National Defence | Défense nationale

Canadian Forces College

Collège des Forces Canadiennes

WHITE PAPERS, UNIFICATION & THE MANAGEMENT REVIEW GROUP: THE ROAD TO INCREASED CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT

LCdr R.T.M. Hooper

JCSP 42

Exercise *Solo Flight*

Disclaimer

Opinions expressed remain those of the author and do not represent Department of National Defence or Canadian Forces policy. This paper may not be used without written permission.

PCEMI 42

Exercice *Solo Flight*

Avertissement

Les opinons exprimées n'engagent que leurs auteurs et ne reflètent aucunement des politiques du Ministère de la Défense nationale ou des Forces canadiennes. Ce papier ne peut être reproduit sans autorisation écrite.

Canada

CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE – COLLÈGE DES FORCES CANADIENNES
JCSP 42 – PCEMI 42
2015 – 2016

EXERCISE *SOLO FLIGHT* – EXERCICE *SOLO FLIGHT*

WHITE PAPERS, UNIFICATION & THE MANAGEMENT REVIEW GROUP: THE ROAD TO INCREASED CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT

LCdr R.T.M. Hooper

Word Count: 4788

Compte de mots: 4788

On 6 April 2016, the Honourable Harjit S. Sajjan, Minister of National Defence (MND), announced the launch of public consultations on the Canadian defence policy review. This public consultation is meant to "help set future direction and priorities for the Canadian Forces."[1] It is the first comprehensive defence review since the 1994 White Paper on Defence. The defence policy review will likely result in a White Paper that will, in all probability, influence the size, capabilities and structure of the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) and Department of National Defence (DND) for many years to come. The current government has promised a "leaner, more agile" military, which could allude to the fact that they intend to cut spending despite the Minister's mandate letter that states the opposite.[2]

Previous Canadian governments have commissioned defence reviews and produced White Papers with various aims and objectives. Some sought to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the military by restructuring organizations while others had the specific aim of cutting defence spending and reducing personnel numbers. The budgetary issues facing today's government are similar to those faced by the federal government in the 1960s and 1970s. As a Western liberal democracy, with no tangible external threats and favourable geography, Canadians see little utility in the military. Consequently, politicians are much more inclined to cut the defence budget during peacetime. Both the Pearson and Trudeau (senior) governments produced White Papers on Defence that were meant to achieve "cost savings, modernizing management methods and improve efficiency."[3] The success of these defence policies is debatable and whether or not the reforms made were actually meant to improve operational

---

[1] Government of Canada, "Minister Sajjan Launches Public Consultations on Defence Policy Review," last accessed 20 April 2016, http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?nid=1047049.

[2] Prime Minister of Canada Justin Trudeau, "Minister of National Defence Mandate Letter," last accessed 22 April 2016, http://pm.gc.ca/eng/minister-national-defence-mandate-letter.

[3] Craig Stone and Brigadier-General Daniel Gosselin, "From Minister Hellyer to General Hillier: Understanding the Fundamental Differences between the Unification of the Canadian Armed Forces and its Present Transformation," *Canadian Military Journal* 6, no. 4 (Winter2005/2006): 8.

effectiveness and economic efficiencies does not really matter. What does matter, is how the reforms (integration, unification and re-organizations) imposed by the governments of the day fundamentally shaped the current CAF and DND.

This essay will demonstrate that the defence policies and decisions of the Pearson and Trudeau governments facilitated increased civilian oversight and management of the CAF and changed the nature of civil-military relations in Canada. An examination of Canadian civil-military situation post World War II (WWII), including the Glassco Report, commissioned by the Diefenbaker government, and Cuban Missile Crisis, will put into context why the Pearson government decided upon unification and further civilian oversight of the military. The 1964 White Paper and unification of the armed forces set the scene for the Trudeau government's 1971 White Paper and Management Review Group (MRG). Analyzing the MRG will highlight how civil servants moved into more senior positions within the department and how the deputy minister gained increased authority and influence.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Paul Hellyer gets much of the credit for the idea of unification and is often blamed for the 'civilianization' of the Canadian military. While he undoubtedly played a large role in facilitating unification, the idea unifying the three services existed prior to WWII. It was Colonel Maurice Pope who laid the foundations for a single service in the 1937 *Memorandum on a Canadian Organization for the Higher Direction of National Defence* for the Joint Staff Committee for the chiefs of staff.[4] Douglas Bland, an expert in Canadian defence policy, states

[4] Maurice A. Pope, Colonel, *Memorandum on a Canadian Organization for the Higher Direction of National Defence: 8 March 1937,* in Douglas L. Bland, *Canada's National Defence, Volume 2: Defence Organization* (Kingston: School of Policy Studies, Queen's University, 1998), 2.

