

National Defence Act Amendment

have an opportunity to ask some questions of the Secretary of State for External Affairs as well as the Minister of National Defence, because these matters affect our whole foreign policy in the future and our relations with the United States, the United Nations and other countries. I believe these are matters which must be clarified before we are expected to vote on the principle of this bill. If the minister will not allow the subject matter of this question to be sent to either of these committees, then I would hope that he would give very complete and, for once, unequivocal answers to all these questions which have been brought up from time to time. He has not done so to date but I hope he will before we are asked to vote on this bill.

Mr. Jim McNulty (Lincoln): Mr. Speaker, in considering the question of unification of the Canadian armed forces, I think it would be interesting to hear the words of a distinguished Canadian soldier, General Charles Foulkes, C.B., C.B.E., D.S.O. As hon. members are aware, General Foulkes gave distinguished service to his country for more than 34 years. He held senior military posts in the Canadian armed forces. He served as chairman of the chiefs of staff committee for over nine years. I should like to read the following article by General Foulkes entitled "Our Defence Dollar Is Being Wasted" which appeared in the *Toronto Star Weekly* magazine of October 14, 1961. The article reads as follows:

Drastic changes are needed in the organization of the Canadian defence forces. This year's regular defence budget—without the additions promised in the present session of parliament—came to \$1.6 billion for a total strength of 120,000 men. About three-quarters of it is needed for pay, maintenance and operation, leaving only \$400 million for new equipment, although effective defence depends more and more on highly complex and expensive weapons. We are well on the way, as one commentator remarked, to having "the best dressed, best paid and poorest equipped forces in the world". Unless we can devise a new approach we shall find ourselves spending more and more money on less and less effective forces.

I am not one of those people who think we can find an easy and painless way out by trying to be neutral or putting all our forces under the United Nations or even by refusing all atomic weapons. Nor do I agree that our forces don't provide any protection. They help to provide the only protection there can be—which is to prevent nuclear war by making it far too dangerous for an aggressor to start one. I think Canada must go on contributing what it can to the "nuclear deterrent" of the free western world. I think we must also go on supporting United Nations efforts—however haphazard—to police the world's trouble spots. The

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

question is whether we can reshape our defence forces so that they can perform these tasks more efficiently.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Can we eliminate the waste and duplication and futility which taxpayers properly complain of? Can we reorganize the navy, army and air force so that they will give the Canadian people value for money and make a better contribution toward preserving peace?

I think we can. With the money we are now spending, I think the forces could be reorganized so as to meet all the major aims of Canadian policy. The first thing to do is to abolish the Canadian navy, army and air force and unite them all into one single Canadian Armed Service, and that is the name I'd use. Their functions already overlap. The army and navy want to fly; the air force already dreads being relegated to underground burrows dusting off automatic missiles.

Instead of keeping a separate air division and army brigade group as part of NATO's European shield, we should have a single Canadian task force. Instead of our scratch collection of ships and aircraft patrolling the oceans—some under the R.C.N. and some under the R.C.A.F. with joint committees trying to control them—we need a single maritime task force. Instead of having the R.C.A.F. clinging to its aircraft as the cavalry used to cling to its horses, while the army conducts survival operations, we need a single task force for continental defence.

After my nine years as chairman of the chiefs of staff, trying to co-ordinate the rival services, I am convinced that we can't achieve much more by the present road. Attempts to integrate the three services by persuasion have been going on ever since 1945. They have woven a huge spider's web of committees, which are rather like foreign ministers' meetings where rival powers try to reach a compromise. Some of the branches, like medical services and chaplains, have actually been amalgamated. But there was no economy in these amalgamations. When former defence minister George Pearkes pushed through a merger of chaplain services, he ended up with two more chaplains on brigadier's salary.

The problem can only be solved by complete unification of the three services, with one chief of staff, one chain of command, one ladder of promotion and one uniform.

I'm thinking, among other things, of the young men who are now in the services or may contemplate joining them. We must realize that these are professionals. Both officers and other ranks look to the services as providing a career. They can't be hired and fired at will as defence requirements may change. But so long as we insist on keeping them in three separate channels, which never meet except to argue on committees, we are crippling their chances for promotion and greatly reducing the career prospects we should be able to offer them.

In 1958 we had to disband the anti-aircraft artillery regiment. Its role was finished. The regiment included many technicians with tradesmen's skills in radar and electronics who had several years' service ahead of them before they went on pension. The air force was busy at the same time recruiting people to man its new radar stations: It took them in green and trained them. Air Marshal Hugh Campbell, chief of the air staff, fully agreed with