

*National Defence Act Amendment*

knows what he is talking about. One writer, after reading the minister's speech, said:

Many of Mr. Hellyer's arguments in support of unification have an improvised air about them, as though he had dreamed up unification first and then devised the evidence in support of it afterward.

I would say there is no evidence that he has devised the evidence in support of unification. At least, it is not on record and he has not told us what the evidence is. He certainly did not tell us in that ambiguous speech in which he said yes and no at the same time. Again I say that perhaps that speech was made so that when he attains a higher office or aspires to a higher office he can say to one audience, "I said no there and I will read it to you," and to another audience in another part of the country he can say, "I said yes here in the same speech." If that is not political expediency, I do not know what is.

**Mr. Churchill:** It is worse than that.

**Mr. McIntosh:** I submit that there is no evidence to support the minister's dream. Regardless of any explanation now put forward by the minister, the fact still remains that the term "unification" as used by the minister in his press releases could only mean extreme integration. I do not want to be unfair to the minister. I am sure all hon. members in this party will agree to a certain amount of integration. Those of us who have served in the forces of our country know that this has been taking effect ever since world war II, perhaps too slowly. If we were in the minister's position we would be able to realize that and speed it up if possible. We would have no quarrel with a program such as that; in fact, we would give the minister kudos for such an attempt.

**An hon. Member:** I would not go that far.

**Mr. McIntosh:** I should now like to say a few words in relation to what the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Forrestall) said last night about a single chief of staff, a single committee, and so on. I do not want to repeat what I said on two previous occasions in this house. The first time I mentioned this matter was in May of 1963, and I dealt with it again just a couple of months ago. At that time I referred to the danger of having a single chief of staff. I agree wholeheartedly with the hon. member for Halifax that there is a danger here. All the minister has to do to realize this is refer to history and find out what happened in the United Kingdom forces when the government attempted to instal a single chief of staff over

their forces. They did not continue that policy. We know what happened in Germany as a result of a similar experiment. I think the minister should be very careful because of his nature, and he should know this, that he does not gather around him "yes" men or people who will agree with him. That is not what the minister needs. I do not know whether the people sitting in the gallery are there because they are "yes" men or not, but I would suggest that if they want to serve their country well they should tell the minister the truth.

**Mr. Churchill:** Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order. My understanding of the practice of the House of Commons is that visitors are allowed in the gallery and are welcome there but they are not permitted to bring in with them various articles such as papers, books or things of that nature. If undesirable people are in the gallery an hon. member may rise and declare to the Speaker, "I spy strangers." I do not want to do that on this occasion because there are some people here who are earnestly endeavouring to gain some knowledge of this debate. But I would ask Your Honour to discover whether the group of people sitting behind the press gallery are authorized members of the press gallery and therefore entitled to have books and papers with them or whether they are visitors to the press gallery who are not entitled to be here laden with books, papers and goodness knows what.

I realize that in recent years we have had to take very much more stringent security precautions in the house. Is it now permissible for people behind the press gallery apparently to have rather voluminous documents in their possession? Are they just visitors to the gallery? Are they members of the press gallery and therefore authorized to be present and have papers with them, or what is their purpose? I would ask you, sir, to investigate.

**Mr. Speaker:** I, of course, cannot see who is behind me in the press gallery. However, I think I should point out to the hon. member that for some time now the row of seats immediately behind the press gallery has also been occupied by persons who would normally sit in the official gallery. In other words, the proliferation of officials attached to ministers' offices over the years has meant that the departmental officials occupy not only the official gallery but also the row of seats behind the press gallery.