

National Defence Act Amendment

forth. All right. I think the minister will have to agree that perhaps he is changing the role of the aircraft he is buying for the air force.

Mr. Hellyer: Not at all.

Mr. Lambert: This comes from a statement attributed to the chief of the defence staff. Somebody is wrong because there is a grave contradiction on this point, or a grave misreporting. I do not know how far this matter goes but here again we want clarification.

● (6:10 p.m.)

Why should there be in a single force, if its role is to be peace keeping, a greater adaptability to differing roles? Peace keeping, if that is to be the role of the force, is not in high odour among world councils today. Is this to be training for operations in the temperate zone? Is it to be for the jungle or for the desert? Is it to be for the Arctic? Remember, the uniform which is talked about is not the fighting uniform. Those will be diverse. The tank men will still wear dungarees; the sailors will still need dungarees at times. They will not be working in those uniforms about which we have heard. Let no one think that the only uniform the soldier will wear in the field or on peace keeping operations will be his "camouflage" clothes. Has the minister never heard of week end leave or time off from duty? Has he never heard of getting out of fighting or working clothes? I have heard a great deal of nonsense, men talking about the kind of shorts they wore in the field during the war, the unconventional clothes they wore fighting. I will tell you this, Mr. Chairman. As soon as they stopped that they went back to their regimental uniforms of which they were inordinately proud.

Ceremonial dress? How long will that last? Will sailors go walking ashore in a green uniform looking like Air Canada pilots? If that is what hon. members opposite think they can do, all right. But I wish they would consult some sailors and see what they think about it.

Surely the hon. member for Greenwood must envisage a further difficulty in his desire that our forces should work on a really co-operative basis with the forces of the rest of the world in peace keeping operations—the difference between the structure of our forces and that of the forces with which we would be working. Our Canadian organization is to be so distinguished, so different from that of others, and yet we are to work with British, French, Italians, Norwegians, Swedes. The call is for co-operation. But we intend to be

[Mr. Lambert.]

the one country that is in step; everyone else will be out of step.

How is co-operation achieved? By integration. By working with equals, with people who know your type of job and who tend to think as you do. But we intend to set ourselves apart, to make ourselves really distinguished on this basis though we know that no one else is giving serious thought to unification.

Let us not confuse unification with integration. A number of countries are examining the possibilities of integration and action has been taken by some of them to a certain extent. But there they have cried halt, with none of this nonsense about one uniform, one rank, one serviceman.

We shall get an opportunity to examine the testimony of individuals whose opinions must be highly respected when we consider the question of unification. All the testimony of General Lilley for instance, has to do with integration and amounts to an explanation of an integrated supply service which is partly in blueprint form. It is still on a three-services basis. If the temperature of international relations were to increase somewhat and if we had to push the accelerator forward two or three notches we would be in trouble. The same applies to the training command. We would be in trouble.

The foundations of integration must be completed and tested, and what is found wanting must be changed. Anyone who listened to the comments of Air Chief Marshal Miller would agree they amounted simply to this: why introduce the dislocation of unification in addition to the problems already brought about by integration? What is the rush? This is apart altogether from an acceptance of the principle of unification.

I will close these remarks hoping that there will be full participation in this debate by members of the defence committee in all quarters of the house. This is too important a subject for hon. members to sit mutely by instead of analysing these proposals like intelligent men, as they are. I want to hear both sides of the question; there may be something I have missed. I also want members opposite to note those proposals to which experienced men have said no.

No country has faced such a situation as we have faced since June of last year in which so many senior officers, men appointed by the present minister under the new plan of reorganization, have chosen to fight or to place