

was forthcoming except his insistence that the whole principle of—I do not know what one might wish to call it—integration and unification must be accepted before one can examine the plan. If the plan has in it one iota of anything which is worth while, it will stand on its own feet and does not require acceptance in principle before examination. One might think the minister is afraid that the plan might not be acceptable or workable and therefore that the legislation must be enacted before the adverse effects of the plan become more and more apparent. In his speech the minister spent a great deal of time talking about the advantages of a single service. It was blocked out paragraph after paragraph. This showed again the confusion which exists in respect of the concept of a unified force and the concept of a single service.

If we go back to pages 10828 and following in *Hansard* we will see some of the advantages which the minister outlined in respect of the single service. These are: 1. Identity; 2, careers; 3, adaptability of change; and 4, demands of modern warfare. In his argument in respect of identify he claims that while sailors, soldiers and airmen will have a common identity and loyalty to their ships, regiments and squadrons, they will have an overriding loyalty to the whole force and its total objectives on behalf of Canada. What unadulterated piffle! Does the minister suggest there is going to be an improvement in loyalty and that there will be a higher loyalty, for instance, to one's country because there will be a single service? I am afraid that the minister shows how woefully short on experience he was in his country's service.

**Mr. Churchill:** It is insulting to the men who are in the service now.

**Mr. Lambert:** Is he suggesting that because the men were organized into regiments or because they were in the air force or the navy and attached to a particular service, their loyalty either to the service or to the country was one whit less? Remember, the minister must show that there is going to be a greater loyalty because they will be under a single identity. This is the first argument. His second argument is:

For able and highly motivated individuals, both officers and other ranks, wider, more challenging and rewarding career opportunities will be available.

#### *National Defence Act Amendment*

Again I say, what unadulterated piffle, because in expansion of that statement the minister said:

When people are able to move in a broad stream, which does not confine employment opportunities to narrow specialties or to the individual naval, army or air force entities, both the individual and the force as a whole will clearly benefit.

More Rand corporation language. I should like to give a comment on that, and I believe the minister will agree with this assessment of the degree of specialization in the forces:

Specialization is essential to maintain competence in today's technical and complex world and this principle applies as fully to defence as it does to industry. Therefore, the special training, equipment and experience to fight in each of the three environments, land, sea and air will remain segregated in our defence forces.

The minister has said that we will still have sailors, soldiers and airmen. Then, to continue:

● (5:20 p.m.)

There is nothing new in having common training or common support facilities provided by one service for the other by the service best equipped so to do or in placing elements of one service under the operational control of another for the specific exercise of commitment. It is obvious too that the spectrum of common training and operations is much narrower than the present service policies would imply. The cost of the multiple specialist training courses required to produce a universally employable service man in terms of dollars and time is prohibitive.

By this it is not meant that the minister proposes to turn out jacks of all trades. Even a four year old would recognize that that would not be feasible.

Let me continue:

It follows that unification of the field forces into a single service is inconsistent with the complexities of today's military facts.

That is a definitive answer to the minister's arguments in this regard.

We then swing away from the idea of a single force back to the idea of a single unified defence force. When the minister talks about adaptability of change he talks about a unified force permitting a much more objective analysis to be made as to the employment of this force. He suggested that because an individual belongs to a single unified force with a common uniform, with no tradition, and because he is one of a great mass, indistinguishable from any other, our defence policy, our weapons systems and all those other matters related to an over-all policy will be more flexible and easier to change. I fail to find any connection in this regard or any relationship between these two theses. The