

National Defence Act Amendment

in manpower and time. He said that the ever expanding area of overlapping of functions and the continual development of new weapons and concepts of war point clearly in the direction of service unification.

He concluded that the development of a single, unified service would lead to an increased efficiency both in logistics and operations; that unification would eliminate the need for combined staffs; would eliminate interservice jealousy and rivalry, and it would make possible the more efficient use of resources available at every level. What was required here or anywhere else where this problem was under consideration was a person with a very sharp mind and an appetite for action, and that is what Philip Smith of *Weekend* magazine concluded was our happy fortune in the Minister of National Defence, a person possessed of the courage to act on the conclusions of past experience.

Hon. members might be interested in some of the quotations that are available from different authorities. General of the army Douglas MacArthur said:

The great lesson for the future is that success in the art of war depends upon a complete integration of the services. In unity will lie military strength.

Mr. Churchill: That is integration.

Mr. Matheson: I am not interested in semantics; I am interested in the development of an idea. I should like to quote what Dwight D. Eisenhower, General of the army, said:

Unity of command in the field so vital to our success was not easily achieved. When war came at Pearl Harbour we had joint command. It was not until we surprised the enemy in North Africa that the first large scale example of unified command emerged. But it was a new device and there were many difficulties which yet remained to be overcome. All of these had to be met and surmounted during actual operations when lives were at stake—

The navy, the air force and army must work as a unit. If I had my way they would all be in the same uniform.

This is General of the army Dwight D. Eisenhower speaking, and many of us in this chamber had the satisfaction of serving under this outstanding military leader of this century.

President Truman said:

We should establish the most advantageous framework for a unified system of training for combined operations of land, sea and air.

All of us can remember what Lord Lovat did with a united task force and what Mountbatten did in difficult days and what

Wingate did in the east. General of the army, Henry H. Arnold said:

Not only unity of command is required, but unity in the preparation of programs, preparation of supplies, preparation of ships and allocation of ships, and movement of supplies.

There was a reference a little earlier by the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Patterson) to our visit to Europe during the summertime. I remember studying for some hours the landing beach at Dieppe. The tragedy which developed from that fateful operation—I say this with humility and respect—would not have happened had there been the unity we are seeking to provide for our forces by this piece of legislation.

Then, Marshal of the Royal Air Force, Sir Arthur Harris, known as "Bomber" Harris, said:

There is only one answer to this otherwise inevitable tendency in each of the services to get tied to a particular and invariably obsolete weapon, and all weapons are obsolete as soon as they are in use. There must be only one service; the survival of three of them at this stage in the development of armaments is wholly idiotic, and there never was any reason or need for them at any time.

● (8:10 p.m.)

Some years ago when talking to some friends from the Royal Canadian Horse Artillery in Europe I was told precisely the same thing. I was given to understand that some weaponry used in the army was used also in the air force and in the navy.

Lord Louis Mountbatten said:

I do not believe that a committee composed of the respective commanders-in-chief, even if it had been under the chairmanship of a minister of state, could have functioned with the advantages which the Supreme Allied Commander enjoyed.

Field Marshal Montgomery said:

It is a grave question whether any large military organization which is not closely integrated and gripped tightly at the top can adapt itself successfully to the required speed of modern life.

The Duke of Edinburgh, respected all over the scientific world, tells us this:

Any idiot can go on doing what has been done before, but it takes real courage, intelligence and character to assess the needs of the future, to devise a sound program and carry it into effect. This is particularly true of the armed services, which become merely an expensive luxury unless the process of improvement, modernization, forward thinking, and planning goes on continuously.

He was speaking at the Royal Society of Military Engineers. Some of my friends might be interested in reading the book "Three Continents" by Field Marshal Montgomery of Alamein, published in 1962 by Collins of