

*National Defence Act Amendment*

Let me point out to the minister that our leader has not taken part in this debate. If he had I suggest that perhaps he might have conveyed to the Canadian people much better results which will result from the attempt of the minister to impose on the Canadian people something of which he knows nothing.

There is no doubt that many Canadians have been seriously disturbed by the implications of the ministers' unification program. We do not understand the ultimate intent of unification because the minister has never explained the meaning of that term in a manner that relates to the services, except by what he has been reported to have said in various newspapers. I have a long list of reported statements but let me read only a few. At one point he said:

Unification is a single military force containing lists of sailors, airmen, artillerymen, infantrymen, dentists, etc.

In another paper he is reported to have said:

In the unified force management will not be imposed from the top, but will work up through the crafts and trades—

This certainly is unorthodox so far as the policy of any other service is concerned.

In another newspaper he is reported as follows:

Unification is probably the boldest plan of military reorganization ever tried by a modern nation—

In another newspaper he is reported to have stated:

Regardless of the words the important thing is to understand the concept which is a force of military specialists and their support all working for a common purpose.

What a conglomeration of words. He is also reported to have said:

We are now becoming leaders in defence organization and thinkers not just followers.

We really must be the laughing-stock of other countries.

**Mr. Churchill:** Just the minister, not us.

**Mr. McIntosh:** We are also a part of the parliament of Canada and if this bill passes it will be partly our responsibility. Let me appeal to all hon. members of the opposition to get up and oppose this bill.

The minister is also reported to have said:

Canada will have indelibly etched he name as the world leader in military organization—

How is that possible with a population of only 20 million?

In another article he is reported to have said:

The aim of our program first and foremost is to build a more responsive force—a force which is more united strategically. To do this there is a necessity for a cohesive plan at the top.

Perhaps some of his staff officers can explain to me how a force can be united strategically. The only conclusion to be reached as a result of such statements is that the minister has some revolutionary ideas to advance that will change the whole concept of defence. Does he intend to keep these ideas secret as a new weapon for Canada?

We have asked the minister to reveal the facts about unification. As you know, Mr. Speaker, we did not want to agree to this fundamental change in principle without knowing the implications of such a change. We are not attempting to carry on a filibuster; we are truly attempting to obtain answers to our questions and to find out what the minister means by unification. Certainly his speech in respect of Bill No. 243 gave no indication of what he meant. In that speech he said yes at one time to one question and no at another time. As I said before, his speech was very ambiguous.

We are not alone in our search for answers. Members of the press have asked various questions such as: Tell us what unification means, Mr. Hellyer? What is required is an official comprehensive public statement on unification. The services and the people must be told why integration is not enough and why unification is necessary. We must be told what we have to give up and what we stand to gain. The services and the people have a right to an explanation of the necessity of this dangerous political experiment, and I am inclined to believe that is all it is, a political experiment. The press has also stated that the minister has not handled this matter well. He must reveal more facts. Unification is untried, untested and undefined.

The minister must have been aware he was causing unnecessary fears and confusion in the minds of the Canadian public by his silence and his refusal to define the term "unification of the armed forces". The minister knew he was not proposing any fundamental change in the services, but he let that idea circulate because of the press coverage he was receiving at that time. Possibly he had dreams similar to those that the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) had for him. Perhaps he wanted to attain the top position—prime minister.