

*National Defence Act Amendment*

If I may digress for a moment to the minister's speech, it had a fine oratorical ring to it. It contains that wonderful phraseology that is today peculiar to the pursuits of the men in grey flannel suits. Returning to the article by George Bain, he said:

Now, get in there and blind them with footwork. It's astonishing all the information you get in this newspaper for a lousy dime.

I would paraphrase and say it is wonderful, all the information you get in *Hansard*, and I think it costs only a nickel. There is even more information in *Hansard*, and it costs only five cents. This applies particularly to *Hansard* for last December 7.

**An hon. Member:** It is \$3 a year.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** I do not intend to make this a commercial on behalf of *Hansard* but it is, as the hon. member suggests, \$3 a year. I am sure that is a good investment.

**Mr. Knowles:** It is \$3 a session, which may be two years.

**Mr. Hellyer:** Buy now, read later.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** It is because of the aura of confusion that has surrounded the subject of service reorganization, as a result of statements, phraseology and public relations gobbledegook, that I am entering the debate at this stage. I think only by a close and detailed analysis of the problem, and this can only be carried out in a parliamentary committee, will we sort out fact from fiction. Certainly it is only by that face to face confrontation that becomes possible between members of parliament and the experts in the Department of National Defence, particularly those experts who have been fired because they disagreed with the so-called policy enunciated in the minister's speech, that we can sort out fact from fiction.

Sooner or later we will have to come to grips with the matter in the defence committee. The tragedy is that we are proceeding, to quote the minister again, on the primitive level of knowledge at this important second reading stage. We could have had the opportunity to listen to well qualified critics, such as General Foulkes, to enlighten us as to why he now disagrees with the trend that the government's integration policy has taken.

The contribution of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. McNulty) is another reason for my wanting to take a few minutes of the time of the house this evening to try to clarify some of the confusion. A good deal of the

hon. member's speech this afternoon was taken up in reading a quotation of General Foulkes, the former Chief of Defence Staff, from an article written in 1961 which was highly in favour of integration. I am sure that most members of the Department of National Defence were in favour of integration, because it had been proceeding at a steady and logical pace for a number of years under several ministers. As the Minister of National Defence pointed out in the preamble to his speech of last December, integration is not a new concept and has been proceeding at a reasonable and logical pace over a number of years.

• (9:10 p.m.)

I asked the hon. member for Lincoln whether he had read the sentiments of General Foulkes as expressed in three articles which appeared last year in the *Ottawa Journal* and in other newspapers across the country. This was five years after 1961. I will take this opportunity to read a short excerpt from General Foulkes' statement, which indicates why he is now disturbed by the current trend of government policy. This was the first in a series of articles and I will start by reading the opening paragraph. It reads as follows:

I know all the senior officers who have been involved in this controversy with defence minister Hellyer over integration. Most of them have served with me in peace and war and I have had an opportunity to evaluate their ability, knowledge and character. I have a high regard for their professional skill, loyalty and esprit de corps and their devotion to the Canadian defence effort is above reproach.

I am sure that if these senior officers had not believed fully in the concept of integration, they would have not have accepted their appointments on the armed forces headquarters staff, knowing full well that their task was to implement the integration scheme.

The only logical conclusion that can be reached on the recent mass retirements is that there is a profound disagreement on the method and pace of implementing this novel and complicated military reorganization.

I think this points up the problem which confronts parliament. Suddenly integration has turned into unification. Anyone who disagrees with the sudden transformation is fired. The minister, in his white paper of 1964 indicated that unification was the ultimate objective. The statement was in the final phrase of that paragraph and was almost an afterthought. This is the impression which I got from the minister's speech, that he suddenly dreamed up the concept of unification, and unification, whatever it means, had a good ring to it. It seems to me that now he is