

*National Defence Act Amendment*

men should be allowed to mix cola with a tot of rum. I can do no better than quote from an editorial in the *Victoria Colonist* of April 14. It is headed "A Rum Business", and reads as follows:

When Canadian sailors were allowed to mix cola with their rum tots, former R.C.N. captain Mr. David Groos, M.P., said in the Commons, "you should have heard the uproar" from some of his "overly conservative" one-time naval colleagues. Whereas, he added, Admiral Nelson would have liked the mix because he was a very progressive admiral.

One hopes Mr. Hellyer was listening, for a year or two ago he was reported as telling local naval officers when pressing his unification theme that they weren't living in Nelsonian days. And he didn't mean this as a compliment to the world-renowned admiral of history.

But speaking by the way how does Mr. Groos know that Nelson would have liked to have his drink diluted with something else? He may have preferred it straight and true, the stronger the better.

What Lord Nelson wouldn't have liked, one feels sure, would have been to see his navy downgraded and its proud title abolished. Mr. Groos should have been more careful in his allusions to famous men. For he is decidedly in favour of Mr. Hellyer's plans.

So much does he support the unification bill that, he told the Commons, he would return to the navy willingly tomorrow.

What "navy", one may ask? When the bill goes through there will be no formation of such designation; there will only be one composite armed force, under a name yet to be chosen.

Next there is a reference to me which, being very modest, I will omit. However, I will read the last two paragraphs of this editorial:

If one is to judge by Mr. Hellyer's advocacy on the subject, there is to be no limit to the extent of military unification. The defence minister in fact claims that as far as military organization is concerned Canada "will be leading the world".

It would be interesting to hear what defence staffs of the major military nations think of that chauvinistic boast. And Mr. Groos also.

The hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) tried to convey to the house the idea that the armed forces, and in particular the navy, have always been too conservative, have never wanted to face the facts and have always looked at the rear view mirror. I received a letter from another naval officer in Victoria who said that the only reason the navy personnel objected to the Canadian volunteer service medal being worn was that it was made of compressed cardboard and it split at the seams at sea. Furthermore, the same medal was awarded also to conscripts. The hon. member for Victoria (B.C.), in trying to show how outmoded and backward the navy

[Mr. Chatterton.]

was, also gave the example of the painting of the maple leaf on the funnels of Canadian warships. This officer told me that the maple leaves were ordered removed from the funnels by order of the admiral in charge of the various ships because it could be used as a mark to aim at.

The hon. member for Victoria (B.C.), also used as an example of how backward-looking the navy was the fact that during the last war navy personnel objected to wearing the Canada flashes on their shoulders. The officer from Victoria to whom I have already referred wrote to me as follows:

We didn't need Canada flashes. We could tell a Canadian by the cut of his jib. The word "Canada" was on our buttons, so why the shoulder badges?

It seems to me that the examples given by the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) were the poorest examples that could be used by an ex-officer of the Royal Canadian Navy, one who gave distinguished service while in the navy, to illustrate that the navy was always behind the times. Even if his arguments that the navy refused to wear shoulder badges and certain medals, that it refused to have the maple leaf painted on the funnels of warships and so on, were correct, how can they be used as reasons for the major step being proposed by the minister and the government for the reorganization of our armed forces?

The idea that any opposition to change is being advanced by people looking to the past was promoted also by Major General F. F. Worthington in an article in *The Ottawa Journal* of Tuesday, April 14, 1967. The headline of the article was: "Annihilation Could Be Result Of Keeping Old Generals". That is an eye-catching headline. The article reads in part as follows:

Unification of certain trade structures and professions cannot help but be beneficial in achieving efficiency and economy in such branches as medical, pay, communications, transport, police, mechanical engineering and so on.

So even General Worthington, the great advocate of annihilating all the qualified and expert people in the armed forces, admits that only the unification of certain services would be of advantage.

The most ridiculous argument I have heard from the other side came from the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra. By this time no doubt the hon. member and many others and possibly many members of the cabinet have heard from people all across Canada. They are becoming worried. I know full well that last October and November there was very little