

*National Defence Act Amendment*

would appear to me to be contradictions and violations of basic principles; the attitude of the government that parliament must swallow this whole bill on faith, and be damned quick about it. This is what forces me to my feet.

The Minister of National Defence stated last Tuesday, in what I took to be his peroration, that there were witnesses available favouring unification who were not called. Why not? Why the unseemly haste in getting the bill back to the house and securing parliament's approval of a process or policy admittedly calculated to take years to implement fully? Surely a week or a month more on a matter so vital, involving the expenditure of so many billions of dollars, and perhaps an irrevocable commitment, merits no short changing in the investigation of its validity. That statement of the minister in itself casts shadows of doubt. It smacks of the salesman of the gold brick or the Brooklyn bridge, with his admonition to "hurry, hurry, hurry, or you'll miss the opportunity of a lifetime." There is an odour here of super high-pressure salesmanship that shakes one's confidence in the proposition.

A great deal of the debate, it seems to me, has been on points peripheral to the basic issue. While not discounting, for instance, a weight to tradition, I cannot get worked into a frenzy as to whether uniforms are baby pink, green, blue, yellow or purple, and above all on the insistence that a single uniform is going to work miracles of efficiency and economy.

What is important in the unification issue is that basically we are dealing with a system of management and organization. That system should be calculated to provide an optimum defence posture for our country, taking due note, as I am sure does the groaning Canadian taxpayer, that the defence department will be laying out about 20 cents of every dollar of the estimates recently tabled in the house.

• (8:10 p.m.)

I cannot and I do not believe the people of Canada are persuaded that it is advisable to jump into something so fraught with awful consequences, just on slogans and assurances that because it is good, ergo it is good. Dr. O'Leary runs about extolling the use of L.S.D.—that it is just dandy; it is the latest. I wonder whether the public goes along with the high priest of hallucinations on that basis.

The minister's semantic juggling of integration and unification, with his invocation of cycles, suggests that perhaps he has in mind a

bicycle, a vehicle used by the Bersaglieri of Italy in the first world war 50 years ago—very old hat indeed. But seriously, sir, I was disturbed by the minister's verbal acrobatics and analogy last Tuesday, likening integration and unification to the cycle of conception and childbirth. This left me aghast, for death is part of that cycle and that, sir, is disintegration.

This brief preface leads me to the fundamental point I wish to make and to which I referred in my opening remarks. In Bill C-243 we are dealing essentially with a management and organization problem, the correct solution of which is vital. While there seems to be near unanimity in respect of the benefits to be derived from integration in the defence department, I would call the attention of the committee and the country to the fact that there are places where effective and modern managerial and organizational procedures are of the essence. We have for example oil companies which are fully integrated on the multi-functional bases of exploration, producing, refining, transportation and distribution activities. The preservation of the integrity of these functional components is considered a must by men who are neither Liberals, Conservatives, Socialists, Social Crediters, nor any other political or ideological category, but who are swayed by and for their judgments on the best possible management of an entity—men who are every day seeking new things and who are charged with the responsibility to spend—and do spend—millions and millions of dollars on basic research. I am not speaking of old reactionary men when I speak of these men who have arrived at the conclusion that the integrity of the functional activity must be preserved in relation to the multibased activity.

To superimpose, cycle in, or otherwise clutter up the preservation of that integrity would be to violate the very rudiments of good management and organization. It would invite bankruptcy and the disappearance of the company as an entity. From this homely but practical analogy I submit that it is not in the interest of good management and organization recklessly to rush into, or go into at all, a process of making a hash of sea, air and land functions, any more than it would be to make a stew of geologists, drillers, refiners, pipeliners and distributors.

No, Mr. Chairman; hashed or stewed up, defence operations are not what the citizens and taxpayers of our country deserve.