

*Interim Supply*

**Mr. Mackasey:** The reason I did not have my earphone on is that I can usually hear the hon. member without it. Unfortunately I do not hear as well as most hon. members.

I have only ten minutes left but I should like to quote one or two very important people. I repeat, because I think it bears repetition, some of the evidence the minister put on the record last week pertaining to the standing committee. The number of meetings of special and standing committees on defence totalled 81. The number of pages of committee evidence amounted to 2,300, all of it devoted to the problem of defence. There were 103 witnesses heard by the committee, retired and serving officers as well as civilians. The number of appearances before the committee of either the minister or one of his representatives such as the associate minister was 63. Talk about censorship. The number of questions answered by the minister in committee, not the number of questions asked but the number answered by the minister who is accused of refusing any information, was 857. If the questions were not intelligent, that is not the minister's fault. If they were not designed to bring out the facts of unification, again that is not his fault.

Another point emphasized so many times as the reason for this prolonged filibuster on unification is that the minister has sprung the whole question of unification on the people of Canada at the last moment. On April 9, 1964 the hon. member for Edmonton West asked the minister of defence a question. It is an important one because it was asked by a very responsible member of a very responsible minister. As reported at page 1942 of *Hansard* the hon. member asked:

Am I to take it from the reference to unification that the minister intends there shall be one defence force, or one armed force in this country, and there will be no distinction among the present three services or any of the units thereof?

● (9.50 p.m.)

**Mr. Hellyer:** I made it quite clear—and this is set out in the White Paper—that the integration of the defence staff is the first step toward a single unified defence force for Canada.

That was April 9, 1964, which means that the defence committee has had over two years to investigate the minister's statement.

**Mr. Lambert:** That is not an answer.

**Mr. Mackasey:** In case there is any doubt in any hon. member's mind, what the minister intended, I will repeat his answer:

**Mr. Hellyer:** I made it quite clear—and this is set out in the White Paper—that the integration of the defence staff is the first step toward a single unified defence force for Canada.

**Mr. Lambert:** He did not know that.

**Mr. Mackasey:** It is set out in the white paper that the integration of the defence staff is the first step toward a single unified defence force for Canada. More than one spokesman for the opposition, more than one editorial writer in this country, has implied, rather unfairly I think, that the only people interested in unification are the young ginger group in the armed forces, young people of 28, 30 or 35 years. It is said that they want to please the minister and endorse unification because it will mean promotion. We have heard all that. Quite properly, we have heard hon. members in the opposition reading into the record the views of those opposed to unification. We have heard about such responsible people as Landymore and Colonel Merritt. Colonel Merritt certainly has a right to express his opinion about unification because he won the Victoria Cross.

I found an article in the *Star Weekly*, written not last year when unification raised its head nor in 1964 when the white paper was issued but written in 1961. The article, which is six or seven pages and too long for me to read in its entirety, says in part:

With the money we are now spending, I think the forces could be reorganized so as to meet all the major aims of Canadian policy. The first thing to do is to abolish the Canadian navy, army and air force and unite them all into one single Canadian armed service, and that is the name I'd use. Their functions already overlap. The army and navy want to fly; the air force already dreads being relegated to underground burrows dusting off automatic missiles.

**An hon. Member:** Who said so?

**Mr. Mackasey:** Here is a further quotation from the article:

Can we eliminate the waste and duplication and futility which taxpayers properly complain of? Can we reorganize the navy, army and air force so that they will give the Canadian people value for money and make a better contribution toward preserving peace?

**An hon. Member:** Who said that?

**Mr. Mackasey:** A man who knows a little about defence said that. It was General Charles Foulkes, former chairman of the chiefs of staff committee and one of the most respected soldiers this country has produced.