

National Defence Act Amendment

what a demoralizing effect the "golden bowl-er" program had. Certainly it did not require the retirement of 10,000 service personnel, and we remember the jockeying that took place. Some of those who were in a position to benefit from it did so, and this was the case in a number of unfortunate instances.

Before proceeding further I want to go into what General Foulkes said in the second of his articles. This is a question that the minister must answer. Why is it that Lieutenant-General Fleury said in the the committee that it would be three to five years before the logistic framework of Canada's armed services could be completed? Here we are rushing headlong into the amalgamation of field forces. Not only did General Fleury speak about this but so did General Simonds and Air Marshal Annis. We would like an answer to that question.

The minister has on many occasions both inside and outside the house alleged that other nations are also moving toward the same end, that they are moving toward a single unified defence force composed of a single service. We even have the highly laudatory phrases—self-adulation, I call them—at the conclusion of the minister's speech in which he stated that this is the goal of the armed services of the rest of the world.

What countries have shown any interest, Mr. Speaker? There has been a remarkably strange silence. I believe at one point the minister said that two countries were taking a look at the proposition. We know that New Zealand did take a look at the proposal but rejected it as not being appropriate. With regard to Great Britain the minister will have to explain some of the passages in the book written by the former naval minister, Christopher Mayhew, about the minister's concept of a single service and some of his other reorganizations of the defence forces of Canada, which Mr. Mayhew says will not work in the United Kingdom. Therefore the United Kingdom may be ruled out as being one of the countries that would emulate Canada.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but the suprema principle has been thoroughly rejected by the British. In their white paper in 1963 they did not go along with the idea of unification or integration at all. I know that the problems of each country are not the same, but somehow or other the minister has given the impression that we are the shining light, the northern beacon that other nations will

rush to for guidance. The only northern beacon there is is just the gleam in the minister's eye, and it has blinded his own vision.

Let us see what Mr. Christopher Mayhew is reported to have said as found in a review of his book published by the Canadian Press. Mr. Mayhew said:

It seemed clear to me, and Mr. Hellyer readily agreed, that the degree of dislocation which he had cheerfully and deliberately created in Canada—

I could use other terms, Mr. Speaker.

—would be too much for a country like Britain, with a larger and more complex defence organization, and with immediate, widespread operational responsibilities—

He says Hellyer has dismantled and rebuilt the defence forces on functional lines.

"He has built an effective machine for allocating scarce resources on rational principles, and for steamrolling inter-service differences."

In the short run, Mayhew writes, the reforms meant increased demand on money and manpower instead of economies, with the centralized departments supplementing rather than replacing the three service departments.

"A member of the department commented sardonically that he doubted whether Canada could find the money needed to finance Mr. Hellyer's economies."

This, Mr. Speaker, is certainly a question to be considered. Admiral Landymore referred to the cost involved and also to the number of persons required in maritime command.

Mr. Hellyer: That was his quote.

Mr. Lambert: That is not his quote.

Mr. Hellyer: It is.

Mr. Lambert: Well, the minister can say it is if he wants to, but the former commander of maritime command would know far more about what is going on in his command than would the minister, who after all never paid it a visit to find out what was going on.

To explain all these difficulties with generals and admirals, Mr. Speaker, the minister maintained there was a breakdown in the lines of communication with the various commanders. If there was a breakdown in the lines of communication, how could he find out what was going on at these commands?

Let me now turn to what the United States has to say with regard to unification. I think the minister is well aware of an article published in the April 1966 issue of "Foreign Affairs" written by Mr. Zuckert, former air force secretary of the United States. I should like to make some rather extensive quotations from this article because I think it helps to place certain things in perspective. It must be