"Pope was at the forefront of those who believe that the unification of defence policy was not only necessarily but inevitably linked to the unification of the services themselves."[5]

Pope conceived a top down model for National Defence made up of a series of interconnected committees that brought public servants and military officers together to formulate and implement defence policy based on the requirements of the government. He wanted the service chiefs to look beyond their own needs and to have them focus on decisions of truly national importance.[6] Pope believed the deputy minister should wield decisive powers and head the aforementioned committees. While some of Pope's ideas were implemented, WWII stymied further reforms. However, Pope's memorandum was a portent of things to come and would influence defence policy post WWII.

Prime Minister Mackenzie King appointed Brooke Claxton as defence minister on completion of WWII. The job of demobilizing the military and significantly reducing defence expenditures, while maintaining modern capabilities for contingencies and post WWII commitments fell to Claxton. In a situation similar to that faced by the Prime Minister today, Mackenzie King wanted a military that was not too expensive and just strong enough to meet the commitments the government had accepted. It was understood that Canada would need some armed forces in the future, "but not too many".[7]

In order to find economies and efficiencies to meet the goals laid out by the Prime Minister, Claxton sought to streamline the defence organization "through a series of reforms, reorganizations, and policies intended to foster the integration and, where possible, the

---

[5] Douglas, Bland, *Chiefs of Defence* (Toronto: The Institute of Strategic Studies, 1995), xv-xvi.

[6] Douglas, Bland, *Canada's National Defence Volume 2* …, 4.

[7] Douglas, Bland, *Canada's National Defence Volume 1: Defence Policy* (Kingston: School of Policy Studies, Queen's University, 1997), 3.

unification of responsibilities and functions in the department."[8] Many of the defence policies implemented by Claxton in 1947 remain in place today. He reorganized the three separate service ministries into the Department of National Defence and created one public service staff.

In a bid to end tri-service bickering Claxton promoted Lieutenant General Charles Foulkes to the position of Chairman of the Chiefs of Staff Committee.[9] The Committee brought together the separate service heads and the chairman of the Defence Research Board in order to advise the minister on matters pertaining to defence policy. Claxton envisioned that this committee would coordinate fulfillment of a single unified defence policy. Unfortunately, Foulkes' appointment was merely a half measure as the new position was that of a coordinator and lacked the authority and responsibility to make final decisions on inter-service issues.

Claxton held his position from 1947-54. He was a strong minister who remained involved in policy creation and implementation. Claxton saw to the unification of the military's support services including medical and dental, legal, postal, chaplains and food procurement. He rewrote the National Defence Act and according to Desmond Morton, a renowned Canadian historian, when Claxton retired, "his goals of a single defence budget, tri-service personnel policies, a single system of military law, and a single Defence Research board had been achieved".[10] Unfortunately, despite his many achievements, he was never able to overcome the conflicting inter-service demands. One of the reasons for this was that he did not have a source of "competent unprejudiced military advice", a role assumed by the deputy minister today.[11]

Building on Claxton's ideas, General Foulkes drafted a paper called T*he Case For One Service* in which he proposed a process "to further amalgamate the armed forces and the

---

[8] Douglas Bland, *The Administration of Defence Policy in Canada* (Kingston: Ronald P. Frye & Company, 1987), 13.

[9] Desmond Morton, *Understanding Canadian Defence* (Toronto: Penguin Group, 2003), 174

[10] Desmond Morton, *A Military History of Canada, 5th ed.* (Toronto: McCelland and Stewart, 2007), 238.

[11] Douglas Bland, *Chiefs of Defence* …, 2.

department into a new, leaner structure" with the hope that decision would be made on the basis of facts and actual requirements rather than on tri-service requirements.[12] The other Chiefs of Staff were not keen on further reforms and General Foulkes soon came to realize that he had no overriding authority. Unlike today, where the Chief of Defence Staff has the final say, service heads in Foulkes' time maintained a veto in the Chiefs of Staff Committee and were able to block the chairman's recommendations. With the change of government in 1957, General Foulkes' ideas for amalgamation would be forgotten and it would not be until 1963 that the military would have to accept any further integration.

