workers responded to the commission's invitation to comment on the draft regulations. The Public Service Alliance and the Canadian Union of Postal Workers commented in writing and the Professional Institute requested a meeting with the commission which was held on February 24, 1967.

3. Not applicable.

FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO CHARTERED BANKS FOR CASHING CHEQUES

Question No. 2,822—**Mr. Caouette:**

For the years 1963-64, 1964-65 and 1965-66, what was the total amount paid by the receiver general or, on his behalf, by the Bank of Canada, to cover the costs of cashing cheques or other instruments, for each chartered bank in Canada?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Under the provisions of section 93(2) of the Bank Act, no bank may make a charge "for cashing a cheque or other instrument drawn on the Receiver General or on his account in the Bank of Canada or in any other bank, or for cashing any other instrument issued as authority for the payment of money out of the consolidated revenue fund, or in respect of any cheque or other instrument drawn in favour of the Receiver General, the government of Canada or any department thereof or any public officer in his capacity as such, and tendered for deposit to the credit of the Receiver General."

The banks are, however, permitted to charge for cashing bond coupons and redeeming Canada savings bonds. The amounts paid for these services during the years in question are set out in the attached schedule.

Total amount paid to each chartered bank during the years 1963-64, 1964-65 and 1965-66 to cover cost of cashing bond coupons and redeeming Canada savings bonds.

Chartered Bank	1963-64 $	1964-65 $	1965-66 $
Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce	232,550.55	253,432.10	250,623.25
Bank of Montreal	204,060.05	216,206.48	207,618.12
Banque Canadienne Nationale	40,146.97	34,209.34	33,605.66
Bank of Nova Scotia	82,149.94	94,683.35	96,418.85
Banque Provinciale du Canada	35,199.84	34,199.68	32,071.60
Royal Bank of Canada	221,677.38	240,172.23	236,956.15
Toronto-Dominion Bank	100,532.26	111,063.99	108,893.86
Mercantile Bank of Canada	1,099.27	1,243.28	1,469.86

EXCISE TAXES ON CIGARETTES AND WINE

Question No. 2,824—**Mr. Caouette:**

What was the total amount collected in excise taxes during the years 1965-66, 1964-65 and 1963-64, in each province on (a) cigarettes (b) wine?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue and President of the Treasury Board):

EXCISE TAX COLLECTIONS
under parts IV and V
of the Excise Tax Act

CIGARETTES

PROVINCE	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66
Nova Scotia	297.92	221.62	351.98
Prince Edward Island	49.50	20.19	27.86
Newfoundland	160,187.10	135,011.25	116,572.46
New Brunswick	850.89	930.26	1,125.67
Quebec	199,610,391.10	196,964,713.32	175,398,576.65
Ontario	434,011.94	385,486.50	42,352,401.19
Manitoba	1,776.92	984.35	1,190.03
Saskatchewan	250.28	295.39	361.32
Alberta	404.11	543.48	1,150.59
British Columbia	3,200.86	6,891.44	3,909.55
Yukon Territory	14.00	25.91	27.70
	200,211,434.62	197,495,123.71	217,875,695.00

WINES

PROVINCE	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66
Nova Scotia	28,335.13	24,163.86	24,420.04
Prince Edward Island			
Newfoundland			
New Brunswick			
Quebec	3,811.00	4,567.22	2,501.87
Ontario	3,135,148.26	3,270,671.60	3,321,765.59
Manitoba			
Saskatchewan			
Alberta			10,872.31
British Columbia	646,832.84	792,691.38	1,042,043.20
Yukon Territory			
	3,814,127.23	4,092,094.06	4,401.603.01

Notes: Excise taxes on domestically manufactured cigarettes and wines are collected in the province where manufacture takes place. Excise tax on imported cigarettes is paid at the port where entry for consumption takes place. No breakdown is maintained by commodities of the amount of sales tax collected under part VI of the Excise Tax Act.

DELEGATION OF POWERS BY PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Question No. 2,826—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

1. Has the public service commission delegated to any deputy head the authority to perform any of the powers, functions or duties of the commission?

[Mr. Benson.]

2. If so (a) to what deputy heads (b) in respect of what positions (c) what terms and conditions were attached to each such delegation (d) what appointments have been made pursuant to such delegations?

3. Have one or more persons under the jurisdiction of any deputy head been authorized by the commission to exercise and perform any of the powers, functions or duties that a deputy head has been authorized by the commission to exercise and perform?

4. If so (a) what deputy head has jurisdiction (b) what is the name and position or title of each such person so authorized (c) what appointments have been made pursuant to such sub-delegation?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I have been given the following information by the Public Service Commission: 1. No.

2, 3, 4. Not applicable.

APPLICATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT REGULATIONS

Question No. 2,827—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

1. To what areas of Canada are (a) paragraph 4(1)(a) (b) paragraph 4(1)(b) of the public service employment regulations applicable?

2. To what areas of Canada is paragraph 4(2) of the public service employment regulations applicable?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I have been given the following information by the Public Service Commission: 1 and 2. Paragraphs 4(1)(a) and (b) and 4(2) are not applicable to any particular area of Canada except when the "public served by the unit" happens to be coincident with the whole population within a specified area. Thus, when making an appointment to a vacant position the commission determines the language composition of the public served by the unit where the vacancy occurs and, if that composition is such as to fall within the limits set by paragraphs 4(1)(a), 4(1)(b), or 4(2) respectively, the appropriate paragraph is applicable to that appointment.

MARKING SYSTEMS FOR RATING PUBLIC SERVICE CANDIDATES

Question No. 2,833—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

1. Where a numerical scoring device is used in rating candidates for a position in the public service (a) what marks are allotted to the candidate for the essential qualifications of the position (b) by what marking systems are the desirable qualifications possessed by a candidate reflected (c) by what systems are the appropriate marks for the degree of language proficiency reflected (d) must the appropriate marks for language proficiency be equal to ten per cent of the marks which may be attained for the essential qualifications or how and in what circumstances may they vary upwards or downwards from ten per cent?

2. Where a numerical scoring device is not used, how is each of the attributes mentioned in part 1 determined?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I have been given the following information by the Public Service Commission: 1 (a) Various marking systems are used for different competitions. In all systems, the marks awarded a candidate reflect the degree to which he possesses the qualifications being assessed. (b) A number of marks reflecting the degree to which the desirable qualifications are possessed by a candidate are added to the marks allotted to the candidate for the essential qualifications. (c) A number of marks, not exceeding the number that is equal to ten per cent of the maximum number of marks that may be attained for the essential qualifications are allotted to the candidate in accordance with his assessed language proficiency, where knowledge of both English and French is a desirable, rather than an essential, qualification. (d) The maximum attainable marks for language proficiency where knowledge of both English and French is a desirable qualification is ten per cent of the marks attainable for essential qualifications. The marks for language proficiency may vary downwards from 10 per cent depending upon the degree of language proficiency possessed by the candidate.

2. The selection board assesses essential and desirable qualifications in the manner it judges to be most appropriate to the competition.

"RESPONSIBLE STAFFING OFFICER" IN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Question No. 2,834—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

1. What persons have been authorized, pursuant to section 2 (1) (e) of the public service employment regulations, to exercise or perform the power, function or duty of "responsible staffing officer"?

2. What method or technique was used to authorize each such person to exercise or perform such power, function or duty?

3. Pursuant to what authority in the Public Service Employment Act was each such person so authorized?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I have been given the following information by the Public Service Commission: 1. The director general and officers of the staffing branch of the Public Service Commission.

2. The assignment of duties by the commission to its own officers includes the responsibilities assigned to the "responsible staffing officer" by the public service employment regulations.

3. No express statutory authority is required for the Public Service Commission to assign duties to its own officers.

CONSIDERATION OF QUALIFICATIONS CRITERIA BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SERVICE

Question No. 2,835—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

1. Have the criteria of "essential qualifications" or "desirable qualifications" been utilized by the former civil service commission, prior to the coming into force of the Public Service Employment Act?

2. If so (a) under what circumstances (b) subject to what conditions (c) pursuant to what authority?

3. Were the criteria "essential qualifications" or "desirable qualifications" discussed or outlined in

any submissions made or evidence given by members of the civil service commission to the joint special committee of the Senate and House of Commons on the public service?

4. If so, when?

5. If not, why did the commission refrain from disclosing these proposals to parliament?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I have been given the following information by the Public Service Commission: 1. Yes.

2. (a) and (b). Every statement of required qualifications prepared for a position or class of positions, prior to March 13, 1967 has differentiated between essential qualifications and desirable qualifications whenever the commission was of opinion that certain skills, types of knowledge or kinds of experience would be a relevant asset, although not an absolute requirement, in the performance of the duties of the position or class of positions to which appointments were to be made. (c) Pursuant to section 33 of the Civil Service Act, 1961.

