

*National Defence Act Amendment*

other. It has been my belief for some time that even had we not been victorious, because of our combined and dedicated services toward the maintenance of freedom, that way of life which best suits man would have survived.

Let me come to my next point in reference to delay. I joined with members of the Conservative party in asking that this matter be sent to a committee for study before second reading in order that we could hear the evidence of experts. Had we been allowed to do so I am sure this debate would have been shortened. The minister on that occasion, because he is a stubborn man, was as unyielding as he is tonight. He would not move because he is inflexible. His attitude has been one of stubbornness. He has said we intend to do certain things and they must be done his way without compromise. In this regard let me first say that had the minister been prepared to compromise and allow this matter to go to the committee in order that the bill could be examined clause by clause before second reading, we would have saved time. For that reason I make no apology for taking part in the debate at this time.

I have thoroughly read the only speech made by a member of the executive on the government front benches, other than the minister of defence. That speech was made by the Minister of Transport, whom I have always respected for his intelligence, though never for his intellectual trickery such as that exemplified by the change in his position on the Crowsnest Pass freight rates, in the transport bill. I never thought I would, either as a Canadian or a member of this parliament, read a speech of the nature delivered by that minister. Let us look for a few minutes at what he said. Many of the things said by that minister should be exploded before this debate concludes. I hope the hon. member for Medicine Hat has read his speech and will be able at the appropriate time, and place, and with the appropriate audience in Alberta, to endorse his words.

Some of the things the Minister of Transport said are very unusual. In reference to the question of unification he suggested this was not something for experts to decide. He said there was no point in calling the chiefs of staff and high ranking officers because we had never before attempted unification, and to do so would be a waste of time. He said he did not put much faith in that kind of evidence because it was worthless. In the event that anyone doubts my analysis of what he said in this regard let me quote briefly from

[Mr. Woolliams.]

his speech. I know the rules in this regard and if anybody objects to what I intend to do let me say that I am familiar with his words and can readily paraphrase them. This is what the Minister of Transport said, which was so shocking:

The point I am making is that in so far as the progress on integration is concerned, that has been going on for three or four years and the evidence of military experts is, of course, of great relevance.

Apparently this evidence was of relevance in respect of integration. As pointed out by the hon. member for Calgary North, we have realized for a number of years that integration must take place and has been taking place. This is true of Canada as well as of other nations. Then the Minister of Transport said:

—in so far as unification is concerned it has no relevance whatever.

Let me point out that the fight being debated in parliament tonight is not in respect of integration but in respect of unification. I have heard on television and read in newspapers the use of the two words as meaning the same thing. A distinguished British officer, and I do not intend to mention his name, was being interviewed on a C.B.C. program. Twice during that program I heard the words "integration" and "unification" used as meaning one and the same thing. Surely that was done for the same reason the minister uses the words in this way. It was done to confuse the people. Even the Minister of Transport followed the same course in an attempt to indicate that there was no difference between integration and unification.

I intend to define these two terms by quoting the definitions of those experts the Minister of Transport feels should not pass an opinion. The Minister of Transport then said, as reported at page 14667 of *Hansard* for April 7:

I want to repeat that. The evidence of experts is of no relevance whatever because there are no experts. There never has been, under modern conditions at least, a unified military force. It is like every step forward, and I believe this is a step forward; it is a step into something in which nobody has any experience.

In other words he is suggesting that the air marshal and the chief of general staff and other high-ranking officers are not qualified to speak on unification.

Who are the two Canadian experts on the question of unification? Apparently they are the Minister of National Defence and the Minister of Transport. That being the case,