

*National Defence Act Amendment*

Then there is the attitude of General Moncel. Certainly very few officers coming before us had greater qualifications than he. We were all impressed by his useful attitude and his willingness to experiment. He was the man who had drawn up practice plans for unification if required. In volume 22 of the committee proceedings, as recorded at page 1312, his attitude is shown in answer to a question I asked him. I quote as follows:

Mr. Nugent: I know that question sounded silly but it bore some relation to the minister's statement that the end result of integration is unification. I wanted to try to indicate that although integration is a progressive performance, and you can find many places where it operates, that does not necessarily mean that integration works everywhere or that it has no other logical end but unification?

Mr. Moncel: Precisely; and as I tried to explain to one of the other inquisitors this depends entirely on your commitments. Give me a pencil and a scratch pad and I will write you a commitment for the country which will generate the need for a unified force. It is very simple. But with your current commitments you do not want one. In fact, it is better that you do not have one.

All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that if those senior officers had shown before the committee such a lack of honesty as Charles King's argument shows, none of us would have been impressed, as we certainly were, with their dedication to this country. I am not blaming Charles King particularly. As he pointed out in his own article, he does not know much about the matter. I know who has been misleading him. It is not a coincidence that he happens to be working for a Liberal rag.

Then there is the attitude of General Fleury, as recorded at page 1490 of committee proceedings No. 24, when he said:

I myself held an integrated position in headquarters for just under a year, from the fall of 1965 to the summer of 1966. There had been over the years a good deal of consideration—possibly more consideration than action—toward integration. I had always felt that the armed forces would benefit by a much greater degree of integration than was the situation in 1964. I think it would not be unfair to say that I was a supporter, maybe even an enthusiastic supporter, of the principle of integration.

These are the people Mr. King and the minister's supporters label reactionary. These are the people they say are opposed to progress because they are opposed to unification. Some annoyance has been displayed about language and imputation, but surely there should be some show of anger or annoyance by anyone who believes that people who have given the public service of this country their entire adult years and to whom this country owes so much should not be treated

in this way. We believe these people are honest and decent gentlemen and we resent very much this sort of article and slanders of this sort against these gentlemen.

Can we not call a spade a spade and say that when people go so far as to ignore the facts and distort the truth there is only one argument that can be used? This is a perfect and classic example of the technique of the big lie, and I do not care whether it is based on the ignorance of Charles King or on political necessity as in the case of some of my hon. friends opposite. When it is used it is unfair, it is dishonest, and it is typical of the arguments that are advanced to support unification and the minister's move to bring about unification now.

• (4:50 p.m.)

It is certainly part of fair debating technique to talk about the qualifications of witnesses, their manner, bearing and deportment, and whether we should listen to and believe them. It is not, I submit, fair to twist the record. I challenge the hon. member for Leeds, or any hon. member on that side of the house, to take the evidence of any of the witnesses who appeared before the committee and point to questions and answers which will substantiate the statement that false and malicious charges have been made on this side of the house by those who are opposed to unification or opposed to progress. In fact, much of the evidence indicates that many of those who are opposed to unification are opposed to it because they believe it will interfere with integration, a process which they believed was making progress.

The entire point of this exercise, of course, is to remind members of the house that those who have already said they will support this measure have said that they will rely on the facts. This reminds me of the statement by the minister that it was not necessary for this matter to go to the committee. I say that any man who believes the facts will support him should want those facts revealed. I do not know of any one who believes this who would not want the facts stated accurately and truthfully so that the accuracy of his statements would stand out and support his argument. It is my opinion that the only people who use this sort of argument are those who realize they do not have a case and that there is no evidence to support their case.

It is my hope that the people of this country will come to realize this. If hon. members opposite, for their own particular reasons, insist on taking the stand they do, probably