

*National Defence Act Amendment*

Having examined this matter from my vantage point in parliament, I am firmly of the opinion that today we have as fine a team as we have ever had in Canada's proud history.

Anyone who knows anything about General Allard's background would I think, be bound to agree. It was my privilege to serve with the Royal 22nd as a gunner officer while he was in Italy. This man is legendary. I do not think it is wrong for Canada to take a great pride in those who are now in charge of our defences. But perhaps I have said sufficient.

We must decide whether or not we shall venture upon this new ground and set the example which, some people believe, will be followed by a number of our western allies, and possibly by countries which are behind the iron curtain. This is something dramatically new. Indeed, we believe that even outer space is militarily no longer remote from the air, the land, the sea, and the waters beneath the surface of the sea. We believe that unification is a means of rendering more efficient, and giving greater clarity of purpose to, a force which we wish it were not necessary to maintain at all. But since this force is engaging the services of many of the finest elements in our nation, prepared to live their lives and give their lives for their country, then let us try to give them, as far as possible, the advantages which come to any who are engaged in civilian occupations.

We want nothing but the best for them. I believe with all my heart that in this unified program Canada is ushering in a new era in defence policy, venturing upon a policy which is fresh, creative, constructive, and designed to lead, ultimately, to world peace.

**Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North):** In introducing the bill to create a single Canadian defence force the minister made a brief reference to the aims or objectives of Canadian defence policy. But he did not go deeply into those matters or indicate how the proposed reorganization of the defence force would enable these objectives to be pursued. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of defence forces is to carry out defence policy. Unless we start from that basic proposition as to what is Canadian defence policy and what are the objectives of Canadian defence policy, to a large extent we are really thrashing around in the dark.

● (8:30 p.m.)

I was very disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that the minister spoke for an hour and three quarters and devoted about half a minute of

his speech to what are Canadian defence objectives. I was glad that the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) and the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Patterson) both had something to say about Canadian defence roles and objectives. I did not agree with what they had to say in many respects, but in any event I thought that they were on the right line in discussing what I think must be the essential starting point for any discussion of this bill and its implications, namely the unification of the defence forces and the forming of one single defence force, rather than the organization we have had.

At this point I should like to make some references to what has been said by the speakers immediately preceding me. The hon. member for Fraser Valley said that he did not know what were the objectives. He complained about that, and he complained about a number of other things that the minister had been doing. He then went on to say that he and his group were going to support the government as far as this bill is concerned. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is a completely illogical position to take. If the hon. member did not know and does not know what are the objectives of Canadian defence policy, and therefore has no conception of what will be the effect of the proposed changes on the avowed aims of Canadian defence policy, how can he possibly support the bill?

The hon. member also spoke of some difficulty that he had over various statements made by General Foulkes. That again, I think, is due to the fact that there has been a great deal of confusion over what is meant by "integration", what is meant by "unification of command", what is meant simply by "unification" and what is meant by what the minister now calls "a single unified force".

I can well understand the confusion of the hon. member for Fraser Valley, because the minister, his representatives and spokesmen during the past three years have, I believe, deliberately confused the meaning of these terms. We have never had any precise or definitive definition of what is meant by integration, unification and so on. These terms have been used either alternately or as synonyms for each other quite regularly. This is a matter to which I will refer a little later in connection with some of the statements made by the minister in his speech.

The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) quoted a large number of unrelated excerpts