DIEFENBAKER AND THE GLASSCO COMMISSION

Jack Granatstein, describes the Diefenbaker government's rule from 1957-1963 as a period of "Defence Débâcle."[13] During this period the government suffered a series of expensive and embarrassing procurement failures, including the Avro CF-105 Arrow, which did nothing to improve civil-military relations. The acquisition of nuclear weapons and other military technology, coupled with rising personnel and administrative costs led to a situation that would have left little capital for the procurement of equipment by the end of the decade.[14] The events that took place during this period, namely the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis and the Glassco Commission on Government Reorganization, served to convince the next Liberal government that unification was a necessary measure in order to strengthen civil control of the military.

Commander Peter Haydon, the author of a study about how Canada reacted during the 1962 Cuban Missile crisis, states, "The shortcomings in the Canadian concept of civil control of

---

[12] Dale R. Herspring, *Civil-Military Relations and Shared Responsibility: A Four Nation Study* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2014), 143.

[13] Jack Granatstein, *Canada 1957-1967: The Years of Uncertainty and Innovation* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1986), 101-138.

[14] Colonel J.P.Y.D. Gosselin, "Unification and the Strong-Service Idea: A 50-Year Tug of War of Concepts at Crossroads" (Canadian Forces College, 2004), 10.

the military became evident during the Cuban missile crisis."[15] Believing that President Kennedy had acted too hastily and upset because the United States did not bother to consult Canada before taking unilateral action, Prime Minister Diefenbaker refused to put Canadian forces on alert as per the President's request. The Canadian military took it upon itself to begin stepping up operations and preparing for war shortly after the American alert.[16] Despite not having the Prime Minister's consent the Royal Canadian Navy began to load war stores and moved ships in order to support United States Navy. The Royal Canadian Air Force convinced Douglas Harkness, the MND, that NORAD forces should be put on heightened alert despite the Prime Minister refusing the very same request.

Due to the perceived indecision of the government, senior Canadian officers took it upon themselves to act, thereby placing their assessment of the situation ahead of the government's. This led to "…the near collapse of civil-military relations in Canada when the control of the armed forces passed briefly out of the government's hands."[17] The government was blamed for the unauthorized and uncoordinated response to the crisis and was portrayed poorly in the media. H. Basil Robinson, a former Undersecretary of External Affairs who worked in the department during Diefenbaker's tenure, believed the crisis was one of the main reasons for the Tory defeat at the hands of the Liberals a year later.[18] This failure of the civil-military relationship would influence the defence policies of the Pearson government.

---

[15] Commander Peter T. Haydon, *The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis: Canadian Involvement Reconsidered* (Toronto: The Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies, 1993), 207.

[16] Dan Middlemiss and J.J. Sokolsky, *Canadian Defence: Decisions and Determinants* (Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1989), 27.

[17] Daniel P. Gosselin, "The Storm over Unification of the Armed Forces: A Crisis of Canadian Civili-Military Relations." In *The Insubordinate and the Noncompliant: Case Studies of Canadian Mutiny and Disobedience, 1920 to Present*, ed. by Howard G. Coombs, (Toronto: The Dundurn Group, 2007), 314.

[18] H. Basil Robinson, *Diefenbaker's World: A populist in Foreign Affairs* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989), 283-295.

The government appointed Royal Commission on Government Organization of 1960, also know as the Glassco Commission, was tasked with reporting on the organization and methods of operation of governmental departments. It was required to recommend changes it considered would best encourage efficiency, decrease waste, and improve service.[19] Many of the recommendations were not immediately acted upon but the Commission would serve as a catalyst for the unification of the Canadian military and be used to justify greater integration of civilians within National Defence. Douglas Bland argues that the Glassco Commission was important because "It provided evidence and arguments for those [like Paul Hellyer] who wished to revamp the way the defence establishment conducted business."[20]

Report 20 (published in 1963) of the Commission, focused on defence due to its size, the range and cost of its activities, and the unique composition of the department.[21] The report contained three themes (all of which dealt with the roles of civilians within defence): the structure of the defence organization, governance (as it applies to senior civil servants, such as the deputy minister) and departmental human resources policies.[22] A series of recommendations designed to promote efficiency were made in the report. These included the concept of tri-service military integration, that more reliance be placed on civilian workers at within the defence and the strengthening of the role of the deputy minister. One of the more notable recommendations was that an appointed chief of the Canadian Defence Staffs replace the chairman of the Chiefs of Staff Committee.

