

National Defence Act Amendment

you of the armed forces of friendly countries while they are visiting Canada.

Mr. Hellyer: The term is also in the present defence act.

Mr. Lambert: But not in the same way, not "Canadian forces." Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it boils down to this. The minister is asking us to accept this measure, not a bill to create a single, unified defence force but to create a single service with a single rank structure. He has not demonstrated the advantages such a step will achieve. I am opposed to the bill on many grounds but principally on this one. I have no hesitation in opposing the bill and that is how I intend to vote in regard to Bill C-243. I refuse to accept what the minister is trying to do to us at the present time by means of this bill.

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, the introduction of Bill C-243 gives members of the House of Commons an opportunity of discussing all phases of defence organization and defence policy. This was made very clear by the minister because in his tour de force, which covers some 65 typewritten pages and in which I cannot think of one aspect of defence policy and organization that was not mentioned, he covered the active services and the reserve services, he covered organization, he spoke of NATO, of NORAD and the United Nations and, as I say, just about everything one can conceive in this connection.

In introducing my own small contribution to this debate I would commence by going back four years to when this issue was first raised and then I will bring it forward step by step as closely as I can to the present day. We all remember, or we should remember, that a white paper was tabled on March 27, 1964. This was the first indication to this house and the country of an anticipated policy of integration and unification.

On August 1, 1964, integration was approved and went into effect. We have had an accelerated rate of integration since that time. It is obvious that the minister in his thinking has now arrived at the conclusion, through the introduction of this bill and setting forth the major policies in the legislation, to move headlong into unification. It is quite obvious that he thinks the integration process has continued to a point where it is now appropriate to proceed to the ultimate goal, the final goal of a unified defence force. That is why we now have Bill C-243 before us.

23033-786

There can be no question that as a result of the statements and actions of the minister, particularly in the past 18 months or two years, a furore of opposition has developed amongst many both in the forces and in the general public across this country. As a matter of fact, the opposition has given rise to a great many stories. Undoubtedly the minister knows the one that spread from Halifax to Esquimalt, namely, that history would show three main troublemakers, one was Corporal Napoleon, one was Corporal Hitler and now it is Corporal Hellyer. That is an indication of the thinking of some people in this respect.

The minister quite honestly made clear what he had in mind, not only at the time of the white paper but also at the time integration came into effect. It must be remembered that on several occasions the minister, while maintaining that the "end objective of a single service is firm", made it clear and emphasized in various statements that the changes in Canadian defence organization and policy would take place step by step.

He also made it clear, at least in my estimation, that from his viewpoint unification is the end objective of what he termed a "logical and evolutionary progression." But he also made it clear—I want to make this clear to others just to make sure I have exactly what was stated over the years by the minister—that "although integration and unification are sometimes regarded as alternatives and inherently different, they are, in fact, merely to be stages in the same process."

There are many who do not think that they are, in fact, merely different stages in the same process. That was made abundantly evident by the remarks of my friend the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). In my estimation the opposition which has developed has not developed as far as the policy of integration is concerned; I think it is mostly opposition to the policy of unification. I believe this was made obvious by one who has certainly been making a lot of speeches and doing a lot of writing in opposition to government policy. I refer to Admiral W. M. Landymore. Therefore if he has basically no objection to integration, there is not too much opposition in this respect. Just to make it understood why I take that position I should like to quote from one of the documents he sent me not too long ago. In this document he said:

● (5:40 p.m.)

Both headquarters are now fully integrated but this is no new experience for the navy or for our