

National Defence Act Amendment

are organized, equipped and trained and possess the morale to accept any task they have or are likely to be given...

I feel absolutely confident that this task can be carried out best by the reorganization of the forces as set out in Bill C-243 (the unification bill)".

These are merely a few examples of the contradiction and confusion of evidence before the committee. Critics of unification disagreed on the grounds for opposition. Exponents of the new policy supported it for different reasons.

Most of the critics were officers who had left the services, fired by Mr. Hellyer because they opposed his policies or retired voluntarily because they felt the reorganization of the forces was being pushed too fast. Most of the defenders of unification were serving officers.

There was a tendency in the committee to downgrade the testimony of the serving officers on the grounds that they were not free agents. It was argued that they had to support the government line because they knew Mr. Hellyer would axe them if they criticized. The ex officers, on the other hand, were held up as free agents speaking the unvarnished truth.

This seems unfair. The ex officers were out of the services, in the main, precisely because they opposed unification, and that was the point of view they expressed to the committee. The serving officers remained in the forces and had risen to the top jobs because they supported unification and their evidence was based on that belief. But both sides spoke from a background of distinguished military service and experience, and those who heard General Allard, for example, give his opinion would find it very hard to believe that he would perjure himself to please his minister, any more than Admiral Landymore would tell lies to embarrass Mr. Hellyer. It is easier and fairer to both sides to ascribe their conflicts to honest difference of opinion.

That does not help in making a judgment on which side is right. But some issues seemed to emerge as the main differences as the hearings proceeded.

There was comparatively little opposition to unification in theory or principle. The argument was over practice.

Many of the critics took the position that unification would make sense if Canada were going to concentrate upon development of a mobile peace-keeping force, but would be impossible, or worse, if the intention was to maintain international commitments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Europe and to the United States in the North American Air Defence Command.

Their argument, very simply, appeared to be that the army in Europe operates within the integrated NATO command, that the R.C.A.F. in Europe is part of a larger international force, that the R.C.A.F. co-operates with the U.S. Air Force in the defence of this continent, and the R.C.N. operates as part of the NATO anti-submarine defence. These forces do specialized jobs in their own environment in co-operation with the forces of other countries, and cannot, in good sense, be unified.

If, however, the Canadian forces were to be re-grouped to operate independently, as a mobile peacekeeping force to police trouble spots or put out brush fire wars, unification would make sense. The R.C.A.F. would transport the troops and provide close support on the battlefield, and the R.C.N.

[Mr. Andras.]

would run, in effect, a shipping line to carry the heavy equipment. All three services would be operating together to one end.

For example, General Moncel: "In the light of the commitments that are undertaken and which indeed are spelled for us in the white paper, a unified force has no place. Now, if you want to change the commitment to a commitment—I could write one for you if you want—which would call for a unified force, then unification per se is obviously a good thing..."

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. As a result of my experience in the house, I submit it is not open to members to read at length, word for word, from newspaper articles. I have been following the hon. member for Port Arthur for several minutes and he has been quoting verbatim almost a whole column of this morning's *Globe and Mail* article on the question of unification. An hon. member may make reference to a newspaper article, but certainly not put it on the record of the house in extenso. The hon. member must be in a position to speak for himself, notwithstanding the qualifications of the man who may have written the newspaper article or the work he has put into it. Certainly, let us have the member's own views but not newspaper articles.

The Chairman: I think I would have to agree that the point of order raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West is well taken. It is not improper for a member to read from newspaper articles to support an argument that he is presenting to the house. However, up to this point the hon. member's speech has consisted almost entirely of the newspaper article. I hope the hon. member will conclude his remarks on that particular aspect as soon as possible and get along with his remarks on clause 2 of the bill.

Mr. Andras: With the greatest of respect, Mr. Chairman, I stated at the beginning that I was going to quote at great length from the article written by Mr. Westell. I feel it is absolutely pertinent to the debate, and I have a purpose at which I will arrive in concluding my speech. Unless there is a distinct ruling otherwise, I would ask your indulgence and continue to quote these very useful comments made by Mr. Westell. He goes on to report, for example, that General Moncel—

The Chairman: Order, please. I must again interrupt the hon. member and advise him that it is not improper for him to read a newspaper article to support his own argument. However, I believe it is improper for him to read a newspaper article which, up to