3. Yes.

4. The significance and the application of "essential qualifications" and "desirable qualifications" were explained and discussed by Commissioner Sylvain Cloutier appearing as a witness before the joint special committee of the Senate and House of Commons on the public service, on November 3, 1966. His testimony is recorded in the minutes of proceedings and evidence of the committee, No. 16, on pages 764 to 766.

5. Not applicable.

EXTRADITION OF COMMONWEALTH CITIZENS

Question No. 2,840—**Mr. Lambert:**

Is the government considering a bill to give the Canadian government the right to refuse extradition in the case of Commonwealth citizens who are prosecuted in countries independent from the Commonwealth for offences of a rather political character?

[*Translation*]

Mr. D. S. MacDonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Insofar as the Department of External Affairs is concerned, no such legislation is under consideration, and none appears to be necessary. Extradition from Canada to other than Commonwealth countries is granted only pursuant to bilateral extradition agreements concluded with such countries. In such treaties it is the common practice to exclude specifically extradition for political offences. Moreover, under sections 21 and 22 of the Extradition Act (RSC 1952 Chap. 322), the Minister of Justice has discretion to refuse extradition whenever he determines that an offence is one of a political character. These considerations apply irrespective of whether or not the person concerned is a Commonwealth citizen.

[*English*]

STATISTICS RESPECTING ENGINEERS, DOCTORS AND DENTISTS

Question No. 2,841—**Mr. Isabelle:**

Is there any available tabulation of figures on graduations in Canada and flows to and from Canada of engineers, medical doctors, and dentists for the past three years?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce): (a) Number of University and College Graduates, Canada[1]

	Academic Year		
Course	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65[2]
Dentistry	259	258	286
Engineering	2,246	2,422	2,256
Medicine	826	773	1,034[3]

[1] includes graduates in the fall and spring of the academic year (e.g., graduates in the fall of 1962 and the spring of 1963). [2] subject to slight revision. [3] prior to 1964-65 l'Universite de Montreal and l'Universite Laval granted the M.D. degree only after the interne year. In 1964-65 they began to grant it before the interne year. For 1964-65, both institutions had two graduating classes.

(b) Number of engineers, medical doctors and dentists who immigrated to Canada:

	1963	1964	1965	1966
Professional Engineers	1,198	1,476	2,254	3,210
Physicians and Surgeons	687	668	792	995
Dentists	42	55	60	78

(c) Number of engineers, medical doctors and dentists who emigrated from Canada to U.S.A.*:

	1963	1964	1965
Professional Engineers	834	821	913
Physicians and Surgeons	472	405	390
Dentists	7	11	21

*Data on movement of persons from Canada is only available for those going to the United States.

Source: United States Immigration and Naturalization Service.

[*English*]

ARRANGEMENTS FOR SCHOOL BUSES GOING TO EXPO

Question No. 2,842—**Mr. Legault:**

Have arrangements been made by the government or the centennial commission with the province of Quebec and other provinces to permit school buses to travel to Expo '67 without commercial licences from each province to be travelled through, and with insurance companies to give coverage to these buses during the Expo period?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): No.

COAT OF ARMS ON CENTENNIAL MEDAL

Question No. 2,846—**Mr. Lambert:**

1. Does the Canadian coat of arms, dating from the royal proclamation of King George V, dated November 21, 1921, appear on the design of the centennial medal to be distributed to Canadian school children in 1967?

2. If not, what is the design of the armorial symbols apearing on the said medal and in what way does it differ from the Canadian coat of arms referred to in part 1?

3. Why is the said design being described as the Canadian coat of arms, and what is the authority for so describing it?

4. When was such design authorized and by whom?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the centennial commission as follows: 1. Yes.

2 and 3. Answered by 1.

4. The coat of arms was authorized by the above-mentioned proclamation and its use, surmounted by the St. Edward's Crown, was authorized by the government for use on various objects, including medals, on September 5, 1957.

SAFETY LEVELS FOR PESTICIDES

Question No. 2,848—**Mr. Noble:**

Will the government give consideration to establishing statutory safety limits in the use of two specific pesticides, aldrin and dieldrin, so that foods produced with their use would not carry the residue above health safety levels?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): The government has established tolerances (maximum permitted levels) for aldrin and dieldrin under the authority of the Food and Drugs Act in a number of foods. These tolerances were established only after very careful consideration of possible hazards to health.

PROVINCES UNDER CANADA ASSISTANCE PLAN

Question No. 2,852—**Mr. Stanbury:**

1. What provinces had taken advantage of the Canada assistance plan within a year after April 1, 1966, the date from which its benefits were available to the provinces?

2. From what dates have these benefits been passed on in each such province to its people?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. The Canada Assistance Plan provides federal support for welfare services, health services and child welfare services, as well as for social assistance; improvements in provincial programs in some of these areas have been made in all provinces since April 1, 1966. The provinces which have increased rates and coverage under their social assistance programs since April 1, 1966 are: Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan and British Columbia.

2. The dates from which the increased rates and extended coverage under provincial social assistance programs became effective are as follows: April 1, 1966, for the province of Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Quebec and Saskatchewan. January 1, 1967, for the province of New Brunswick. April 1, 1967, for the provinces of Ontario and British Columbia.

FOOTWEAR MANUFACTURERS AND IMPORTS

Question No. 2,854—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. What was the total quantity of shoes and other footwear manufactured in Canada in 1962 and in the first nine months of 1966?

2. What was the total quantity of shoes and other footwear imported into Canada in 1962 and in the first nine months of 1966?

3. What percentage quantity of total domestic consumption in each of these periods was imported and what percentage was manufactured in Canada?

4. If the percentage of total consumption met by imports increased during the nine month period in 1966, what steps are being taken to protect the Canadian industry and Canadian labour employed in the industry?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): 1, 2 and 3. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports the answers to these questions are as follows:

Questions

	January-December 1962	January-September 1966
	— number of pairs —	
Canadian production	62,752,458	47,444,127
Minus exports	2,384,675	931,881
Apparent Canadian consumption of footwear produced in Canada	60,367,783 (73.7%)	46,512,246 (65.0%)
Plus imports	21,573,278 (26.3%)	25,069,778 (35.0%)
Total apparent Canadian footwear consumption	81,941,061 (100.0%)	71,582,024 (100.0%)

4. The government departments concerned are following very carefully developments in the Canadian footwear market, and consult as required with representatives of the Canadian manufacturers.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAY COMPANIES

Question No. 2,857—**Mr. Latulippe:**

What were the amounts paid by the government of Canada as subsidies of all kinds or as compensation payments to (a) the Canadian National Railways (b) the Canadian Pacific Railway (c) other railways, if any, for the years 1964, 1965 and 1966?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): a,b,c. If by subsidies and compensation payments is meant payments to the railways in respect of certain specific authorizations by parliament, the following payments have been made:

Payments to railway and transportation companies based upon the Freight Rates Reduction Act and interim payments related to MacPherson commission recommendations, (FRRA and interim payments); payments to CNR and CPR equal to the annual cost of maintaining trackage between specified points in northern Ontario, (northern bridge subsidy); payments based upon the Maritime Freight Rates Act, (MFRA subsidy); payments related to the suspension of freight rate increases on export grain moving between certain ports on Georgian bay, great lakes, St. Lawrence river and the east coast, (At. and East).

Payments applicable to Railway Calendar Year 1964 (000)

	FRRA & Interim Payments	Northern Bridge Subsidy	MFRA Subsidy	At. & East Payments
Algoma Central & Hudson Bay Rly.	373			
Canada & Gulf Terminal	40		26	
Canada Steamship Lines	512			
CNR	39,297	3,266	12,515	
CPR	26,575	3,734	856	
Cumberland Railway Co.			639	
Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.	70			
Dominion Atlantic			381	
Great Northern Railway	4			
Grand Falls Central			308	
Midland Railway Co.	66			
Napierville Junction Rly. Co.	11			
New York Central	93			
Northern Alberta Railway Co.	1,143			
Ontario Northland Railway	2			
Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo	151			
	68,337	7,000	14,725	

Payments applicable to Railway Calendar Year 1965

(000)

	FRRA & Interim Payments	Northern Bridge Subsidy	MFRA Subsidy	At. & East Payments
Algoma Central & Hudson Bay Rly.	347			
Canada & Gulf Terminal	58		27	
Canada Steamship Lines	584			
CNR	51,173	3,251	12,850	
CPR	34,083	3,749	818	
Cumberland Railway Co.			699	
Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.	72			
Dominion Atlantic			370	
Great Northern Railway	11			
Grand Falls Central Railway Co.			289	
Midland Railway	95			
Napierville Junction Rly. Co.	11			
New York Central	72			
Northern Alberta Railway Co.	951			
Ontario Northland Railway	4			
Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo	190			
	87,651	7,000	15,053	

Payments applicable to Railway Calendar Year 1966 (Est.)

