

ilar to the pre-war committee on imperial defence which was established in Great Britain, is necessary. Does such a committee exist? Is it being considered?

There is, of course, a defence council, but that is an entirely different organization. By order in council P.C. 887 there has been set up a reorganized defence council. This unwieldy body has nine members, six civilian and three military. The members are: Chairman, the Minister of National Defence; the parliamentary assistant to the minister; the deputy minister; the chief of the naval staff; the chief of the general staff; the chief of the air staff; the director general of defence research, and the two associate deputy ministers. Its functions would seem to be to allocate the available resources between the three services and to settle questions of general administration on which a common policy is desirable. But in the absence of guidance from a broader committee, such as a defence committee, its decisions are likely to be of a hit-or-miss nature. Its duties are defined in P.C. 887 as: to advise the Minister of National Defence on matters relating to the naval, military and air services.

I should like the house to note the limited scope which is given in that order in council to the defence council.

To come down one step in the departmental organization, each service maintains an independent staff responsible for operations, planning, training and intelligence. Thus we have an assistant chief of the naval staff, a vice-chief of the general staff, an air member for air plans and another air member for operations and training. Dealing with all the problems of manning, again each service has its own head, namely, the chief of naval personnel, the adjutant general and the air member for air personnel as well as directors of civil personnel and treasury representatives. Each of these officers is responsible for the recruiting, discipline and administration of all the officers and men of his own particular service, making uniformity and equality of treatment in matters of discipline, special allowances and pay and a host of things which affect the morale and welfare of the troops, almost impossible to achieve. As an example, there are in northern Canada today stations where the airmen receive special allowances for isolation, to which the soldiers living in the same quarters are not entitled.

Finally, there are three separate staffs provided for the equipping, accommodating and supplying of the three services. These are controlled respectively by the chief of naval administration and supply, the quarter-master

general and the master general of the ordnance, now combined in one person, and the air member for technical services. Below all these levels, the triplication of organization is continued. Each service still has its own machinery for pay, medical treatment, and many other services of administration.

The feature hardest to understand is that, despite this triple set of naval, military and air planners, trainers and administrators, thousands of civil servants are charged with the general administration of the department, and the deputy minister is the senior permanent official on the defence council. The result is that in every department of administration the responsible service heads must find their way to the minister through the labyrinth of the deputy minister's branch. The service officers are thus deprived of initiative, obstructed and hampered in the discharge of their responsibilities.

It will be obvious that this complicated organization of the Department of National Defence must be incapable of making and executing a unified and workable plan for the defence of Canada. In peace time, the money allotted for defence must be limited. Each independent service is naturally and inevitably concerned to maintain its strength as high as possible, to keep up its efficiency, to conserve its traditions, and to protect what it conceives to be its own interests. Each set of planners will plan with these things in mind, and each service will bid against the others for such funds as they feel are likely to be made available. How then can there be any coordinated plan of defence under which all funds are spent in the right proportion on ships, aircraft, tanks and the other things which are needed to carry out such plans? With the department organized as at present, every plan of defence put before the government is the work of a committee, and in the very nature of a committee it must be a compromise as between the rival claims and interests of the three services. Who, for instance, is to say what proportion of the trades and man-power generally is to be mobilized for each service if war comes, or are the services to do as they did last time and compete in the open market for the men they need? I venture to say that the man-power difficulties during world war II arose very largely because there had been no adequate pre-war organization which could assign the resources in properly balanced proportions, in the light of the country's economic position.

What authority comparable to the defence committee of Great Britain is there or was there for coordinating departmental action in