

*National Defence Act Amendment*

interest across the country in unification. As a result of the very clever propaganda put out by the minister's office, people accepted the statement that unification and integration were the same thing. The minister quoted reams of figures to show how integration had saved the taxpayers' money. Of course, the obvious implication was that more money would be saved by unification.

● (5:40 p.m.)

When the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra and others started to hear from people across the country that perhaps unification and integration were not the same thing and that they were perturbed about the possible destruction of the identity of the three fighting forces, the chairman of the defence committee came up with a most ingenious idea. He told the people that the only thing involved in Bill No. C-243 was a change in the name of the armed forces. I should like to quote from the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra as recorded on page 14714 of *Hansard*:

Only one thing of any real importance remained to be done and that was to give the new single force which we had created in 1964 a name.

On page 14715 we find these words:

I repeat that this bill asks us to do only one thing of consequence. It asks us to give our forces a name: "The Canadian Armed Forces."

How desperate can those on the other side get when they will say that the only effect of this bill—this statement was made by the chairman of the defence committee, one who supposedly has the confidence of the government and the endorsement of the Minister of National Defence—is to give the forces a new name. I should like to hear from the Minister of National Defence before long as to his reaction to the interpretation of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra of this bill. All it seeks to do, according to the hon. member, is to give a new name to the forces that already exist.

If that is all this bill does the question arises, why the hurry? Why is there this pressure? The minister has said that after the passage of the bill it will not be proclaimed for four or five months. Why the rush if the only effect of this bill is to change the name? Why the insistence by the minister that the morale of the armed forces must be preserved and we must proceed immediately to approve this bill during this session? He says that the department cannot get on with the reorganization until the unification bill has been

passed. In my opinion this is an argument of the utmost desperation.

Let me point out the difference between the old sections 15 to 18 of the National Defence Act and the provisions of this bill. The old sections of the National Defence Act read in part as follows:

The Canadian forces are the naval, army and air forces of Her Majesty raised by Canada and consist of three services, namely, the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force.

There shall be a component of each service of the Canadian forces consisting of officers and men who are enrolled for continuing full-time military service; and those components are referred to in this act as the regular forces.

The fact of the matter is that the main effect of Bill No. C-243 would be to destroy the identity of the three fighting services of our armed forces. Yet the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra dares to say that the only significant change that would be occasioned by the passage of this bill would be to change the name of the armed forces as already created by Bill No. C-90. No wonder the Liberals are not putting up any more speakers; they have obviously run out of even the most desperate arguments.

I believe this would be a good time to quote from an editorial which appeared in the *Winnipeg Free Press* on Wednesday, April 4:

In his initial position on "integration" Mr. Hellyer's statement indicated both wisdom and a broad-minded approach.

I do not completely agree with that statement. We were in agreement with the general idea of integration, although we believed the minister committed many faults in bringing it about.

Seemingly when he raised the matter of total unification, however, he was unable to accept the fact that his most experienced officers, both outside and within the service, advised strongly against it. This qualified and considered advice was interpreted by Mr. Hellyer as interference and personal opposition to his will, an attempt to obstruct and thwart his own ambitions. In this context, Mr. Hellyer has apparently determined to plunge blindly ahead regardless of any harm done to himself, the services, his government or the nation.

Surely by now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of National Defence and the government must have some inkling of the serious opposition to the proposed unification measure. I have received a great number of letters on this question. Incidentally, I would venture to say that the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) is out of touch with the people at the Esquimalt base. Judging by the letters I have received and by