Algoma Central & Hudson Bay Rly.	445			
Canada & Gulf Terminal	86		30	
Canada Steamship Lines	728			
CNR	66,451	2,091	12,211	736
CPR	44,474	2,655	864	1,024
Cumberland Railway Co.			660	
Chesapeake & Ohio Rly. Co.	107			
Dominion Atlantic			235	
Great Northern Railway	9			
Grand Falls Central Railway Co.			289	
Midland Railway	137			
Napierville Junction Rly. Co.	15			
New York Central	82			
Northern Alberta Railway Co.	1,225			
Ontario Northland Railway	7			
Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo	207			
	113,973	4,746	14,289	1,760

In addition annual payments are made to Canadian National Railways related to operating deficits on ferry services for Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland, and between Yarmouth and Bar Harbour, and on the Victoria bridge at Montreal.

WHEAT BOARD PURCHASES IN MANITOBA AND SASKATCHEWAN

Question No. 2,861—**Mr. Rapp:**

How many bushels of wheat, oats and feed barley have been purchased by, or on behalf of, the Canadian Wheat Board in each month since January, 1967, in each of the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan?

Questions

Mr. Bruce S. Beer (For the Minister of Trade and Commerce):

	January	February (bushels)	March
Saskatchewan			
wheat	19,759,000	7,806,000	16,477,000
oats	332,000	373,000	484,000
barley[1]	948,000	956,000	1,911,000
Manitoba			
wheat	3,492,000	1,459,000	3,705,000
oats	307,000	210,000	327,000
barley[1]	437,000	324,000	681,000

[1]It is not possible to establish the final use of barley at the time of its delivery to the country elevator.

PERFORMING ARTS CENTRE, OTTAWA

Question No. 2,862—**Mr. Danforth:**

1. What is the estimated date of completion of the national centre for the performing arts building in Ottawa?
2. Is it planned that the finished edifice will contain space and accommodation especially at street level that may be utilized by private companies or corporations on a rental and lease basis and, if so, when and to whom should representations by interested parties be made?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Department of Public Works and the National Arts Centre Corporation as follows: 1. The prime construction contract is to be completed by December 31, 1968. Following this, there is to be a three month specialized equipment testing, coordination, and run-in period before the building becomes operational.

2. The finished edifice will provide space and accommodation, including the street level, that may be leased or otherwise used for purposes ancillary to the major purpose of the centre but the possibility of leasing to commercial enterprises has not been ruled out. This subject is being considered by the board of trustees and persons wishing to register their interest may do so by writing to the director, National Arts Centre Corporation.

FARMS IN CANADA

Question No. 2,864—**Mr. Godin:**

1. How many farms are there in Canada?
2. How many have electrical power?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. According to the Census of Agriculture, June 1, 1966, there were 430,522 census farms in Canada, which are defined as consisting of one acre or more with sales during the previous year of $50 or more. A considerable number of these farms are occupied by persons employed principally in occupations other than agriculture. Included in this number are 276,835 commercial census farms which are defined as consisting of one acre or more with sales during the previous year of $2,500 or more.

2. Information from the 1966 Census of Agriculture is not yet available on the number of farms having electrical power. However, as at June 1, 1961 there were 409,882 census farms reporting electrical power.

[*English*]

TELEPHONE COMPANIES IN CANADA

Question No. 2,866—**Mr. Godin:**

1. How many telephone communication companies are there in (a) Canada (b) each province?
2. How many subscribers does each of these companies have in (a) Canada (b) each province?
3. What were the revenues declared for income tax purposes by each of these companies in 1965 in (a) Canada (b) each province?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Departments of Trade and Commerce and National Revenue as follows: 1. (a) During 1965 there were 2,330 telephone communication companies in Canada. (b) Newfoundland 1, Prince Edward Island 5, Nova Scotia 127, New Brunswick 4, Quebec 141, Ontario 132, Manitoba 2, Saskatchewan 952, Alberta 961, British Columbia 5.

2. The number of subscribers is not available. However, the number of telephones excluding those on private branch exchange, extensions, public pay telephones and mobile telephones is as follows: (a) Canada total—5,189,453. (b) Newfoundland 65,992; Prince Edward Island 20,668; Nova Scotia 164,963; New Brunswick 124,529; Quebec 1,411,934; Ontario 1,978,036; Manitoba 262,873; Saskatchewan 243,420; Alberta 375,522; British Columbia 534,849; Northwest Territories 3,052; Yukon 3,615.

3. The information submitted by each company for income tax purposes is confidential and cannot be divulged.

*NEW POST OFFICE INSIGNIA

Question No. 2,869—**Mr. MacEwan:**

1. Has the postmaster general designed or has someone designed for him, a new insignia for use by the Post Office Department to replace the present coat of arms?
2. If so, when does he intend to introduce it?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Postmaster General): The answer to the first part of this question is no. The second part is not applicable.

JUDGE ADRIEN MEUNIER, QUEBEC

Question No. 2,870—**Mr. Allmand:**

1. Is Judge Adrien Meunier still receiving his salary as a judge of the Superior Court for the province of Quebec?

2. How many cases did he hear during 1966?

3. During that year did he carry on any other specific duties in his capacity as judge?

[*Translation*]

Hon. P.-E. Trudeau (Minister of Justice): 1. No. Mr. Justice Meunier was granted leave of absence from his judicial duties without pay from the first day of November, 1965, until further Order of His Excellency the Governor in Council.

2. None.

3. No.

[*English*]

MONTREAL OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF BANKRUPTCY

Question No. 2,871—**Mr. Allmand:**

1. What was the budget for the office of the superintendent of bankruptcy in the district of Montreal during 1966?

2. How many employees are employed by this office and what are their classifications?

3. Are there any lawyers in Montreal specifically charged with prosecutions under the Bankruptcy Act?

4. Are there any accountants in Montreal specifically engaged in the investigation of bankruptcies?

5. Does the R.C.M.P. conduct investigations under the Bankruptcy Act?

6. How many cases of fraudulent bankruptcies were investigated in Montreal during 1966?

7. What is the status of the investigation into the murder of lawyer Adrien Paquette?

Hon. John N. Turner (Registrar General): 1. During the period March 1, 1966 to December 31, 1966, the superintendent of bankruptcy had one investigator in Montreal and the expenditures of the bankruptcy branch for that period for the Montreal office were as follows:

Salaries	$10,222
Travelling	551
Telephone, Supplies, etc.	400
Total	$11,173

2. As of April 12, 1967, the staff of the office of the superintendent of bankruptcy comprised the following:

Classification—	
Branch director (Superintendent of bankruptcy)	1
Assistant branch directors (Assistant superintendents of bankruptcy)	2
Regional office director	1
Auditors	14
Investigators	6
Bankruptcy administration supervisory officers	5
Office manager	1
Stenographers	13
Clerks	8
Total	51

While the total establishment of the office of the superintendent of bankruptcy, as of April 12, 1967 provided for 69 positions, the establishment of the Montreal regional office was at that time as follows:

Regional office director	1
Auditors	7
Investigators	3
Stenographers	3
Clerk	1
Total	15

3. Prosecutions under the Bankruptcy Act for offences of an administrative character, whenever necessary, are conducted by the legal advisors of the federal Department of Justice in Montreal.

4. Yes.

5. Yes.

6. The expression "fraudulent bankruptcy" may be used to refer to a wide variety of undesirable situations. It may refer to irregularities on the part of debtors, creditors, inspectors, trustees or any other persons having some connection with bankruptcies. During the course of 1966, the office of the superintendent of bankruptcy, in some cases with the assistance of the R.C.M. Police, initiated in the metropolitan Montreal area more than 200 investigations into alleged irregularities connected with bankruptcies on the part of bankrupts, creditors, inspectors, trustees or other persons. This figure does not include investigations carried on by the provincial authorities or the Montreal municipal police or by trustees.

Questions

7. Investigations of this nature are the responsibility of the provincial authorities which are charged with the administration of criminal justice in the province.

TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT PURCHASES OF HELICOPTERS

Question No. 2,872—**Mr. McCutcheon:**

1. From what countries have helicopters been purchased for use by the Department of Transport?

2. Have any helicopters been purchased from France for the Department of Transport and, if so (a) how many (b) when were they purchased (c) what was the purchase price (d) were the purchases made as a result of tenders?

3. Are complete repair facilities for such helicopters available in Canada, and (a) if so, where (b) if not, what arrangements are necessary for repairs?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. United States and France.

2. Yes. (a) 3 Alouettes. (b) 1965-1966 (c) $181,400 each. (d) No.

3. No. (a) Not applicable. (b) Air frame overhaul conducted by Department of Transport facilities. A number of components can be overhauled in Canada. Sud Aviation is now conducting a survey to determine which companies can overhaul more of these components. Engine and main transmission and tail rotor gear boxes must still be returned to the factory in France.

MANITOBA REPRESENTATIVE ON HISTORIC SITES BOARD

Question No. 2,874—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Has any change been made in Manitoba's representative on the historic sites and monuments board?

