

*National Defence Act Amendment*

respect to the selection of the CF-104. Yet the minister himself has stoutly defended the selection of the C-5, even though it was just as stoutly resisted by the air force authorities. I am not going to get into a debate on that subject; perhaps we will deal with it later in this discussion. I do not want to take up time in dealing with some of the technical details with respect to the merits of the CF-5 as opposed to the other types of aircraft which might have been selected. However, perhaps I may mention that its load capacity is limited as compared with the F-4 or the A-7. Its air refuelling capacity is less; its endurance is half that of other types of aircraft. Notwithstanding all its deficiencies and the recommendations of the authorities, the minister chose the C-5. But he criticizes the right hon. Leader of the Opposition for similar action when he had the responsibility as prime minister of this nation.

There is another question that interests me. I refer to the control of the news media by the minister and his staff. I mention this in passing. I recall the night of the famous interview on television of Lord Mountbatten. In the middle of the interview and out of the blue—it turned out that this particular television clip had been taken some months previously—strategically and suddenly at a critical moment in the debate Lord Mountbatten seemed to be supporting the idea of unification and amalgamation. There is something rotten in the state of Denmark, as they say.

There is another reason, of course, why the minister is pursuing this headlong course. It is because of his inexperience operationally, which has been mentioned before. We have been described as Colonel Blimps resisting change; but if you unify our forces in this complex, technological age, if you bring them all together in one great monolithic unit, how can you maintain the specialization and flexibility that are required to meet the complexities of our technological age? A monolithic unit, rather than providing for flexibility introduces rigidity. The minister says: If you have a single supreme commander, you must have a single force. That is nonsense. It is not even necessary to debate the point, because in every other area of modern society we are moving toward specialization, we are moving toward specialized knowledge in complex fields so that we might not introduce institutional rigidity into our national structure. Anybody who has operated under conditions of modern warfare will understand that this is so. This is why Lord Mountbatten emphasizes combined operations and bringing the

various units together, with their backgrounds of tradition and esprit de corps, with their specialized knowledge. This business of rigidity and inflexibility is the product of the sawdust Caesars, the men of the first part of the twentieth century who brought their nations to the brink of disaster by their rigidity and even their stupidity in their approach to military matters.

Not very long ago I was re-reading "The First and the Last" by the German general, Adolf Galland, who commanded the luftwaffe during the last war. He attributes the collapse of the luftwaffe, which was supposed to be supreme in its field, to the fact that the civilian authority took over, interfered with and ignored the advice of the military experts. I mention one example in this respect. I would recommend the reading of this book to the minister, who is obviously a military strategist. Corporal Hitler overruled the luftwaffe experts when they had developed the jet aeroplane ahead of other nations. The jet aeroplane could have played a major role in determining the outcome of the war. Corporal Hitler overruled his experts and decreed that the aeroplane should be modified and used as a blitz bomber rather than being involved in the fighter force. This resulted in a delay of some six months in the production of the aircraft. Decisions of this nature had the gravest consequence.

I am not going to deal further with the speech of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. His was one of the major contributions to this debate and I think what he said has been adequately dealt with. The Secretary of State for External Affairs did not in any way reassure the members of this house that we were going to be able to meet our commitments to NATO, NORAD and the United Nations. In fact, it is impossible for us to say we will be able to meet those commitments because we do not yet know what they are going to be. Also, we have the expert advice from retired generals, admirals, air marshals, and so on, that the reverse will be the case.

I want to conclude my remarks by dealing with a matter that I do not think has been raised in this debate. The minister has talked about the interservice rivalry which will be removed by amalgamation. I would like to suggest—

**The Chairman:** Order, please. I must advise the hon. member that the time allotted to him has expired. Does the hon. member wish to continue?