---

[19] The Royal Commission on Government Organization, Volume 4 Special Areas of Administration (Ottawa: Queens Printer, 1963), last accessed 29 April 2016 http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2014/bcp-pco/Z1-1960-4-4-1-eng.pdf, 4.

[20] Douglas Bland, *Canada's National Defence Volume 2* …, xvii.

[21] Ibid., 61

[22] Daniel Gosselin, "Unelected, Unarmed Servants of the State: The Changing Role of Senior Civil Servants Inside Canada's National Defence," *Canadian Military Journal* 14, no. 3 (Summer 2014): 40.

The Commission advocated for increased responsibilities for the deputy minister so that he would be able to better "assist and advise the minister in the discharge of his responsibilities for the control and administration of the armed forces."[23] In order to maintain the principle that the military is subject to civilian power, the Commission suggested that the deputy minister, and a team of informed civil servants, would be responsible for providing independent defence advice to the MND. The Commission felt that the minister relied too heavily on the, primarily military, Chiefs of Staff Committee for advice. The perception of a minister relying excessively on a group of senior military officers could have been perceived in a negative light and raised concerns about the reality of civilian control of the military.[24] The Commission provided ammunition for those who wanted to impose a civil service hierarchy within the defence headquarters.

While civil control of the military was a theme of the Commission's report, its recommendations were geared towards promoting better coordination between the Navy, Army and Air Force and between the armed forces' headquarters and the department. According to Harriet Critchley, a Canadian defence analyst, it should be noted that Commission's recommendations were made "in the interest of managerial efficiency" and that although integration and unification of the services were alluded to, "the whole tenor of the commission's report clearly assumed the continued existence of three separate services."[25] While Paul Hellyer did not follow all the recommendations of the Glassco Report he did rely on its conclusions,

---

[23] Douglas Bland, *Canada's National Defence Volume 2* …, 54

[24] The Royal Commission on Government Organization …, 76.

[25] Harriet Critchley, "Civilianization and the Canadian Military," *Armed Forces and Society* 16, no. 1 (Fall 1989): 123.

which he thought "had recently done such a splendid job of exposing the waste and extravagance resulting from duplication and triplication" when writing the 1964 White Paper on Defence. [26]

MINISTER INVOLVED, THE 1964 WHITE PAPER AND UNIFICATION

Paul Hellyer is often vilified or blamed for 'issues' perceived to be the result of the unification of the Canadian Armed Forces. Regardless of whether or not unification was the right decision it forever changed the nature of civil-military relations in Canada. Hellyer believed "that the institutional structures in place were not adequate to ensure civilian supremacy over the military" and that there was a need to enforce better civil control. [27] Unification, he believed, would strengthen the mechanisms of civil control and also set the stage for increased influence of senior civilians in defence.

The Liberals, under Lester B. Pearson, returned to power in 1963. The new Prime Minister believed that the Conservative government's mishandling of defence issues was the main reason for its downfall and that the defence department was a political liability.[28] Pearson wanted to ensure a similar fate did not befall his government and as such appointed a strong, experienced defence minster, Paul Hellyer, to prevent it from happening.

Hellyer was well acquainted with the defence portfolio as he had served as the associate defence minister in the 1950s and had been the Liberal defence critic during Diefenbaker's rule. He was young, ambitious and the most involved minister since Brook Claxton. Immediately taking the reigns of the department, he suspended major equipment purchases and outright cancelled others. He quickly came to the conclusion that military was not offering a "unified strategic approach to government in the formulation of defence policy" and that there was a lack

---

[26] Paul Hellyer, *Damn the Torpedoes: My Fight to Unify Canada's Armed Forces* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1990), 36.

[27] Dale R. Herspring, *Civil-Military Relations and Shared Responsibility …,* 149

[28] Douglas Bland, *Chiefs of Defence* …, 67.

of coordination.[29] Hellyer believed that inadequate coordination amongst senior officers stemmed from the Chiefs of Staff Committee, because "cooperation was given lip-service, but in reality the services were three separate fiefdoms, each jealous of its own terrain."[30] The idea for a unified military staff was a result of this belief.