2. If so, what was the nature of the change and for what reason was it made?

3. What was the name and credentials of the former representative?

4. What is the name and the credentials of the present incumbent?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. It is hoped that an announcement can be made as to the new representative in the near future.

2. Term expired.

3. Professor W. D. Smith, M.A.

4. N/A.

[Mr. Turner.]

AIR CANADA PLANES AWAITING ENGINES

Question No. 2,875—**Mr. Ormiston:**

1. How many planes now being held by Air Canada are unable to be placed in service because of engine shortage?

2. What are the types of these planes and the number of each?

3. What types of engine are usually supplied for these types of plane and where are they manufactured?

4. Is it possible to substitute Rolls Royce engines for the original types?

5. Has any attempt been made to acquire engines from any alternative source?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Air Canada advises as follows: 1. None.

2, 3, 4 and 5. Not applicable.

SUPPLY OF BUFFALO MEAT

Question No. 2,876—**Mr. McLelland:**

Is there at this time a supply of buffalo meat available at 42 cents per lb. which can be obtained for special events during centennial year and, if so, is this meat in storage or are the animals to be slaughtered at a later date?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. No. The limited supply has already been allocated to groups wishing to serve buffalo meat at non-commercial centennial celebrations. The animals were slaughtered during the winter in national park buffalo herd reduction programs and the meat is presently being distributed at 42 cents per pound to groups which responded to the offer contained in my press release of February 28, 1967.

POLICY RESPECTING TRUSTEES IN BANKRUPTCY

Question No. 2,879—**Mr. Lambert:**

1. When is it anticipated that a decision will be reached and announced by the government as to the qualifications for and nominations of new trustees in bankruptcy?

2. What is the date of the decision taken many months ago not to appoint further trustees until a new policy with respect thereto had been decided upon?

3. How many applications for such positions are presently outstanding?

Hon. John N. Turner (Registrar General): 1. The policy regarding the licensing of trustees under the Bankruptcy Act is a question which is being looked into by the advisory committee on bankruptcy legislation that has been appointed in February of 1966. While awaiting the report of this committee,

it has been decided to adopt an interim policy that will permit the licensing of none but the very best of the individuals that have shown an interest in becoming trustees. It is expected that it will be possible to announce what this interim policy will be within the next two months or so. It may be added that there is no indication that the public interest has suffered in any way as a result of the lack of new appointees.

2. The decision not to appoint new trustees under the Bankruptcy Act was taken very shortly after the appointment of Mr. Roger Tassé as Superintendent of Bankruptcy in April of 1965.

3. Fifty-eight.

Questions

HOUSING CORPORATION STATISTICS

Question No. 2,886—**Mr. Tucker:**

1. How many direct loans were made by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation in the years 1965 and 1966?

2. How many applications for loans have been received from January 1, 1967, to April 15, 1967?

3. What was the total number of houses built under the National Housing Act in 1964, 1965, and 1966?

4. What is the total amount of money made available by the government under the National Housing Act in the years 1964, 1965, and 1966?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour):

1.

Gross Loans Approved by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation:

		1965		1966		
			Amount			Amount
Item	Loans	Units	($000)	Loans	Units	$(000)
New Housing—NHA, Sect. 40	28,754	31,451	431,702	29,133	32,481	478,868
Other sections	80	2,491	29,694	127	5,079	65,538
Existing Housing—NHA, Sect. 40	2	2	25	8	8	80
Other sections	25	1,719	21,692	21	1,300	16,340
Other purposes	202	—	56,535	217	—	84,781
Total	29,063	35,663	539,648	29,506	38,868	645,607

2. Applications for C.M.H.C. Loans, January 1—April 15, 1967 (Dwelling Units):

Item	Number
New Housing—NHA, Sect. 40	16,987
New Housing—NHA, Sect. 40 Other sections	747
Existing Housing—All sections, NHA	1,326
Total	19,060

3. Dwelling Starts and Completions Under the National Housing Act (Dwelling Units):

Item	1964	1965	1966
Starts	53,396	54,919	51,126
Completions	51,183	45,494	59,877

4. Funds Committed by the Government Under the National Housing Act

Item	1964 ($000)	1965 ($000)	1966 ($000)
Loans Approved	442,074	539,648	645,607
Grants and Investments Approved	22,317	12,493	30,777
Total	464,391	552,141	676,384

SYMBOLS USED BY POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Question No. 2,889—**Mr. McCleave:**

Which of the following symbols are being used by the Post Office Department this year (a) the Coat of Arms of Canada (b) Maple Leaf, containing the intertwined letters "C.P." (c) an oval containing three maple leaves branching from one stem (d) a ring of ten maple leaves surmounted by a crown surrounding the intertwined letters "C.P." (e) a circle containing the words "Postes Canada Post" followed by five wavy lines (f) a ring containing the words "Servire Populo" surmounted by a crown and encircling a maple leaf with the letters "C.P." intertwined within the maple leaf?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Postmaster General): (a), (b), (d), (e) and (f) are being used this year. (c) is not being used.

FRENCH EDITION OF "AUDIT OFFICE GUIDE"

Question No. 2,891—**Mr. Grégoire:**

1. Was or is Audit Office Guide, Catalogue No. FA3-258, published by the Queen's Printer, available in French and, if not, for what reason?

2. Is it intended to publish this volume in French and, if not, for what reason?

Questions

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): The Auditor General's office advises as follows: 1. No French edition of the Audit Office Guide was prepared, presumably because there was no demand for it. The last edition of this guide which was released in January, 1958, is now out of print.

2. No, because this volume must be revised. Important changes have been and are continuing to be made in the financial management of departments of government. When these changes are substantially complete, the intention is that the Audit Office Guide be revised and a new edition released. The next edition will be made available in both official languages.

INDIAN AFFAIRS LAND PURCHASE, TERRACE, B.C.

Question No. 2,897—**Mr. Pugh:**

1. Did the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development purchase some 20 acres of land in Terrace, B.C., since the beginning of the present year?

2. If so, what was the price paid, and who was the vendor?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS ON CANADIAN SERVICEMEN IN EUROPE

Question No. 2,899—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

1. What is the reason that Canadian servicemen in Europe are denied the right to visit several European countries including the U.S.S.R., Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Romania?

2. Will the government give consideration to giving Canadian servicemen in Europe the same rights to visit these countries that the servicemen of the U.S.A. have?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Associate Minister of National Defence): 1. NATO travel control requirements apply equally to all personnel serving under NATO. Each application made by Canadian servicemen for travel to the countries listed is assessed on its relationship to security.

2. As stated above, Canadian servicemen have the same visiting rights as United States servicemen under NATO with one exception, i.e. visits to Berlin. The subject of easing restrictions on visits to Berlin by Canadian servicemen is under review.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

RETURNING OFFICER, ROBERVAL CONSTITUENCY, QUE.

Question No. 2,900—**Mr. Gauthier:**

Has a new returning officer been appointed for the constituency of Roberval, which remained unchanged in the last redistribution, and, if so (a) for what reason (b) what is the name of the new returning officer?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Yes.

(a) Mr. Édouard Duchesne, who held this position, has reached retirement age.

(b) Mr. Roland Dion, 213 des Érables, Dolbeau, P.Q.

[*English*]

REFORESTED LAND IN QUEBEC

Question No. 2,901—**Mr. Gauthier:**

Of the 1,850,000 acres in Canada that were reforested from 1900 to 1965, as reported by the Minister of Forestry and Rural Development, how many are in the province of Quebec?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry and Rural Development): 151,940 acres.

ENGINEERING REPORTS, PEMBINA RIVER PROJECT

Question No. 2,902—**Mr. Muir (Lisgar):**

1. Has the international joint commission received all the necessary engineering reports in regard to the Pembina river project in Manitoba and North Dakota?

2. Has the commission approved these reports and, if so, is it now in a position to indicate when the project can be proceeded with?

3. Where will the dam projects be located, what are the estimated costs and when does the government expect that tenders for construction of the projects will be called?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): In so far as the Department of External Affairs is concerned: 1. The International Joint Commission has received the report of the international Pembina river engineering board.

2. The International Joint Commission is now considering the terms of the report and recommendations that it is to make to the Canadian and United States governments.

3. When the governments receive the recommendations of the commission, they will be in a position to consider what action should be taken on them.

AIR TRAFFIC, REGINA AND SASKATOON

Question No. 2,903—**Mr. Watson (Assiniboia):**

1. How many scheduled Air Canada flights were there out of Regina airport in 1965 and in 1966?

2. How many scheduled Air Canada flights were there out of Saskatoon airport in 1965 and in 1966?

3. How many passengers arrived and departed from the Regina airport in 1965 and in 1966?

4. How many passengers arrived and departed from the Saskatoon airport in 1965 and in 1966?

5. How many scheduled flights were there by other airlines that operate on a time schedule from these airports in the years 1965 and 1966?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. There were 2,938 scheduled Air Canada flights out of Regina airport in 1965 and 3,037 in 1966 (regular and extra sections).

