

*National Defence Act Amendment*

Hellyer's defence policies are bang in the middle of this new tradition. He is trying to Canadianize the armed forces by ridding them of the trappings of "foreign" (British) origins.

**An hon. Member:** Good.

**Mr. Churchill:** Someone on the other side said "good". Just because my ancestors happened to come from Great Britain they suggest I should be ashamed of them and that I should deny my origin and have no pride in it. On the contrary, I have a great deal of pride. I hope those people whose origin is French will have pride in that origin. Apparently anything now that is British is foreign.

Mr. Terence Robertson then writes:

I believe this is far more important for the country, the government, Hellyer and for the forces themselves than any purely military argument on the merits of one service, three, or even a dozen...

According to Hellyer's plans, the front line formations of the navy, army and air force will function in the future much as they do today. But they will be the sea, air and land arms of the new service—not the Royal Canadian Navy, the Royal Canadian Air Force, the Royal Canadian Artillery, or the Royal Canadian anything else.

This is what is said by an observer who suggests that the real reason behind this whole program is a policy of the Prime Minister, supported by the Minister of National Defence, to do what Mr. Robertson calls Canadianization of our armed forces by getting rid of our traditions. These have been noble traditions.

Let me continue with Mr. Robertson's article as follows:

Uniforms are the most tangible trappings of any military structure...

No matter how much Hellyer integrates or unifies, he cannot succeed in Canadianizing the armed forces without first getting rid of the present uniforms for they are the ultimate public symbols of Canada's military heritage.

The most effective and economical way to Canadianize the forces is to put everybody—soldier, sailor and airman—into the same suit. This would have the effect of putting a single service on public display without actually creating one, and without imposing any fundamental disturbances on the existing military structure.

Apparently we should meld them together by dressing them the same and by getting rid of all our past traditions. In this way we might Canadianize the armed forces. Having served in the Canadian Armed Forces on a good many occasions over a good many years, let me say that neither I nor my friends had any doubt that we were Canadians and not anything else. We were never confused for

[Mr. Churchill.]

the British, Australians, New Zealanders, South Africans or United States soldiers.

Mr. Robertson then states:

When Hellyer took office three years ago, he was deliberately vague about the lengths he would go with integration. "Integration breaks new ground" he said then. "We don't know yet where it will end".

It's quite possible that he didn't really know himself—that though he knew of the Prime Minister's intention to Canadianize Canada, he hadn't worked out how the principle could be best applied to the armed forces.

He is still very vague and he still does not know where this is going to end. It will end in great confusion and will be a great disaster for Canada. Mr. Robertson then states:

Hellyer needed time, not only to learn about the entire defence organization, but also to assess where, and from whom, he might expect opposition. His most senior officers were relatively young. They had superb records in war and peace, and they controlled forces that enjoyed unexcelled reputations for efficiency and élan among NATO allies.

Those are the men the minister started to work with, and he paid them a great compliment.

● (9:50 p.m.)

The article continues:

Most of them supported the idea of integration from the outset, and Hellyer has said all along that he couldn't have got integration off the ground without their enthusiastic support.

These are the men that the minister threw out of office just a year ago, in the summer-time. These were the young, able men with good records in war and peace who supported the minister when he commenced this operation of his, and he disposed of them last summer. That's gratitude for you. He could not have got his operation off the ground had they not supported him; yet he threw them to one side when they opposed some of his plans. This same author, Mr. Terence Robertson, writing a year earlier in "Weekend Magazine" of February 6 had this to say with regard to that assistance:

Hellyer readily admits even though he didn't reap a whirlwind of protest, his revolution might have stalled at the white paper stage had it not been for the co-operation of the senior officers at defence headquarters. The chiefs of staff fell in behind him, decided among themselves to set an example to all ranks by avoiding controversial public debate and by declining to comment in the press.

The Minister of National Defence owes everything to those men. Mr. Robertson in that article of 1965 goes on to speak of some of them. Just listen to the names: Air Chief