While better civil control of the military was one of the key issues Hellyer wanted to deal with, there were other matters that unification was to address, specifically defence spending. Ross Fetterly, an expert in Canadian defence budgetary issues, writes "...in 1963, the defence budget represented the most significant non-statutory federal expenditure".[31] This was during a period where the national deficit continued to rise and as such Hellyer was instructed by the Prime Minister to reduce defence expenditures "quickly and quietly."[32] He turned to the Glassco Commission for inspiration and also consulted with retired General Foulkes regarding the paper he wrote on the subject of "One Service".

Hellyer initiated a review of defence, via a series of ministerial study groups, which culminated in the *1964 White Paper on Defence.* Douglas Bland feels it is a landmark defence document because it was based on Canadian national interests and proposed unification of the armed forces.[33] The White Paper, which was primarily authored by Hellyer, was meant, ostensibly, to increase administrative efficiencies, improve operational effectiveness and save money. It promoted a single unified defence force for Canada as a means of achieving the

---

[29] Daniel Gosselin, Unelected, Unarmed Servants of the State …, 317.

[30] Paul Hellyer, *Damn the Torpedoes* ..., 34.

[31] Lieutenant-Colonel Ross Fetterly, "The Influence of the Environment on the 1964 Defence White Paper" *Canadian Military Journal* 5, no. 4 (Winter 2004-2005), 50

[32] Douglas Bland, *Canada's National Defence Volume 1* …, 58.

[33] Ibid., 59.

desired results. Hellyer told the Prime Minister that his proposed organizational changes would increase civilian control, reduce waste and make the services work together more efficiently.[34]

Hellyer wanted to strengthen civil military control and one of the methods he chose was a headquarters restructuring that saw centralization of the control and administration of the Canadian military placed into the hands of one senior officer, the Chief of Defence Staff (CDS). The integration of Canadian Forces Headquarters (CFHQ) and the creation of functional commands eliminated the need for three separate service chiefs reporting independently to the minister and was the first step toward a unified armed forces. Hellyer wanted a CDS, with the authority to reign in the service chiefs and end individual service parochialism. It was envisioned that the CDS, would advocate the requirements of the functional commands and provide the minister with coherent defence policy predicated on national interests vice individual service interests. Furthermore, as all orders to the CAF would be issued by the CDS, it stood to reason that the military would obey and execute government direction.

The legislative results of Hellyer's policy were embodied in Bills C-90 and C-234. Bill C-90, *Integration of the Headquarters Staff Act*, received Royal assent 16 July 1964 and was widely accepted. The bill established the position of CDS, put an end to the service chiefs and officially created the unified CFHQ. Six functional commands were established in 1966. Hellyer was convinced that unifying the military under one senior leader would enable government to better control defence policy and more efficiently manage the defence budget.

Bill C-234, *The Canadian Forces Reorganization Act,* was granted Royal Assent 1 February 1968 and was a much more contentious bill. It amended the National Defence Act to eliminate the Royal Canadian Navy, Canadian Army and Royal Canadian Air Force and legalize

---

[34] Jack Granatstein, *Canada 1957-1967* ..., 223.

the creation of a unified Canadian Armed Forces. It was a highly debated act that led to dissention amongst senior military officers. Despite pressure from the senior military leaders against unification, the minister would not be swayed stating, "the law of the land puts the military under civilian control and this is the way it's going to be run."[35]

The White Paper also made another key recommendation about how the minister could best maintain effective civilian control of the military. It echoed the Glassco Commission in recommending that the deputy minister be given enhanced responsibilities. In addition to assisting the minister with his duties the deputy was to have an increased role in the review function of the organization and administration of the defence establishment.[36] Although Hellyer pointed out on many occasions that there was a need for the minster to receive separate civilian and military advice he backed away from this assertion shortly after the White Paper was released stating that requirements to change the legislation regarding the powers of the deputy minister was not necessary.[37] Integration and then unification of the military were Hellyer's prime objectives.

Despite backing away from changing legislation regarding the deputy minister, Hellyer still felt it was essential to have a strong civil staff in the department that was outside the military chain of command in order to provide independent analysis and review of military requirements.[38] As the senior civilian this responsibility fell to the deputy minister whose powers did increase, specifically with respect to procurement oversight. A secondary effect of the creation of CFHQ was that the number of military staff was decreased while civilian numbers

---

[35] Daniel Gosselin, "Unelected, Unarmed Servants of the State," …, 327.

