

National Defence Act Amendment

Mail to the effect that a clause in the unification bill to delay implementation might help win parliamentary approval. This has been recommended by a lot of men including some now in the service. The chief of the general staff did say that a delay would hurt morale and so on but did not say precisely how this would come about. In any event, here is the comment about the editorial writer:

He said the editorial writer obviously had not read the full transcript of evidence before the Commons defence committee—

This would be true because it was not available.

—and listed several books that the writer had also apparently not read.

If they were the books the minister referred to in his appearance before the committee when there was some judicious picking out of certain passages, then perhaps it was just as well the man had not read them. If the minister had continued quoting from the books he would have found his face very red because the case was not supportable.

Mr. Hellyer: The way you chose your witnesses.

Mr. Lambert: The minister made a remark about choosing witnesses. If the minister's representatives on the committee had been prepared to call witnesses, we of the opposition were prepared to take all of those witnesses they wished to put forward.

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): As many as they wanted?

Mr. Lambert: As many and as often.

Mr. Laniel: So the bill would not come back to the house.

Mr. Lambert: Oh, no, nothing of the sort, because the committee had been told it would be able to hear all the witnesses that it desired to hear. However, there was a desire on the part of government members to close off everything. The hon. member started out on the committee but then went off on some other course and was not there. Perhaps he has not read all the transcript, so the remarks of the hon. member for Châteauguay—

Mr. Laniel: For Beauharnois.

Mr. Lambert: Oh, for Beauharnois; je m'excuse—indicate he had better read the transcript of the remarks of some of his colleagues.

In any event, let us go on to see what the minister said about the editorial writer. He [Mr. Lambert.]

might say the same thing about the writers in the *Globe and Mail*. He said that the editorial writer obviously had not read the full transcript of the evidence before the defence committee and then listed several books which the writer had apparently not read. Then the article continues:

"I'm not even sure he's read my second reading speech," Mr. Hellyer said.

Well, I am not sure that reading the second reading speech would help anybody. However, I question whether the minister is on strong ground when he says this:

He added that it was a mistake for the public to assume that editorials are based on a wide fund of knowledge and depth of understanding.

I do not share all the views of these editorial writers but I find they are not writers for elementary school children and their knowledge is great. In any event, I want to deal with some of the remarks the minister made this afternoon. I am not going to indulge in an exchange of views with regard to integration. I think the first 50 minutes of the minister's speech were quite irrelevant to this debate. The point is, what are the advantages? Are there demonstrable advantages, are there preponderant advantages for unification, the single force concept? Are the men better fighting men? Do we get more for our defence dollar?

We have heard a great deal in terms of man management. Unfortunately, this program is man management mad. One point has been forgotten which General Moncel was able to emphasize. He said that after all our defence forces exist to fight. This is the real *raison d'être* for a defence force, that ultimately it may have to fight. We do not want that but if they are not trained for it, if they are not geared for it, then there has been no purpose in setting up a defence force. So I am suggesting to the members of the committee that the man management concept has gone wild, that there is a peacetime philosophy that has gone abroad and that what has suffered has been the fundamental purpose of having a big proportion of our forces available and trained to fight. The operational men have special considerations.

The members of the services are not of two categories. The people in the supply and administration fields are not a different category of member of the armed services from those who are in the field units. There is an exchange to avail ourselves of the skills of those in the administration and supply fields. We can also take men who are perhaps a little