

preparation for war? The problem needs continuous study, not only as between the armed services and civilian requirements, but also on an interservice basis, so that in terms of man-power, weapons and equipment the resources available are distributed in properly balanced proportions. Surely the proper answer, in order to apply the great lesson of the war and bring about the necessary unification, planning and direction, is unification at the top now. It is better to make mistakes now, and in the immediate future—and it is inevitable that there will be mistakes, as there are always mistakes when you are trying out a new system—than to wait until another war comes and then attempt to correct them, because, if another war comes, there may not be an opportunity to correct them.

I know that certain writers on parliamentary procedure say it is the duty of the opposition to criticize. One could go on criticizing the organization of the national defence department and the organization of the services, but if I can break away from the advice of those writers for a moment and treat the national defence department as something of far too great importance to this country to permit mere partisan advantages to be taken, I should feel that I was making a bigger contribution to this debate if I offered one or two constructive suggestions. I believe that the first step to bring about unification and to avoid such mistakes is the establishment of a defence committee under the authority of the cabinet; and the second is the appointment of a single, responsible, professional adviser to the government as chief of staff of all the armed forces. Under this head the three staffs now charged with the separate planning, training and organization, would be merged into one, and would be able to produce a single unified plan of defence and to design a balanced force to carry out that plan. Likewise the triple staffs now dealing with man-power or equipment or supplies should be unified under one head instead of under three; and anyone who says they are now unified under one head does not know what he is talking about. Only in that way can man-power be properly allocated in war. In no other way can economy and efficiency be secured in the supply of equipment, clothing and all the innumerable items needed by the forces. It is essential that the minister be provided with a guiding hand to formulate and unify defence policy for the three services. For lack of such unifying influence the separate aspects of our defence tend to be examined one by one. There is no provision for any thorough examination of the

different service plans to ensure that if war comes, we shall be ready to meet it in all respects.

This weakness is not overcome by the appointment of a minister of defence. He has neither the time nor the technical training for the task. His chief concern is the administration of the services in accordance with the general policy and within the resources allotted to him. The chiefs of staff committee at present does not form a combined staff in the sense of an impartial organization which formulates plans without regard to the interest and prejudice of each particular service. You will never get that thorough unification; you will never have a proper, coordinated plan submitted to this government, until there is a chief of staff who is chief of staff of all three services.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the office of the deputy minister, with its cumbersome organization duplicating the administrative machinery of the services and hampering every act of the service heads, must be materially reduced. The financial saving in overhead would then be enormous. This reorganization can be brought about without any one of the services losing any of its worth-while traditions or peculiarities. For generations the army has welded its different arms and regiments—the artillery, the armour, the engineers, the infantry and so on—into brigades, divisions and corps. It has done so without diminishing in any way the efficiency of the separate units within those various arms; and, having done so, the army has been able to win major battles. And this was done while the individual characteristics and esprit de corps of each arm, and even of the individual regiments were actually being fostered. The same result can and must be achieved as between the three services themselves. So far, this government's attempt to form an integrated service can be described only as having been a topsy-turvy affair. The government has said to the very young naval and air force cadets attending Royal Roads, "You must learn to work and play together." But as you advance up the military hierarchy you find seniors still working in airtight compartments and officers of middle seniority endeavouring to serve two masters.

With reference to the policy for research, the problem here is to secure the continued and complete integration of military and scientific thought at all levels, and to ensure that, in the planning of defence research as a whole, account is taken of the scientific effort of the country in other fields, so that our resources may be efficiently and economically used.