2. There were 2,296 scheduled Air Canada flights out of Saskatoon airport in 1965 and 2,530 in 1966 (regular and extra sections).

3. The number of passengers enplaned at Regina airport on scheduled and other unit toll services was 81,078 in 1965 and 93,220 in 1966. From a 15.3 per cent (approximately) sample, it is estimated that in 1965 120,519 passengers arrived, 80,230 deplaned and 121,-367 departed, and that in 1966 141,830 passengers arrived, 92,420 deplaned and 142,630 departed.

4. The number of passengers enplaned at Saskatoon airport on scheduled services was 53,194 in 1965 and 61,736 in 1966. From a 15.3 per cent (approximately) sample, it is estimated that in 1965 80,725 passengers arrived, 51,643 deplaned and 82,725 departed, and that in 1966 91,318 passengers arrived, 60,328 deplaned and 92,726 departed.

5. The number of flights operated on a time schedule by airlines other than Air Canada out of Regina airport was 900 in 1965 and 1,350 in 1966. Out of Saskatoon airport, the number of scheduled and extra flights other than those of Air Canada was 985 in 1965 and 1,049 in 1966.

IMPLEMENTATION OF METRIC SYSTEM

Question No. 2,910—**Mr. Stefanson:**

Is the government giving consideration to implementing the metric system in Canada and, if so, what steps have been taken towards this and what further steps are now contemplated?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce): Please refer to answer given to question No. 2,353 as tabled in *Hansard* No. 198 of February 1, 1967, page 12516, which reads as follows: "No. There is no comprehensive program at present to promote the wider use of the metric system in Canada. Encouragement is being given to the study of the subject in various sectors of Canadian industry, particularly with respect to the impact on export trade. Any consideration of the adoption of the metric system of measurement must take into account the requirements in Canada's main export markets and practices in the countries which are the principal sources of Canadian imports of technology."

N.C.C. ATTENDANCE AT EASTERN ONTARIO DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL MEETINGS

Question No. 2,911—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

1. Did any member or official of the national capital commission attend any of the meetings or functions of the eastern Ontario development council at Ottawa on April 19, 1967?

2. If so, what members or officials?

3. If not, why did the national capital commission overlook the opportunity of contact and discussion with the mayors, reeves and municipal councillors of all municipalities in the national capital region and of other parts of eastern Ontario?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): 1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Chairman of National Capital Commission received a notification, not an invitation, of the meeting and a card which was to be returned indicating whether or not he could attend. Having previous commitments, card was returned regretting inability to attend meeting.

CORPORATION TO TAKE OVER DOSCO COAL OPERATION

Question No. 2,914—**Mr. Douglas:**

When the crown corporation proposed by the federal government to take over the DOSCO coal operation is established, is it the intention of the government to have the present miners' pension continued?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The matter of pensions is one of the many items to be dealt with in the legislation dealing with the new crown corporation, to be introduced in the house in the near future.

AIRFIELD EXTENSION, WIARTON, ONT.

Question No. 2,915—**Mr. Noble:**

1. Is it the intention of the Department of Transport to extend the Wiarton airfield?

2. If so, would regular air travel service be made available?

Questions

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. There are no present plans to extend the runways at Wiarton airport.

2. Not applicable.

NATIONAL PARKS

Question No. 2,918—**Mr. Southam:**

1. What was the total attendance in Canada's national parks in the years 1964, 1965 and 1966?

2. What plans has the government for the development of further national parks in Canada in the years 1967, 1968 and 1969, and where will they be located?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Fiscal years, 1964/65, 9,179,028; 1965/66, 9,845,283; 1966/67, 11,367,912.

2. Negotiations are currently under way for the possible establishment of several new national parks. It is hoped that agreements will be reached for at least one new national park in each of the years 1967, 1968 and 1969. However, because under present policy land for new national parks must be turned over to the federal government free of all encumbrances by the provincial government concerned it is considered it would not be in the public interest to identify specific sites until a joint announcement can be made by the federal and provincial governments.

EXPANSION OF AIR TRANSPORT FACILITIES FOR CENTENNIAL YEAR

Question No. 2,919—**Mr. Southam:**

1. What plans has the government under the air transport policy to step up Canada's national air passenger, air express, and air freight service in keeping with demand in Canada's centennial year?

2. Will runways suitable to accommodate jet planes be developed at the Regina air terminal in 1967 in time to allow the servicing of passenger and tourist travel to and from Canada's world fair at Montreal.

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Close contact with air lines has been maintained for this purpose.

2. The Regina airport is capable of accommodating jet aircraft at the present time.

REMUNERATION TO PROFESSOR NORMAN WARD

Question No. 2,921—**Mr. Cowan:**

What remuneration has been paid Professor Norman Ward of the University of Saskatchewan,

[Mr. Noble.]

for the following services (a) as a member of the committee on election expenses (b) as a member of the electoral boundaries commission for Saskatchewan (c) as a commentator on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation networks?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Representation Commissioner, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and my department as follows: (a) March 1965 to November 1966: $5,412.50. (b) $2,200. (c) It has not been customary to require the C.B.C. to disclose payments to individuals.

INSTRUCTIONS TO MANPOWER CENTRES ON ANTI-DISCRIMINATION POLICIES

Question No. 2,922—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Were instructions issued to all Canada manpower centres by the Canada manpower division of the Department of Manpower and Immigration, on or about December 4, 1966, and February 27, 1967, the effect of which was to cancel all directives and instructions previously issued to the national employment service offices by the Unemployment Insurance Commission and the Department of Labour, with respect to the Canada Fair Employment Practices Act and its anti-discrimination policies?

2. Will the Minister of Manpower and Immigration table copies of the instructions issued to the Canada manpower centres on or about December 4, 1966, and February 27, 1967, by the Canada Manpower Division?

Mr. J. C. Munro (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. No. The instructions on anti-discrimination measures are included in employment circular No. 233-1 which remains in effect.

2. Yes. They will be tabled today by the minister.

FIREBOAT PROTECTION, MONTREAL HARBOUR

Question No. 2,923—**Mr. Peters:**

Is there any real fireboat protection for the port of Montreal during Expo '67 and, if not, has the Minister of Transport conducted or does he intend to conduct a study of the feasibility of equipping the National Harbours Board tug, *Sir Hugh Allan* which is located at Montreal, as a fireboat fully equipped with a fire nozzle tower and other up-to-date firefighting equipment?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: Fireboat services are available at Montreal harbour. The use of the *Sir Hugh Allan* as a fireboat is not considered to be practical.

INDUSTRIAL MISSION TO FRANCE

Question No. 2,924—**Mr. Schreyer:**

1. Did a specially constituted Canadian government industrial mission travel to France in 1966?
2. If so (a) what was the purpose of this mission (b) what was the cost of this special mission and what was the cost per major item (c) what results have been achieved as a result to date?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. A Canadian economic mission to France was staged during the period June 3 to June 16, 1966.

2. (a) The objective of the mission was to promote closer economic and trade relations between France and Canada by drawing to the attention of the respective business communities in each country the prospective benefits to be derived from closer relationships with counterparts in the other country, both at the individual company level and at the trade or industry association level. The mission examined and reported upon prospects for expansion, on a reciprocal basis, of technical co-operation at the industry level, of investment and of continuing links between like national organizations.

(b) The total cost of the mission was $41,121.88. Of this $15,586.48 was spent for transportation, $22,943.97 for accommodation, $1,800.75 for receptions, $361.30 for printing of publicity and brochures, freight, express, stationery and other miscellaneous costs $429.38.

(c) Results are to be measured by the degree and extent to which individual members of the respective business communities, or their group organizations, take steps to intensify past and establish new relationships with counterparts in the other country. The report has been widely distributed within Canada and the response from trade and industrial associations, and from chambers of commerce and boards of trade, on behalf of their memberships has been very gratifying. A similar response has been noted in France.

Government will of course do all that it can to encourage, further and facilitate initiatives taken by private business. For example, this department is enlarging its program of participation in trade fairs in France and is increasing its trade missions vis-à-vis France. For its part, the government of France is actively encouraging closer economic and trade relations between its businessmen and ours: more than 50 French businessmen and professional groups are on record with the business development bureau of Expo 67 there will be a series of "technical weeks" at which prospects for increased relationship in a succession of industry sectors will be examined.

