

National Defence Act Amendment

in the house on many occasions. In fact, the question was asked today: Why is it that so many eminent military leaders have found it necessary to resign or be ousted because of the position they have taken in respect of the unification proposals. Even though many distinguished officers have voiced opposition to the program, there must surely be equally distinguished officers who support the course that is being followed.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I have come up against a problem. On November 1, 1966 the Associate Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) quoted an article written by General Foulkes in support of the concept of unification. Yet I have heard this same gentleman referred to as one who opposes the concept of unification. I do not know which to believe. Perhaps I might refer to the statement to which the associate minister referred, as it appears at page 9395 of *Hansard*. He stated that General Foulkes was reported to have said the following in the *Star Weekly* magazine of November 14, 1961:

● (6:30 p.m.)

We need one single armed service under one supreme chief of staff in one uniform. We need to organize our armed forces in the form of task forces designed for their particular jobs, at home or off our coasts or in Europe or with the United Nations. They should each be given the strength they need for their particular job at a given time. They would have no fixed establishment with rigid ladders of promotion, as the three services have now. They would all come under one system of administration, and by this means—and only by this means—I believe, the taxpayers' legitimate complaints of extravagance, duplication and waste can be removed and Canada can start to get real value for its defence budget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I say, I am having some difficulty in reconciling this statement with some of the statements which have been attributed to this same eminent officer by some of those persons who argue against unification. I have several articles here. One which appears in the *Ottawa Citizen* November 12, 1966, is entitled "Top officer gives support to Hellyer's defence plan". The article is referring to Air Marshal F. R. Sharp, vice chief of the defence staff. There also is an article which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of November 15, 1966, which quotes the chief of the defence staff, General J. V. Allard as supporting the policy of the minister. Perhaps I might read just the first two paragraphs:

The chief of the defence staff, General J. V. Allard, yesterday defended the integration and proposed unification of Canada's armed forces and said it is not the intention to make the forces a melting pot of individuals without identity or pride in their environmental and functional affiliation.

[Mr. Patterson.]

He insisted that each of the three present services will continue to operate in an environment of their own "keeping the traditions associated with their operating environments at the unit level".

Are we to assume, Mr. Speaker, that those who are serving officers at the present time support the principle of unification, but when they get out of the service they state something completely different. It almost would seem that way. Therefore if that be true, then it would seem that we cannot believe the officers who are presently serving. It would seem that they are being required to state government policy and say that they agree with it, and believe it is the only thing. I think possibly the minister might refer to some of these contradictory statements and perhaps clarify them for us.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I do not think my hon. friend wishes to make that suggestion. It would be grossly unfair to the officers who presently are serving. It also would be grossly unfair to the minister and associate minister, because we have not required anyone serving to make statements in favour of the policy, nor would we expect them to make such statements if they did not believe in them. I believe that is only a fundamental courtesy which we might extend to them and others who have retired, and who have different views.

Mr. Patterson: I certainly would like to agree with the minister, but as I say, I am in a quandary because here we have an example where in 1961 General Foulkes apparently stated his full support for a single armed service with one chief of staff, one uniform and so on, and yet he is being quoted as being in opposition to the unification program, now that he is retired. The minister shakes his head. Perhaps I have misunderstood some of the statements made by members of the official opposition. However, may I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I am not in any way trying to decrease the stature of those who have served or who are serving; I am not attempting to do that. I am just trying to state my position in an attempt to understand just why these seemingly contradictory statements are being made by the same individuals.

I have stated that generally we support the policy as outlined in the bill, but I believe the minister is to be blamed for being so close-mouthed in the past, if he in fact was clear headed enough to know where he was going and what he intended to do. I should like to go back to November, 1966, and read two or