

*National Defence Act Amendment*

problem to identify themselves as Canadians. One of the ways of doing this is with a distinctive Canadian uniform. Is it being anti-British to ask for something that is pro-Canadian? I should like somebody some day to explain that to me.

There is evidence at the moment that in England there is a new demand for one armed service. I turn to the *Morning Herald* of Sydney, Australia.

You should read this article. It is very interesting.

The debate has been given impetus by the submission of annual plans by individual departments.

Critics are saying that Mr. Healey's latest reforms, mainly the abolition of separate ministers for each of the three services, do not go anything like far enough.

It is known that proposals for much more sweeping reforms have been put to Mr. Healey—

Not Hellyer—Healey.

—particularly for a unified policy on weapons. Mr. Healey has rejected these proposals. He is a "strong" minister who feels he can overcome inter-service rivalries and he refuses to contemplate an ultimate unified armed service. He argues that tradition is too deeply embedded.

It seems that only Canadians could think that our minister could not do something good in this way. It seems to be the belief of some that everything the minister does, because he sits on this side of the house, is wrong. I have read the article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* where it refers to Mr. Paul Hellyer as the able and thrusting Canadian defence minister.

[Translation]

I conclude—I still have five minutes; I kept track of my time—with Mr. Patrick's last paragraph.

[English]

There is talk about the new uniform, the colour and what type it should be. I do not think anybody really cares so long as it is sensible and functional.

[Translation]

Mr. Chairman, a fortnight ago the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre—he has a lot to say—asked that the Red Ensign be flown at Vimy. I respect the Red Ensign, but it no longer is the Canadian flag. The single leaf flag is Canada's flag.

Mr. Chairman, much is said, often blindly, within the bounds of tradition, with no possibility of escape toward new attractive concepts.

[Mr. Prud'homme.]

[English]

**Mr. Churchill:** May I ask the hon. member a question?

**Mr. Prud'homme:** I have just four minutes.

**Mr. Churchill:** All right.

[Translation]

**Mr. Prud'homme:** The hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) have asked for a pause in order to think things over and make sure we are heading in the right direction. But did they stop to think whether it was wise to clamour for the resignation of the chief of staff, General Allard, or to tell him in the house to "shut up"? Did they take the time to check the accuracy of the reports published in the press? Surely not. No more, indeed, than they apologize for the off-hand manner in which they handled this unfortunate affair.

On the other hand, we find on the part of headquarters nothing but sensible and effective planning, checked and double-checked, with the assurance that it is time to go ahead, that we are going in the right direction and that the time to act has come.

Mr. Chairman, I pass over two quotations, because I would like to read the last one. I shall not say—I do not think I will be forced to do it—who said this.

● (4:50 p.m.)

[English]

If you should like to know who made the statement let me read you the last paragraph of my speech. Before doing so I should say that I am not referring to any hon. member of this house. This is the quotation:

Any idiot can go on doing what has been done before, but it takes real courage, intelligence and character to assess the needs of the future, to devise a sound program and carry it into effect. This is particularly true of the armed services, which become merely an expensive luxury unless the process of improvement, modernization, forward thinking, and planning goes on continuously.

**An hon. Member:** Who said that?

**Mr. Prud'homme:** This was said in an address to the Royal Society of Military Engineers on July 20, 1962, by someone I hope my hon. friends will respect. It was said by none other than the husband of the Queen of Canada, the Duke of Edinburgh.

[Translation]

**Mr. Caouette:** Would the hon. member allow me a question?

**Mr. Prud'homme:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I still have three minutes so that—