

attitude we now have certain things that were brought about by dictators in the past. Again I refer to the recent statement made by General Foulkes who said of one dictator that he dismissed every general who told him what he should know, and not what he would have liked to hear.

I suggest that the minister should look at what his propaganda team is doing. Its members are probably very expert. They are probably feeding him propaganda, but the Canadian public are not swallowing the unification idea, certainly not those people most concerned with it.

As recommended reading for the minister I would refer him to editorials printed in the *Winnipeg Free Press* in August last year, and in particular to one headed "Two Serious Errors," which reads in part as follows:

The two serious errors in defence minister Hellyer's otherwise constructive program for integration of the three armed services concern the two extremities of the military establishment, namely the command structure at the very top, and the lower levels of the regimental family, the ship's company and equivalent units. The grave weakness in these two areas has already been illustrated through the recent retirements of a number of senior generals, admirals and air marshals. If not soon corrected, these two faults could destroy the effectiveness of our defence establishments.

The initial fault in Canada's command structure commenced with the army back in 1950 when, despite all the clear lessons of history, we created a virtual commander-in-chief. In the more recent re-organization of a unified defence council and a chief of the defence staff, Mr. Hellyer has not only perpetuated this faulty principle, he has enlarged the error by making it applicable to the combined services.

We now have in fact, if not in name, a captain-general of the forces, a post which became obsolete in Queen Anne's reign.

In essence, the chief of Canada's defence staff is now the adviser to the government on all defence matters. Mr. Hellyer argues that we do have a defence council. But members of this council do not vote or speak with a voice equal to that of the chief of the defence staff nor do they have the right of direct access to the government.

History has demonstrated times without number the fallacy of this arrangement. It is much like the relationship between a patient and his doctor—the professional. When the patient refuses to accept the doctor's professional advice the doctor must either abandon the case or be fired. In history, where the commander-in-chief principle has been attempted, either the minister representing the government or the commander-in-chief has dominated. One or the other, or sometimes both, must be destroyed or become mere ciphers.

Invariably a commander-in-chief tends to gather around him his friends and like-thinking "yes"

National Defence Act Amendment

men, who have no authority to question his decisions, their future appointments and promotions being dependent on his favour.

That is as far as I wish to quote that editorial, but once again I would direct the minister's attention to the last paragraph which I read. I know the minister is not required to listen in the house but I hope he will take into consideration the arguments that are put forward. I see now that the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Stewart) is leaving the house. I would ask him to get up and express his opinions with respect to this unification bill. As in other matters he has spoken outside the house but he never seems to be able to get up and put his ideas across in the house.

The propaganda team which has been referred to, and which has been acknowledged by the Minister of National Defence, is possibly a follow-up to the truth squad, something that was originated by the Secretary of State, but very soon dropped. I trust the propaganda team will come to the same fate as the truth squad, for no other reason than that the personal pride of its members should lead them to leave the staff of a minister who acknowledges that they are nothing more or less than a propaganda team. If this is the type of work they are performing, then I repeat that their personal pride will call upon them to quit, once the minister indicates that they are nothing more or less than a propaganda squad. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether this is getting across or not, but I trust it will be brought to their attention when they arrive in the house tomorrow.

The minister has often stated that unification will result in economic savings. He has often mentioned the 1964 white paper. I defy him and anybody else on that side of the house to point out where the 1964 white paper indicates anything in the way of savings for the Canadian taxpayer. There is absolutely nothing in it to indicate a saving to the taxpayer in respect of defence matters.

May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.