

*Interim Supply*

favours those men who support Mr. Hellyer's views; if one opposes them, according to one officer, "from a career angle you are finished."

We had evidence of that just prior to the present debate. The second point made in this article reads:

One reason for the doubts and questioning is that the government's complete plans for integration or unification are as yet vague and undefined.

They might have added the word "amalgamation", since that has crept into the debate. It goes on:

There is also reason to believe that in its drive to push ahead with integration, the defence department is not anxious to have any member or past member of the armed forces who might be critical of the program appear before the defence committee.

Critics of the integration program have three major objectives. They want to see maintained the identity of the three services even within an integrated defence organization. They would like to see a halt made in the integration program so that problems which have arisen can be examined.

This is the request which has been made of the government time and time again throughout this debate. I continue to quote:

And they would like to have a full inquiry made into future plans of the government in this field so that their impact can be properly assessed. The latter could not, of course, be done without the government disclosing all details of its future program.

This is all we want. We may agree 100 per cent with what the minister is proposing, but we certainly do not intend to agree with him blindly. The fourth point made in this article is this:

The critics' requests for fair hearings do not seem unreasonable.

None of the requests I have heard made from this side of the house appear unreasonable to me. If there are any which appear unreasonable to the minister, let him say so and we will withdraw them. The fifth point made in this article is:

The implications and consequences are many and varied. It is, in the circumstances, no more than right that the government should be willing to lay its cards on the table, so that the armed services and the Canadian people can see what the government is trying to do and can then give the government's plans the consideration they deserve and should have.

We agree 100 per cent with what is said there. The sixth point is:

This, as Mr. Diefenbaker rightly pointed out, puts the Commons in the awkward position of having to vote approval of the bill in principle before it has had an opportunity to hear the views of those who are opposed to it.

23033—619½

And the seventh:

Legislation containing so many critical changes to the nation's defence structure should be given detailed study in committee before the house is asked to approve it in principle.

This is all we are asking the government to do. Remember that these proposals which I have enumerated come from the Liberal party's own adviser, the *Winnipeg Free Press*. We would be content if the government would follow the suggestions outlined in this editorial.

As far as I am concerned, my hon. friend from Kamloops in his speech a few days ago clearly outlined precisely what we want. As reported in *Hansard* on page 9517, he had this to say:

After all, at the root of this discussion is the policy of unification and the question of whether this country can afford it in terms of the security of the nation, the expenditure of dollars and the efficiency of that expenditure.

We want to find whether the policy is correct.

He went on to say:

The minister's policy of unification appears to be based on three assumptions. I must necessarily summarize here, Mr. Chairman. As I understand it, they are these: first, that there will never again be a conventional war in the sense of say world war II.

If that is one of the minister's assumptions, he has no more right to say it is a correct one than I have. No one knows whether the next war will be a conventional war. We must guard against that possibility, otherwise, as I have said before, we might just as well disband the Department of National Defence and save the entire vote of money for that department.

The hon. member for Kamloops continued—

—second, that a nuclear war on a world scale is impossible to envisage, or if we can envisage it, it would be impossible for Canada to do anything effective, and we might as well forget about it.

At this point the minister interjected to say: Don't give me my assumptions. Use your own.

Anyone could be forgiven for wanting to know what the minister's assumptions are. We should like to know what makes him believe his assurances are correct. I say once again that his proposals might, in theory, be good for Canada. But theory does not always work out well in practice. There must be something else besides theory. Take, for example, an appendectomy. It is easy to explain what it is, to say it is necessary to make an incision to remove a useless gland, and so on. But if the operation is performed without the necessary