National Defence Act Amendment

M-113 armed personnel carrier is being ac- The plan for a single unified management was most significant improvements in our over-all range of equipment and one which has provided to our infantry the armoured protection they have badly needed for so long.

The process of integration and unification is well on its way in bringing together first at headquarters on a functional basis members of the navy, army and air force to administer the total force in unity. In a sense then our headquarters is unified. It is unified in the sense of being a single management of the navy, army and air force. This is where the problem of semantics between these words crops in. It is unified but with members of three separate legal entities, the navy, army and air force.

Our command structure is integrated or unified. Again one could use either word. These commands include, in the units assigned to them, elements of more than one service. In their directional staffs are included members of more than one service all working together toward a common goal. Maritime command is perhaps the best example. Maritime command has assigned to it ships of the Royal Canadian Navy, airplanes of the Royal Canadian Navy, helicopters and of course the long range airplanes of the Royal Canadian Air Force, all under a single integrated, unified command and all with the same missions-anti-submarine, search and rescue, as well as a secondary transport requirement. It is interesting to note that each one of these missions involves more than one of the traditional elements. Anti-submarine operations are sea operations; helicopters are flown from ships. Then there are submarines, land-based airplanes and airplanes flown from the carriers all in the same role. Search and rescue is sea and air. Transport is sea and air. In almost every instance there is a combination of elements. The old clear division between land, sea and air no longer applies.

This kind of organization, which in my opinion is very effective and will increase in effectiveness throughout the next four year period at a steady pace, leads inevitably to a [Mr. Hellyer.]

quired in quantity both for the brigade group developed and approved by many of the offioverseas and in Canada. This is one of the cers who gave testimony before the committee.

> Mr. Churchill: Would the minister permit a question at this point?

> Mr. Hellyer: Would the hon. member mind waiting until I have concluded these remarks?

> Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I should like to raise a point of order. If the minister is going to give us his impression of what a witness said in the defence committee, I do not think the house should accept that. Let us have the exact page reference for the statement made by the witness. I suggest that the minister is not doing this now with regard to Air Chief Marshal Miller when he creates the impression that Air Chief Marshal Miller has said something or other. We should have the exact page reference now that we have the information before us in the evidence of the committee. That is my point of order.

> Mr. Harkness: The minister is completely misrepresenting the evidence given by Air Chief Marshal Miller.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, the evidence given by Air Chief Marshal Miller is in the record. I do not think I am doing any injustice to it in my statement. The organization at headquarters and commands is effectively unified. In other words, all commanders report through the same chain of command to the same head of service. I think, therefore, that logic would lead one to the inevitable conclusion that the end objective is exactly as stated in the white paper at the time the cycle was begun, that is, that integration of the headquarters was the first step toward a single unified defence force for Canada.

The advantages which would result from the passage of this bill have been stated. Perhaps, however, I should go over them again today. The first is identification. All these people working together in the headquarters and in the unified commands will be identified with the force as a whole. There are some very serious disadvantages in doing single service. Air Chief Marshal Miller in his it the other way. If people are in unified staff testimony before the committee underlined organizations as representatives of different this. He rejected the idea of separate heads of services, the service representation becomes service. As soon as one rejects the concept of the significant factor in the choice of personseparate heads of service one is talking about nel. It becomes a matter of the ratio of a single service. Regardless of what you call personnel between one service and another, it you are talking about unified management. the balance of people by colour. From my