

National Defence Act Amendment

which I think the minister should do before the conclusion of this debate is to give us a definition of these terms and an explanation of his concept of them. This would clear up the confusion which has existed for the past three years and which has served to make any reasonable debate on these questions much more difficult than it should be.

Mr. J. M. Forrestal (Halifax): In following the debate on second reading of the defence bill I have listened with some interest to the remarks that have been made up to date. As the minister probably knows, when we debate defence I usually go to sea. Those are his words; but may I say that in many respects it is better to be at sea than to be adrift, as he is. I will be quite parochial and provincial, in that my remarks will be confined primarily to an area in which I have some knowledge and understanding, being neither professional nor expert in this field. Nevertheless I will base my remarks on communications which I have received and on discussions which I have had with many hundreds of serving officers and men in the Royal Canadian Navy.

Before I do that I want to put on the record again what it is that we are speaking about in Halifax when we refer to the defence structure, and what is the real impact of defence spending in the Atlantic provinces in what was revealed in the original research conducted by the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council last fall, and produced last October.

In the 1963-64 fiscal year the military pay and allowances in Nova Scotia amounted to some \$70,595,000; the civilian pay was some \$25.7 million; another \$3 million went into travel; another \$45.7 million went into supplies, and there was a miscellaneous item of \$2.8 million, making a total of \$147.8 million. It can be readily understood why we in Nova Scotia become concerned about the loss of the navy when we realize that it constitutes the largest part of these expenditures. Nova Scotia cannot withstand the economic impact of the loss of even 10 per cent of its current defence structure.

According to this bill the minister has active plans for the consolidation of bases. These plans are not yet out in the open. We have had some indication of what is about to happen at *Cornwallis*. Rumours have been rampant about what is to happen at *Shearwater* and at *Greenwood*, and very serious doubts have been entertained about what might happen to the main base at *Stadacona* and to the supporting services at *Dockyard*. We wonder why the minister is so concerned

[Mr. Harkness.]

about the separate identity of the forces to which he has referred.

Our fears and our concern are based primarily on four criteria, which have been essentially used in defence planning in the United States. One is the rejection of the principle that the execution of defence planning requires today a growing awareness of the role of the professional, much more so than it did even during the days of the second world war. I believe that competition is an essential factor in our way of life today and to remove it from the services will result in decreased initiative which is essential to the solution of most problems. We believe that a defence force should have an efficient management. The best example of this can be seen in General Motors. They have set up competition within this massive industry not only for competition's sake but also for the sake of management efficiency. They have learned, as have most industries, the benefits that can be enjoyed from this type of approach to a massive organization.

● (9:20 p.m.)

Finally, there is the intangible aspect of the spirit, the *esprit de corps*. The absolute necessity of this in any efficient military organization that is going to be called upon to prosecute your country's national aims and objectives in terms of national defence is self-evident. What about these four points? The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) has quoted what many prominent military people in the United States, indeed all over the world, have said on the subject of integration and unification. There is no need for me to spell out to the house the system that has remained in effect in the United States. Indeed, this system has been in effect for some 17 years and it has been building toward the high degree of efficiency that has been achieved. We all know about that.

We all know the United States system has a defence secretary, joint chiefs of staff and a secretariat for each of the land, sea and air environments. Earlier this year, the deputy secretary of defence, Mr. Vance, gave his views on the subject of integration and what he termed the creaking fuzziness or misunderstanding on the part of many people in the United States about what was happening to the defence structure. He said this:

I believe very deeply in the importance of and the need for military departments. We cannot run the defence department properly without them . . . It is essential, however, to have unity of effort;—