DEFENCE AND ENERGY COMMISSION PAY RATES

Question No. 2,927—**Mr. Schreyer:**

What are the current pay rates of the Canadian defence establishment, Beausejour, Manitoba, and the Atomic Energy Commission establishment at Whiteshell, Manitoba, for the following job classifications: labourer; painter; plumber; electrician; carpenter; mechanic; heavy equipment operator; driver (heavy); driver?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): In so far as the Department of National Defence is concerned the current rate of pay of the Canadian defence establishment, Beauséjour, Manitoba for the classes mentioned is as follows:

	per hr.
Labourer	$1.85
Painter	2.50
Plumber	2.90
Electrician	3.00
Carpenter	2.65
Mechanic (motor)	2.05
Heavy equipment operator	2.30
Driver (heavy)	2.05
Driver	1.90

In so far as Atomic Energy of Canada is concerned: Pursuant to recently concluded collective agreement—

	per hr.
Labourer/janitor	2.13
Driver	2.43

Rates payable under current collective agreement being renegotiated and before conciliation board—

	per hr.
Painter (spray)	2.66
Painter (normal)	2.58
Plumber	2.97
Electrician	2.97
Carpenter	2.91
Mechanic (machinists & millwrights)	2.97
Mechanic (automotive)	2.97
Heavy equipment operator	
Shovel operator	2.94
Mobile crane operator	2.46
Loader operator	2.39
Farm tractor operator	2.13
Driver (heavy)	2.46

Orders for Returns

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

PURCHASES IN CANADA IN SUPPORT OF WAR IN VIET NAM

Question No. 2,595—**Mr. Southam:**

1. What is the direct impact upon the Canadian economy of foreign purchases in support of military activity in Viet Nam, in terms of (a) quantities of Canadian raw materials, semi-finished products, finished products, components (b) export value, in the same categories (c) direct employment of Canadian citizens?

2. What is the current and the long term impact of the above, on the basis of contracts which have been (a) arranged or sponsored directly by the government of Canada or any of its agencies (b) allocated by foreign corporations to their own Canadian subsidiaries (c) arranged directly on the corporate initiative of Canadian-controlled companies?

3. To what extent are Canadian exports (as described in part 1 (a) above) being purchased by or on behalf of any foreign government (a) to replace other supplies or products thereby released for direct use in the Viet Nam conflict (b) to assist in the training of any foreign government's armed forces for the Viet Nam conflict?

4. What is the government of Canada now doing, or proposing to do, to ensure that (a) Canadian controlled companies, including banks (b) Canadian subsidiaries of foreign corporations, are able in their individual corporate capacities to make and give effect to decisions appropriate to the functioning of their usual business operations—all within the framework of Canada's own foreign policy and without 'direction' or 'persuasion' from governmental or corporation sources in any foreign country?

Return tabled.

FEDERAL ADVERTISING PLACEMENTS

Question No. 2,633—**Mr. Schreyer:**

1. Is all government of Canada advertisement placements administered through one co-ordinating office, or is this a matter for each department or agency to administer?

2. What is the name of the director or directors in charge of government of Canada advertisement placement?

3. What is the budget for advertising for each department and agency of government in the current fiscal year?

4. How many advertising agencies are retained on account of the government of Canada and what are the names of these agencies and how much has been paid to each in this and the preceding fiscal year?

5. Of the total number of advertising agencies holding an account with the government of Canada, how many were holding government accounts in (a) 1961 (b) 1964?

Return tabled.

[Miss LaMarsh.]

COMMISSIONS ON SALES OF EXPO TICKETS AND PASSPORTS

Question No. 2,663—**Mr. Webb:**

1. What organizations are eligible to receive a commission on the advance sale of Expo tickets or passports?

2. What is the total commission paid to date?

3. Who were the recipients of the commissions paid to date?

Return tabled.

FEDERAL COMMERCIAL OFFICES ABROAD

Question No. 2,714—**Mr. Allard:**

1. In what countries does Canada maintain commercial government offices, services or agencies?

2. Are these commercial branches located in Canadian embassy offices or outside embassy offices?

3. What are the functions and the operations of these commercial branches?

4. In each of these countries, how many employees of Canadian origin and how many locally hired employees does Canada retain and pay?

5. In each of these countries, how many employees working in the commercial branch (a) speak French as their mother tongue (b) speak English as their mother tongue (c) are bilingual in terms of Canada's two official languages (d) speak French or English and another language which is not one of Canada's two official languages?

6. In those countries and cities in which Quebec has representatives or commercial offices, is there any collaboration or consultation between the Quebec representatives and Canada's commercial representatives?

7. In what language do Canadian government commercial offices advertise abroad?

8. How do the employees of these commercial branches go about interesting foreigners in doing business or investing in certain Canadian provinces?

Return tabled.

CONTRACTS WITHOUT TREASURY BOARD APPROVAL

Question No. 2,725—**Mr. Schreyer:**

1. Since February, 1965, in how many instances did the Department of Transport and the Department of Defence production enter into contracts involving amounts in excess of $25,000 without the approval of treasury board?

2. In cases of entering into contract without treasury board approval, were tenders called in each case?

3. How many contracts were let without tender being called and what was the value of each?

4. By what authority does the Department of Transport and the Department of Defence Production enter into contracts exceeding $15,000 value without treasury board approval?

Return tabled.

DISPOSAL OF CAMP WAINWRIGHT BUILDINGS

Question No. 2,761—**Mr. Brand:**

1. How many bids were received on the 71 buildings from Camp Wainwright, Alberta, recently sold by Crown Assets Disposal Corporation?

2. What are the names of those individuals or groups who submitted tenders?

3. Who was awarded the tender and what was the amount of the successful tender?

4. In deciding the successful tender was any consideration given to charitable or community organizations in preference to those who are interested mainly in speculative purchasing?

Return tabled.

JUDGMENT OF BIDDERS ON GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Question No. 2,779—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. What criteria does the government use in judging the financial stability of persons bidding on government projects?

2. What method does the government use to determine the capacity of the bidder to complete work within a prescribed deadline?

Return tabled.

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

Question No. 2,817—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. What are the components of the consolidated revenue fund?

2. What specific use is made of the consolidated revenue fund?

3. How many warrants were issued to obtain money from the consolidated revenue fund (a) during the years 1964, 1965 and 1966 (b) in what amount in each case (c) for what purpose in each case?

4. What factors are used to determine the urgency and the necessity of obtaining money from the consolidated Revenue fund?

Return tabled.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES ON ALCOHOLISM

Question No. 2,820—**Mr. Caouette:**

What was the total amount spent by the federal government for the years 1965-66, 1964-65 and 1963-64, in each province, for the (a) rehabilitation of alcoholics (b) education of the population with regard to alcoholism?

Return tabled.

EXPENDITURES OF DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Question No. 2,823—**Mr. Caouette:**

In the following departments and agencies: Agriculture, Citizenship and Immigration, Finance, Fisheries, Forestry and Rural Development, Industry, Mines and Technical Surveys, National Health and Welfare, Northern Affairs and National Resources, Post Office, Public Works, Trade and Commerce, Transport, Unemployment Insurance Commission, Veterans Affairs, Farm Credit Corporation, Industrial Development Bank (a) what was the total amount spent by these departments or agencies during the years 1965-66, 1964-65 and 1963-64 (b) what was the total amount paid by such departments to interested taxpayers, as loans, grants, etc., for the years 1965-66, 1964-65 and 1963-64 (c) what amount was paid in each province, during the same years?

Return tabled.

"TWENTY ETHNIC SONGS FROM WESTERN CANADA"

Question No. 2,873—**Mr. Mandziuk:**

1. How many copies of the booklet "Twenty Ethnic Songs from Western Canada" were published and at what cost?

2. Are other such publications planned by the Secretary of State?

3. On what authoritative basis have the Doukhobors and Mennonites been designated as ethnic groups in Canada?

4. What cultural organizations or scholars were consulted about the material in said booklet?

Return tabled.

RESTORATION OF LOUISBOURG FORTRESS

Question No. 2,877—**Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway):**

1. At the time contracts were awarded for the restoration of the Fortress of Louisbourg, did the government deal with any of the following firms or their agents in Sydney and/or locally in Louisbourg and district: J. W. Stephens Ltd.: Chappells Ltd.; M. R. Chappell; Maritime Cement; Atlantic Spring and Machine; Canadian General Electric; Northern Electric; Imperial Oil; Irving Oil Co.; Municipal Ready Mix; D. & B. Concrete; Steel City Sales; Canadian Pittsburg Ltd.; Mira Lumber Co.; Dominion Rubber Co.; Canadian Johns-Manville; Warrander Photographic Services; Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co.; Kirshner Camera Supplies; Parl Photo Services; Canadian Kodak Sales; Hudson Photographic Industries and, if so, with what firms or what agents for what firms in Sydney and/or Louisbourg and district?

2. What were the details of the services and/or materials provided for the Fortress of Louisbourg restoration project by (a) Donald Beaver, September 18, 1961, $1,000; November 15, 1961, $4,000; August 6, 1962, $2,250 and $300; September 13, 1962, $3,500; April 24, 1963, $300; December 4, 1963, $300; December 18, 1963, $300 (b) M. R. Chappell, September 13, 1962, $400; August 27, 1962, $725; March 27, 1963, $440 (c) MaCaulays Garages, October 25, 1961, $13,144 (purchase order No. 17344) (d) Island Motors, January 23, 1962, $4,103.40 (purchase order No. 20980); April 15, 1965, $500 (purchase order No. 32900) (e) Mrs. D. Pearl MaCaulay, June 27, 1962, $14,850 (purchase order No 04517) (f) Lewis and Company, April 1, 1964, $2,000 (purchase order No. 22153-2); February 28, 1966, $2,000 (purchase order No. 40742) (g) William Dalton, June 14, 1962, $1,200 and $962?

