

National Defence Act Amendment

older and who have had experience. This is also a good place to train men, younger men even, and bring them forward where administration is required. In operational units horizontal promotion is as good as vertical promotion. This is what I feel is wrong; this is where my big objection to unification lies.

● (6:00 p.m.)

What is the demonstrable effect, and it must be demonstrable, excepting the integrated command, the functional command and the functional organization, of taking a sailor, an airman and a soldier and putting them in the same uniform, in the same rank structure and calling them the same thing? What particular advantage is there in that? After all, as the minister has said there are to be air, sea and land elements. Those men will be specialists, each in his own field. Of course we will not have hybrids, notwithstanding the example of stewards. One should hear the report about stewards from the army going on board ship and how good they are when they return. If that is the start, I must say it is a wonderful one. But we shall not get these hybrids; otherwise men will spend their time training for jobs and never put their training into effect.

If you have a sailor, an airman or a soldier in an integrated command why will he be better because he happens to wear the same uniform as the chap alongside him? Those who have had the privilege of serving in units in battle conditions know that there is something more than meets the eye that calls to a man. There are all sorts of little intangibles that you refer to and appeal to whether in the field of battle, in a ship at sea or in the air. It is not the man managing with computers who will bring that out in the fighting man. What matters is what you will do to the fighting man's heart and how you will get him to do just a little better under such conditions.

Why is there this change for the sake of change at this time? It is not needed for integration. Gracious me, it will take three years to get the supply services going full tilt, and that is on the best advice the forces have. We are told that the Judge Advocate General's branch is a good example. With all due apology to the gentlemen occupying the chief positions in that branch, and I know and respect them, their branch is unrepresentative of the armed services. One might call them civil lawyers in uniform. Theirs is the one section of armed services where normal retirement ages do not apply. In fact, again apologizing to the hon. gentlemen occupying

those positions, that branch could easily be handled by civilians.

Mr. Churchill: Yes.

Mr. Lambert: There is no question of rank or uniform. Perhaps the branch ought to be run by civilians. But that does not establish the argument that by asking a number of personnel in the Judge Advocate General's branch to be civilians we are asking the whole of the armed services to put on civilian suits or put on one suit. Not at all. The Judge Advocate General's branch is one particular type of administrative service.

The Chairman: Order, please. I must advise the hon. member that the time allotted to him has expired.

Some hon. Members: Go on.

Mr. Lambert: I thank hon. members for this opportunity. I hope I shall not abuse it.

We heard the minister speak about broader career and employment opportunities. Why should this be? Because a man is called a major instead of a lieutenant commander or squadron leader, why will he have wider career opportunities? If his uniform is light blue or dark blue or khaki rather than a uniform approved by user trials—and I will not pick any particular type of uniform—why will he be a better man? Why will he have a broader employment opportunity? This applies, once you reach a certain rank, to staff promotions and staff learning. But there are other areas in which it does not work as well. Surely those could be ironed out. But why do you need to put a man in the same uniform as all other men and into the same rank structure?

I shall have a great deal more to say when we get to the appropriate clause about the question of command and rank structure, and some of the difficulties in some of the regulations. Let me say here that there is a great potential for trouble ahead. Does anyone in his sane moments think that if a commander of a ship has decided to take the rank of lieutenant colonel that any officer junior to him will insist on his particular naval rank? Let us to practical. It will be all or nothing.

A great deal was made by my hon. friend from Greenwood that this measure would give us a force that will be more adaptable to change and will have a quicker response. The quicker response is merely a question of integrated command. The minister said there could be a quicker change of role and so