

*National Defence Act Amendment*

the services. Anyone who has served knows perfectly well that his loyalty was to his unit, to his corps, or to whatever branch of the services he was in, whether navy, army or air force; but there was an overriding loyalty which did not have to be further developed, that loyalty to his country, to Canada. It was the same in the first war and in the second; there was this overriding loyalty to Canada. Every serviceman that I ever saw or met had that loyalty and was proud of the fact that he was serving his country.

The minister tries to tell us that because the services are split between navy, army and air force the people in these separate services must develop a higher loyalty to a single service, and hence to their country. That, sir, I think is an insult—an insult to Canadians who have served and to Canadians who are now serving, and I reject it entirely.

I was interested and amused by the reference by the minister to adaptability to change, which appears at page 10831 of *Hansard*. Then the minister went on to tell us about the various weapons and their influence on the services. Let me quote some of his words, as reported at that page:

Many of these developments cut across the traditional lines of distinction between the different services. One example of this is the anti-submarine warfare equipment which can be carried in land-based aircraft or carrier-based aircraft, or in ships on or under the sea. Another example is the use in all three services of fixed-wing aircraft and missiles. Still another is the use of helicopters in all three armed forces as reconnaissance vehicles, weapons platforms and instruments of mobility. The recent creation by the United States of mobile divisions with their reliance on helicopters may mark a departure from tradition which will have a profound influence on the nature of military activities.

Then the minister goes on to say this:

Such changes must affect the organization of the forces. It is clear that the influence works in the direction of a single service for reasons of military effectiveness, cost and career considerations.

I do not know where the minister gets these illogical statements. Just because an artillery weapon is used on a ship as well as on land the minister seems to think that you must therefore unify the services. Just because a machine gun is used in aircraft, on ships and by the army on land he says you must therefore unify the services. It is just sheer and utter nonsense.

The minister thinks that the use of the helicopter with a mobile division is going to change the whole nature of organization within the United States forces. On the contrary, the use of the helicopter is just another

[Mr. Churchill.]

method of obtaining mobility, which has been the search of armed forces ever since the beginning of warfare. If we had more helicopters in the Canadian army we could form a helicopter brigade, fashioned upon the experience of the United States division which is now in South Viet Nam. As the years go by there will be other means of getting infantry from one position to another, whether by a track vehicle by helicopter, by some other method such as propelling an individual over ditches or walls; or even the age old method of simply walking on your flat feet.

I do not see why the minister suggests that because these changes are taking place we have to have a single unified force. The whole history of warfare is that changes have been adopted from time to time, some of them slowly, some of them more rapidly. But it is not necessary to unify the navy, army and air force just because they happen to use similar weapons.

Then the minister had some profound words to utter about the demands of modern warfare. The hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Smith) talked about that a little while ago. As reported at page 10832 of *Hansard* the minister said:

The need for fast decision-making and quick reaction is synonymous with modern warfare.

• (8:20 p.m.)

I have heard all that before. Everything is to be done much more rapidly than in the past. Decision making is to be done in a split second instead of being carried out over a period of time. But it is too bad this cannot be applied to civilians such as those who compose the present cabinet. Their decisions are not reached in a split second. There is procrastination, delay and postponement. But the minister is attempting to tell us that everything is changed—that there must be a new attitude and a single, unified force in order that we can have these quick decisions. I have heard all that before—in 1939, in 1940 and in 1941. The second world war was to be so different from the first. Everything was to be done much more rapidly and men who could make quick decisions were required. My actual experience of the second world war showed that in many respects it was like the first. I regret the need to mention these things, because the minister said earlier, as Your Honour will recall, that my knowledge of such matters is primitive, which means, archaic, antiquated and ancient.

If I may be pardoned, let me state categorically that decision making in the second world