Return tabled.

Inquiries of the Ministry

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

STEVEN TRUSCOTT—CONSIDERATION OF GRANTING OF PAROLE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General I direct my question to the Prime Minister. It has to do with the decision reached by the Supreme Court of Canada in the Truscott case which finalizes the legal proceedings and in my view denies any further consideration by parliament in any way.

However, there still remains the question of parole. Is the Prime Minister in a position to say whether the parole board is now examining this question, and when we may expect a decision? I ask this within the general purview of the usual course of the Queen's mercy being granted during celebration years, and particularly in this centennial year. Is the government giving consideration to a general examination of the records of those now in penal institutions with a view to having their sentences reduced and releases granted?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman has asked me two questions. The first refers specifically to a case which was submitted by the government to the Supreme Court of Canada. That court was asked to answer certain questions. The court has done that, and I have nothing to say in respect of that particular report from the Supreme Court.

In respect of the larger question of commutation during centennial year, I should not like to say anything at this moment. I will be glad to discuss the matter with the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General. It has a wider connotation than the particular case under consideration.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, will the Prime Minister say whether there has been discussion with the members of the parole board as to the release on parole of Steven Truscott?

Mr. Pearson: I cannot answer that question as to whether or not there has been any discussion with the parole board. Certainly this has not been discussed by me, and in order to answer I would have to check with the ministers directly concerned. It must be understood by the house that it is a very delicate matter for the government to intervene with the parole board in respect of the commutation of sentence.

[Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway).]

Mr. Diefenbaker: So there will be no misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker, let me say that there is no suggestion of intervention but rather a simple question in respect of what information the government can provide.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Prime Minister whether the government will consider discussing with the parole board the possibility of acting in this case under section 8 of the Parole Act?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to look into that particular possibility.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): I have a further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether the government will consider referring those aspects arising in the Truscott case which were not before the Supreme Court of Canada to the committee on justice and legal affairs.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I certainly would not like to deal with that particular matter at this moment during orders of the day.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GREECE—INQUIRY AS TO MAINTENANCE OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, asking him whether the government of Canada is continuing diplomatic relations with the new régime in Greece, and whether he has anything to report as to the relationship between the government of Canada and the new régime.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I may have something to say in greater detail later in the week. At this time there has been no change in the position of the head of state of Greece and consequently Canada as well as certain other friendly governments continue to have diplomatic relations with that government.

Mr. Douglas: I have a supplementary question. Have any representations been made to

the new régime in Greece particularly in respect of the safety of political prisoners and the rescinding of the provision which eliminated the death penalty for political prisoners? If so, what replies have been received?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The Canadian chargé d'affaires in Athens has made inquiries about one particular situation and in respect of the security of certain other political personalities. The responses available to us in all cases have been that their security has not been imperilled.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

DAIRY POLICY—PROPOSED MARCH ON OTTAWA BY FARMERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

In view of the fact that the Canadian Federation of Agriculture is organizing a march on Ottawa for the 24th of this month, is the minister now considering the possibility of changing or improving the dairy policy announced by the government on April 1 last?

[*English*]

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I have had meetings with the dairy farmers of Canada and other farm representatives. If any change were to be announced it would of course be announced in the house or otherwise in the proper way.

FINANCE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON TAXATION COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING MINING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Bert Leboe (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. Since there is a great deal of concern over the postponement or cancellation of many projects in British Columbia, particularly in the mining industry, amounting to close to $500 million, I wonder whether the minister has anything to report on this matter. This has to do with the report of the Carter commission.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): I have no report to make today, Mr. Speaker.

FISHERIES

INQUIRY AS TO ESTABLISHMENT OF GEOGRAPHIC CO-ORDINATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs which may not have an unfamiliar ring to him. I would like to ask whether the "soon" he has mentioned has arrived and whether this is the day in this session when he can tell us what has happened about the establishment of base line co-ordinates for our fishing zones.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Pretty soon, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

COAL

ALBERTA—NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING FREIGHT RATES ON SHIPMENTS TO JAPAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport and ask if he could inform the house what progress, if any, has been made in the negotiations between the coal interests in Alberta and the C.P.R. relating to certain freight rates in connection with a possible contract for the purchase of coal by Japan.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can give a brief answer to this important question, but I can assure the hon. gentleman and the house that it is being given the most urgent consideration by the government.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—SUGGESTED EXTENSION OF PROPOSED PAUSE IN BOMBING

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, is the Secretary of State for External Affairs in a position to inform the house whether he has received any favourable support from any of the nations involved in connection with the suggestions made by the Canadian government regarding the situation in Viet Nam? Has any representation been made to Washington by the government of Canada in the past 10 days

suggesting that a pause of one day to be made at this time be extended over a period of weeks to enable the possibility of a resort to the conference table?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there have been recent discussions between the government of Canada and particular governments involved in the situation in Viet Nam. In so far as the government of the United States is concerned, in the suggestions that were made by the Canadian government based on the Geneva accords for a physical disengagement in the demilitarized zone, the government of Canada pointed out that this involved a cessation of bombing against the north, or any military action from the south or elsewhere against the north. We have not had any reaction from the government of the United States to this phase of the suggestions that we have put forward.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, were it not that the minister is noted for his clarity I would ask for an explanation. However, I will put a further question to him. Has there been any acceptance of the suggestion that the neutral zone be widened? When the minister states that there should be a pause, did he mean a pause within the suggested additional neutral area?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian government has not suggested an expansion of the area of the demilitarized zone. This was a proposal made by the government of the United States. The first proposal of the Canadian government was that there should be a degree of physical disengagement by all the parties. We took the position that this would have to include the bombings and any other military action against North Viet Nam, whether actually undertaken from South Viet Nam or from some other point of origin.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Was there any reaction from North Viet Nam?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The Canadian commissioner, Mr. Dier, was in Hanoi from April 31 until the middle of last week. He has had discussions with top personalities in the government of the north, and as the result of a request made by the government of the north I am not at liberty to communicate to the house the nature of those conversations.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): On a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister whether in view of his statement in New York during a press interview we can take it that the proposals he advanced on behalf of the Canadian government were not fully acceptable to the government of the United States?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I do not believe the four propositions were fully acceptable to the government of the United States. I have already implied this in the reply I made to the right hon. gentleman a few moments ago, when I said that the proposal for a degree of physical disengagement would involve cessation of bombing.

Mr. Douglas: I have a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister which of the four proposals made by the Canadian government were not acceptable to the government of the United States? Was it only the one on bombing, or were there others?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): There was no particularization by the United States government respecting any one of the four proposals, but I should think that the second, third and fourth proposals would probably be acceptable.

Mr. David MacDonald (Prince): Mr. Speaker, earlier in the session the minister indicated that the external aid department was looking into the possibility of bringing Vietnamese civilians to Canada for rehabilitation. I wonder whether we can expect a progress report on that particular plan.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to report at the moment.

Mr. MacDonald (Prince): On a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister when we can expect a report. I believe this has been under consideration for some time.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Yes.

[*Translation*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

QUEBEC CITY—REPORTED LAY-OFFS AT GRAIN ELEVATOR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

In view of the fact that the National Harbours Board, with the approval of the government, has rented the grain elevators to an American company, the Bunge Company of New York, is the minister aware that a hundred employees of such elevators have been laid off quite recently and is it his intention to take measures to find out the reasons for such mass lay-offs?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the grain elevators of Quebec have been transferred to the Bunge Company under the contract that has been signed. We are confident, I would even say highly confident, that this will increase employment in grain elevators.

We are now going through a transition period which will last a few weeks. I think that it is too soon to answer the hon. member's question.

Mr. Caouette: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Is the minister aware that some employees with 14, 15 and even 20 years of service have been laid off and can he tell us if they will be the first to be hired should the company decide to increase the number of employees?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, we are interested in what happens to the employees. It is likely that within a few weeks I will be able to give the hon. member a more definite answer.

[*English*]

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT RESPECTING NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether he could comment on the status of the half million people who are unemployed; and does he have any answers?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question as asked is not in order.

HOUSING

TORONTO—INQUIRY AS TO STEPS TO MEET SHORTAGE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Labour who is responsible for housing. In view of the drastic situation and the shortage of houses, particularly in Toronto and the surrounding area, where families have to be housed in one of the armoury buildings because of the shortage of housing, can the minister advise the house what steps are being taken to relieve this serious situation?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I hope to make a statement on the subject of housing within the next few days, in the new session. I have nothing to say on the subject today.

