

*National Defence Act Amendment*

given. Other witnesses were not reported at all.

It is therefore with a great deal of pleasure and admiration that this morning I was able to read in the April 3 edition of the *Toronto Globe and Mail* a first class, and in depth, job of reporting by Mr. Anthony Westell. Mr. Westell, rather than simply accepting the highly sensationalized and one-sided versions from the wire service coverage of the hearings, obviously took the trouble to read the evidence in depth. Because of the professionalism and clarity of his article, and because it represents an independent and not always favourable point of view, I intend to record a considerable portion of this article on the record.

**Mr. Churchill:** Could the hon. member permit a question at this point? It has to do with Mr. Westell's article. How did Mr. Westell get access to the reports of the committee hearings, which reached the members only today at noon?

**Mr. Andras:** I quote:

The transcript of evidence taken by the Commons committee on defence, when it was studying the bill to unify the three fighting services, runs to more than 2,000 printed pages, or close to a million words. Searching through the record for the truth about unification is rather worse than reading the verbatim evidence in a hard-fought criminal trial to form an opinion on guilt or innocence.

At a trial at least some of the witnesses are disinterested and impartial; before the defence committee, all the evidence was, in fact, advocacy of a particular point of view, and much of it was impassioned. The admirals, generals and air marshals who appeared were all experts, and for each opinion expressed there was a contradiction of equal authority, but no other evidence.

**Mr. Westell goes on:**

In these circumstances, the debate—or rather, the trial of unification—is likely to produce far more heat than light, far more confusion than clarification. The jury, which is the public, will hear many speeches intended to sway its emotions, but few which will inform its opinion. All the facts and opinions are already on the record in the transcript of the committee proceedings.

As a background to the debate in the Commons, this is an attempt to isolate and analyze some of the main trends of thought and argument that appeared before the committee. To illustrate the difficulty, and the caution with which judgment must be approached, consider a few quotations:

Rear Admiral Jeffrey Brock, fired as Maritime Commander by Defence Minister Paul Hellyer in 1964 and since living in retirement: "Our navy now, and its anti-submarine capability, is greatly diminished from what it was 2½ years ago."

Commodore H. A. Porter, director-general, Maritime Forces, presenting a brief prepared in consultation with the naval staff and present commander of Maritime Forces: "I think from the anti-submarine point of view we are more effective today than we have ever been."

Then Rear Admiral Landymore is cited. His opinion is:

"Unification has very little, if any, merit. It is change for the sake of change. It is unnecessary and expensive. It is oriented politically and not militarily."

On the other hand, the next paragraph states:

Rear Admiral C. J. Dillon, 36 years in the R.C.N., a supply officer who was Deputy Comptroller-General when he retired last year, recalled to undertake a special study for the Defence Staff, and a student of military history: "I think when all the froth is blown off the beer and we get over this period of adjustment these people are embarking on, I suppose I could say my only regret is that I am too old to participate any further... I have often said to people when they have talked about unification, "You ought to belong to my church". I happen to be an adherent of the Church of Rome and it is going through some very traumatic experiences these days. They are probably akin in some ways to what is over the horizon for the services. I think we can rise above this... I certainly will shed a tear for the Royal Canadian Navy, but I think we live in a world where we must adjust to change... I think it is all going to work out all right."

● (9:30 p.m.)

Lt. Gen. R. W. Moncel, vice-chief of the defence forces until he retired last year after becoming convinced that unification was going too far too fast: "... First, to translate the white paper (of 1964) into the force that it called for required, by all my calculations, a force of 150,000 at a budget of \$2 million, accruing at 5 per cent. I could never do for less than that, what the white paper said could be done."

Air Chief Marshal Frank Miller, chief of defence staff until he retired last year, questioned about General Moncel's statement: "I do not know where he got those figures; they do not ring any bells with me, and I think they are on the high side for our present commitments... I do not see any real difficulty in our meeting our commitments up until now."

Air Chief Marshal Miller, at the close of his evidence: "... I am in favour of integration as we have it now, as it is developing. I am not closing the book at all on some future unification, but because of the need to get the integration machinery oiled up and working, I would not want a disruptive influence such as unification at this time to be thrown into the machinery."

General J. V. Allard, chief of the defence staff, commander of the Canadian brigade in Korea, a commander of a British division, an amateur yachtsman and a qualified pilot: "I would like to make it clear, therefore, that in making my presentation before you, I do so as the man responsible for carrying out the policy of the government through the Minister of National Defence, for ensuring that the defence forces we have today