

National Defence Act Amendment

and that men create tradition and pride of title not vice versa.

Unification of the three services is undoubtedly sound and timely. Let interservice jealousy, personal rivalry and the extravagances of triplication give way to a single, effective and streamlined service in which Canadians can build future history and new tradition in the service of Canada, whether by land, sea, air or space.

Mr. Dinsdale: Would the hon. member permit a question? It seems to me that the hon. member is talking about integration and not unification. If he talks of unification how can he bring the sea, land, air and space together.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: I very seldom rise to speak in the house and hon. members opposite have told me so. With your permission, I shall come back to this whole problem. As far as I am concerned, it is part of the same operation.

Those statements, Mr. Chairman, are those of retired senior officers. They know very well what they are talking about and they definitely support unification. Their number increases constantly.

As for members of the opposition, at a certain time, and even today, I count seven of them—which shows the extraordinary opposition they have raised against this matter which, according to them, will destroy our traditions—I count one, two, three, four, five and even nine of them in the house. Monday night last, April 3, there were only five. That is no doubt an indication of their conviction.

Wing Commander Yellowlees certainly put his finger on it when he said, and I quote the *Calgary-Herald* of December 10, 1966:

[*English*]

For months now Canadians have been watching military traditionalists arguing against unification. The dispute unfortunately, has been shamefully distorted by emotion, blatant politics and jowl-shaking demagoguery.

This is written by a man called Yellowlees—not Lee.

Mr. Churchill: Lee's name comes into everything.

Mr. Prud'homme: That is the name I have heard many times since this debate started.

● (4:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

However, I cannot understand those relentless attacks against a man by the name of Lee.

[*Mr. Prud'homme.*]

[*English*]

I have heard it said of Mr. David McIntosh of the Canadian Press that he is biased, superficial, and does not report objectively to the Canadian population. He may be biased yet many editorials are written on his reports, columns are based on them and cartoons are drawn. I do not wish it to be thought that when I speak I reflect the words of Mr. Lee, just as I do not think when the hon. member for Athabasca speaks he reflects the hidden words of Mr. McIntosh. I do not care to behave in that way. I shall now continue:

Modern—and future—military operations call for hard, business-like methods. The scientist, the engineer and the logistics expert will be all-important.

That might have concerned the hon. member for Brandon—

An hon. Member: Brandon-Souris.

Mr. Prud'homme: Brandon has a nice sound. I went there every week end for two summers.

Mr. Churchill: It is close to Shilo.

Mr. Prud'homme: I continue quoting:

The future demands the utmost in efficiency. Let us listen to Mr. Hellyer.

[*Translation*]

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see briefly who is against this policy. They are of many categories. First, there is the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) who still endeavours to define unification but who did not bother to read the record of the committee proceedings in which, on many instances, the minister defined unification as follows:

[*English*]

When I refer to a unified force, I refer to a single integrated service encompassing the naval, land, air and support units necessary to carry out its assigned roles and missions, and operating under unified management.

[*Translation*]

That is clear enough, I think. And then there is the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Nugent). I intended to take up every point of his numerous statements. I am not in the habit, on the other hand, of launching verbal attacks against anybody in an unparliamentary manner. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) must have noted that I have followed his remarks very closely. I have listened to his many interventions which are always made