PUBLIC SERVICE

SUPERANNUATED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—REQUEST FOR INCREASED PENSIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Prime Minister—I assume he has gone to the other place—may I direct a question to the President of the Treasury Board. In view of the recommendation in the report tabled this morning by the special joint committee on the public service of Canada for increases in the pensions of retired civil servants, may I ask whether the government will consider taking action on this matter early in the new session?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue and President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, of course I have not as yet read the report, as it is the product of the committee, but I can assure my hon. friend that as always the government will give the committee's report due consideration.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Minister of Justice. In view of the statement made by the premier of Quebec would the government not review its position—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether the hon. member might not ask his question later on, or perhaps put it on the order paper.

Mr. Baldwin: I will take it up later on, Mr. Speaker.

Royal Assent

THE ROYAL ASSENT

A message was delivered by Major C. R. Lamoureux, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Deputy Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable house in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the house went up to the Senate chamber.

In the Senate Chamber, the Deputy Governor General was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills:

An act respecting Interprovincial Pipe Line Company.

An act to incorporate Anniversary Life Insurance Company.

An act respecting La Société des Artisans.

An act to incorporate Laurier Life Insurance Company.

An act to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof.

An act respecting the occupational training of adults.

An act to amend the Income Tax Act.

To these bills the royal assent was pronounced by the Clerk of the Senate in the following words:

In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Deputy Governor General doth assent to these bills.

Then the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed the Deputy Governor General as follows:

May it please Your Honour:

The Commons of Canada have voted supplies required to enable the government to defray certain expenses of the public service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Honour the following bill:

An act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1968.

To which bill I humbly request Your Honour's assent.

To this bill the Clerk of the Senate, by command of the Deputy Governor General, did thereupon say:

In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Deputy Governor General thanks her loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence and assents to this bill.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

After which the Deputy Governor General was pleased to close the first session of the twenty seventh parliament of Canada with the following speech:

[Mr. Baldwin.]

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

During the first Session of the twenty-seventh Parliament, which opened on January 18th, 1966, much important legislation has been enacted and many government actions of great significance have been approved.

The hearts of all Canadians were saddened during this session by the death of our distinguished and well-beloved Governor-General, His Excellency General Georges P. Vanier. His selfless devotion to duty during a lifetime of public service will always be an inspiration and an example to all.

Recognizing the vital importance to Canada of effective administration of our public affairs, early in the session you approved a measure providing for an extensive reorganization affecting certain departments of the government to enable them to respond more appropriately to the needs they serve, and to facilitate closer co-ordination in various fields of government activity. You also have enacted three measures which together make provision for a complete transformation of the processes of personnel management in the Public Service of Canada. They provide for the introduction of collective bargaining and for the continuation and extension of the merit principle of appointment under an independent Public Service Commission. My government has also announced a series of programmes designed to encourage the development of bilingual skills within the Public Service of Canada.

Following an important Federal-Provincial Conference held in October, major improvements were made in the fiscal arrangements with the provincial governments. A new system of equalization payments was introduced which will enable all provincial governments to provide a reasonably comparable level of basic services. A new revenue stabilization policy will protect provinces against serious declines in total revenues. Substantial additional financial resources have also been made available to the provinces in respect of the costs of post-secondary education.

You have completed the first comprehensive review of the Bank Act in the past decade, and have approved a measure amending that Act to bring it into line with present day needs. This statute completes the most thorough and far-reaching revision of our banking legislation that has ever been made, and will increase the degree of competition and flexibility both within the banking system and between the banks and other financial institutions, thereby improving the service available to the people of Canada. A further step in the strengthening of our financial system was the adoption of legislation to establish the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Approval was given to the Canada-U.S. agreement on automotive products. My government regards this agreement as one of the most important trading arrangements ever made between Canada and the United States. It has already led to a substantial increase in production and employment in the automotive industry, and to a significant decrease in the imbalance of trade between the two countries in these products.

In recognition of the importance of science and technology to Canada's industrial and economic well-being, you approved during this session a measure to provide incentives to increased activity in industrial research and development

You have approved the National Transportation Act which will provide a completely new basis for an overall approach to the development of transportation in Canada. This measure defines a national transportation policy suited to modern requirements in this country and provides for the establishment of a national transportation authority to give effect to the policy. It provides for new methods of fixing freight rates and for the rationalization of branch lines. Through these and other provisions, the Act will be of major assistance to the continuing economic growth of the country.

You have enacted legislation authorizing the unification of the Canadian Armed Forces. This makes possible the completion of the reorganization begun in 1964.

You were obliged to give consideration to labour disputes of serious concern to the national interest. My government, deeply aware of the human as well as the economic price of work stoppages, has appointed a Task Force of highly qualified persons to examine, as a matter of urgency, the many aspects of labour-management relations and to make recommendations for their improvement.

You have amended the Fair Wages and Hours of Labour Act so that standards prescribed in the Canada Labour (Standards) Code concerning hours of work and minimum hourly rates of pay will be applicable to Government construction contracts. You have also amended the Code to ensure that longshoremen who work for more than one employer may qualify for general holidays. The Canada Labour (Safety) Code that you have enacted constitutes Canada's first national safety code and is an important addition to the body of labour law applying to industries within federal jurisdiction.

You have adopted a measure to make crop insurance applicable to all phases of agriculture and to make the program more attractive to Canadian farmers. The establishment of the Canadian Dairy Commission represents an important milestone for Canadian agriculture. Measures were also enacted to provide assistance to livestock feeders in Eastern Canada and British Columbia, and to establish a fund for the economic and social development of special rural development areas.

Under the provisions of the Fisheries Development Act, passed during the session, fishery development activities are being intensified in cooperation with the governments of the provinces and with the fishing industry.

My government has continued in its efforts to work for the co-ordination of measures to reduce poverty and increase security in all parts of Canada. In this connection, a measure has been passed providing for guaranteed income supplements for recipients of old age security. You have also enacted legislation introducing the Canada Assistance Plan to provide assistance to persons and families in need.

A measure of particular importance enacted during the past session was the Medical Care Act which provided for the commencement in Canada of a national Medical Care Program. This measure will make a major contribution toward the improvement of the health of the people of Canada and toward the mitigation of domestic financial crises caused by illness.

You have approved legislation authorizing the establishment of a Health Resources Fund to provide financial assistance to the provinces to aid them in research and in the training of health personnel.

You have passed legislation to encourage the occupational training of adult Canadians by the payment of training allowances and by providing for the federal purchase of training services through the facilities of the provinces and of industry.

Under the provisions of a major extension of the National Housing Act, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation has been authorized to insure loans made by approved lenders and make direct loans to persons who intend to purchase, improve and occupy existing housing. To assist provinces and municipalities in continuing their efforts to combat soil and water pollution, the period of forgiveness for loans made on sewage treatment projects has been extended three years to March 1970. Mortgage loans have also been made available for the provision of student housing at vocational and training schools, training hospitals and schools for special groups of handicapped people.

In order to provide young people with increased opportunities for service to the community, you have approved a measure to establish the Company of Young Canadians.

In the last Session of Parliament before the day marking the Centennial of Confederation, it was appropriate that attention should be given to some of the symbolic and non-material aspects of our nationhood. The achievement that began with the adoption of our national flag was carried forward with the approval of "O Canada" as our national anthem. My government also announced the approval by Her Majesty the Queen of the Order of Canada as a means of recognizing service of special quality and merit to our country.

Looking to another aspect of the quality of our national life, my government has established a Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon the status of women in Canada and upon the steps the government might take to ensure for women equal opportunities with men in all aspects of Canadian society.

My government has tabled a white paper setting forth its views with regard to future broadcasting policy. This statement, together with the report of the Standing Committee of the House of Commons on the subject, will provide the general background for the legislation on broadcasting which is soon to be introduced.

You have enacted a measure to provide for the establishment of a National Arts Centre, which will be the principal centennial project in the National Capital and will have beneficial effects for the performing arts in Canada. You have also passed legislation to establish the Canadian Film Development Corporation which will help to stimulate the film industry in this country.

You have approved a measure establishing rights of appeal to an independent tribunal both by persons ordered to be deported and by Canadians wishing to sponsor the admission of certain relatives to Canada. A White Paper defining the principles of immigration policy has been presented for your consideration.

Many other important items of legislation were approved in this Session of Parliament which has been one of the most productive in our history. My government is conscious, however, that the need for legislative change and reform in Canada is greater today, and more constantly demanding, than at any period in our history. The accomplishments of this Session of Parliament must, therefore, be regarded less as a source of satisfaction

than as an indication of the pace and scope of change that must be maintained and increased if the needs of the country are to be met.

Members of the House of Commons:

I thank you for the provision you have made for the public services in the current fiscal year.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

May Divine Providence continue to bless our country.

This concluded the first session of the twenty seventh parliament.

END OF SESSION