

*National Defence Act Amendment*

London. In the chapter "The defence organization of Britain" he writes under the heading "One fighting service: not three". Montgomery concludes:

Progress and development in the modern world have outmoded the old conceptions of the organization of armed forces; but we cannot see this, so strong are our habits and traditions. The separate existence of the three services, sea, air, and land, automatically results in waste of money, waste of manpower, waste of time.

**Mr. Lambert:** Nonsense.

**Mr. Matheson:** Nonsense, is it? Perhaps my hon. friend sat too long reflecting about war and the tragic circumstances of Dieppe, because if unification had been implemented earlier, if he had more assistance on the beaches of Dieppe he might not have been a prisoner of war for so long.

**Mr. Lambert:** It would have taken more than that.

**Mr. Matheson:** I suggest that listening to Montgomery, who had some experience in war is worth our while. He said:

The separate existence of the three services, sea, air, and land, automatically results in waste of money, waste of manpower, waste of time...

But the greatest fact of modern times is that change is inevitable;...

Progress depends on courage to make decisions to meet the needs of the times.

He says that this confusion in military thinking is the result basically of the old feudal system of three services. He said:

The old feudal system, first of two services and now three, has existed for too long—

He says this, and I quote:

It seems to me to be ridiculous to go on in this way. Obviously we cannot today go over to one service—

He is speaking about the United Kingdom. He suggests that the final step must be to abolish the three services and organize them into one fighting service under a single war department.

I notice in another statement he concludes:

If the United Kingdom were today a recently created state organizing the fighting forces it is inconceivable that they would be separated into three services.

This step of course invites all kinds of opposition. I can understand people who love tradition being upset. I do not believe there is any person involved in the implementation of this operation who does not care about tradition. I should like to touch on some of this in a minute. Nevertheless, we are compelled to

[Mr. Matheson.]

come to certain conclusions. I was interested to read the observation of a prominent Canadian who, when speaking of the Minister of National Defence, said:

He has perhaps more integrity than any man I've ever met in public life,—

These words were spoken before the Christmas recess. I think we are exceptionally fortunate in Canada to have this minister at this time willing to undertake this difficult and in some respects unpopular task which must be done.

**Mr. Bell (Carleton):** Disastrous.

**Mr. Matheson:** Disastrous, the hon. member for Carleton said. Well, General Charles Foulkes, former chairman, chief of staff committee in the *Star Weekly* magazine of October 14, 1961, said something about this—and my hon. friend from Carleton was sitting over here in those days where he might have done something about it. The *Star Weekly* article I refer to states unequivocally:

We need one singled armed service, under one supreme chief of staff, in one uniform.

The author General Foulkes, says that only then can Canada start to get real value for its defence budget.

**Mr. Harkness:** You had better read what he wrote in 1960.

**Mr. Matheson:** Perhaps my hon. friend who formerly had responsibility in this regard would listen. Perhaps it was not his fault that his defence policy was so utterly paralysed, going in opposite directions. Perhaps he would not mind listening to our Minister of National Defence who has put his reputation on the line. Our minister is prepared to carry this through. Believe me, many Canadians feel this makes good sense.

One of the things that appeals to me in this program is that it will undo the confusion in trades. John Gellner tells us that there are 346 separate trades in the services. A careful study, conducted since October, 1964, has shown that there need be only 98. Of these, 28 are unique to one service and will exist only in one. The remaining 70 trades will be common to two or all services. He says:

To integrate these trades was the only sensible thing to do. It should have been done long ago.

Some of us have had an opportunity to discover how, for a period of years there was an oversupply in some trades, and a great