

National Defence Act Amendment

We do not have any good figures concerning our combat effectiveness. All we have is a sort of innuendo. We know that one battalion of the infantry had to be stripped down in order to reinforce another battalion in Cyprus. We know that ships are being laid up. We have the right to be disturbed about the lack of manpower in the combat forces of the army. I think we also have the right to be disturbed about the state of training in these services.

How are we to continue to supply the soldiers, sailors and airmen we are going to need? This is where morale enters the picture. Money never has been an overriding factor. One can never hope to pay members of the services an amount sufficient to represent a purely monetary incentive. Pride of service has played a very substantial part in getting people into the services and keeping them there. If we have a faceless unified service, will we be able to attract people to it or will we be able to maintain effective combat units?

The minister is a great admirer of Mr. McNamara. Mr. McNamara has initiated studies in the United States concerning ways to get rid of the draft. His officials, when speaking of getting people into the services, have an expression they use—"professional incentives". What this really means is the pay rate that would be required in order to have a completely professional service. The studies they have made indicate that the cost would be astronomic to maintain the United States services on a voluntary basis. Do we have any idea concerning what professional incentives we will have to offer in order to get people to remain in our services? Do we have any estimate of the dollar value involved in this or are we to continue along on this course, have our services depleted and then in two or three years find that in order to maintain our forces it will be necessary to have conscription or some other form of compulsory service? Will this be the result?

There are the important questions in respect of recruitment and retainment of personnel in the service. The minister skirts around them; yet I think these are the vital questions in respect of the matters we are considering today. We should not accept the minister's proposals and should not adopt the bill in principle until we have a full explanation.

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, the bill of the Minister of National Defence is of great importance to areas such

as the Atlantic region and particularly the maritime provinces. I should like to put on the record a few thoughts on this matter. I do not intend to deal in detail with various matters such as the new set-up concerning the chief of staff and so on which have been dealt with adequately by other members. I should like to reiterate, however, what was said by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) and other members to the effect that our Canadian defence policy should be threefold. First, it should provide defence for our country, second, honour our international commitments so far as NATO and NORAD are concerned and, third, participate in the peace keeping operations of the United Nations.

In his excellent speech yesterday I believe the hon. member for Calgary North pointed out that with the mobile command now taking the priority position in our new national defence scheme our navy and our air force will only be support components and will not have an important part in our defence set-up. It is my submission that this should not be the case. If we are to carry out our commitments in this regard and provide an adequate defence of Canada, we require the three services which we have today.

I believe that integration at the various levels certainly is a necessary thing. It has been agreed by many officers in our armed forces that integration in respect of supply, pay and many other things—the components which make up the administrative part of our defence forces—is something which should be carried out, but not unification as proposed by the minister.

Perhaps I might place on the record a most interesting article which I do not believe has been referred to in this debate. It appeared in the *Halifax Chronicle-Herald* and was written by Dave McIntosh of the Canadian Press who had quite a wide experience in Korea writing on defence matters. The article is dated September 14, 1966, and reads as follows:

A manpower crisis, a financial crisis and planned unification of the armed forces have arrived simultaneously at the defence department.

He points out that the three problems are intertwined.

Since Mr. Hellyer took over the defence portfolio in April, 1963, the strength of the armed forces has dropped by some 17,000 to 106,000—45,000 air force, 44,000 army and 17,000 navy—of whom 12,000 are serving with NATO in Europe and 2,000 are on United Nations service in world trouble spots.