[36] Honourable Paul Hellyer, Minister of National Defence and Honourable Lucien Cardin, Associate Minister of National Defence, "*White Paper on Defence*," in Douglas Bland, *Canada's National Defence, Vol I: Defence Policy* (Kingston, ON: School of Policy Studies, 1998), 93.

[37] Daniel Gosselin, "Unelected, Unarmed Servants of the State," …, 42.

[38] Daniel P. Gosselin, "The Storm over Unification of the Armed Forces," …, 319.

were maintained. The influence of senior military advisors was reduced leading to an increase in the civilian influence within department.

Harriet Critchley contends that "implementation of unification did necessitate a revolution within the structure of the armed forces and a readjustment for many personnel" but that it did not necessarily lead to increased influence of civilians within the department.[39] It was not until the MRG, four years later, and the subsequent amalgamation of CFHQ with the Department of National Defence that civilian influence was significantly increased.

DEFENCE IN THE 70'S & THE MRG

Unification was not the panacea Paul Hellyer had hoped it would be. When he handed over the department to Leo Cadieux in 1967 there were still problems within the department. Poor co-ordination and planning, procurement issues and a perceived lack of transparency / responsiveness by the department were all sources of frustration for the government.[40] The MRG of 1971 aimed to solve those problems by proposing fundamental changes to departmental management, the structure of headquarters and more significantly an increase in the role of senior civil servants in defence.

Pierre Trudeau, was elected Prime Minister of Canada in 1968. Despite having served in the Pearson government his views on the direction of foreign and defence policy were vastly different from those of his predecessor. He did not agree with the policies laid out in the 1964 White Paper and in 1969 announced a reversal of the previous government's defence priorities. He was sceptical about Canada's alliances, specifically Canada's role in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and wanted to have a defence policy that focused on Canada rather than commitments to allies. Phillip Lagassé, an expert in Canadian constitutional affairs,

---

[39] Harriet Critchley, "Civilianization and the Canadian Military," …, 127.

[40] Daniel Gosselin, "Unelected, Unarmed Servants of the State," …, 43

interprets the eschewal of the previous government's defence policy as a telltale sign that Trudeau was not satisfied with the military's role in advising the minister and cabinet on defence policy.[41]

Both Bland and Granatstein contend that Trudeau felt that the CAF was of little importance and a waste of money.[42] As such, he appointed a defence minister, Donald Macdonald, who felt much the same. Macdonald had actively campaigned in cabinet for Canada to pull out of NATO and did not trust of defence officials. He recruited somebody from outside the department to write the 1971 White Paper, *Defence in the 70's*. The document was developed without military consultation because rather than turn to his expert military advisors for advice Macdonald was convinced he had to turn them out.[43]

The 1971 White Paper priorities were: protection of sovereignty through the surveillance of Canadian territory and coast-lines; defence of North America in cooperation with the U.S.; fulfillment of NATO commitments; and international peacekeeping when necessary.[44] The new defence policy effectively increased defence commitments while freezing spending at the same time. More importantly, the White Paper acknowledged that the minister had appointed a Management Review Group to examine the organization and management of the entire department.

Mismanagement of capital acquisitions, like the DDH-280, and the mishandling of the implementation of government policy regarding NATO, convinced Macdonald that something needed to be done. He believed management solutions could overcome resource inadequacies

---

[41] Phillip Lagassé, "Accountability for National Defence," *IRPP Study* 4 (March 2010): 35

[42] Jack Granatstein, *Who Killed The Canadian Military* (Toronto: Harper Collins, 2004), 121 and Douglas Bland, *Chiefs of Defence* …, 94.

[43] Douglas Bland, *Chiefs of Defence*…, 95.

[44] Honourable Donald Macdonald, Minister of National Defence, "*White Paper on Defence*," in Douglas Bland, *Canada's National Defence, Vol I: Defence Policy* (Kingston, ON: School of Policy Studies, 1998), 144.

and produce efficiencies. He appointed John Pennefather, a prominent businessman, with very little expertise in defence matters, as the head of the MRG. The MRG, comprised of six private sector members, sought to bring modern management techniques and organizational ideas to the department. The consultants relied heavily on the Glassco Commission findings. Both Bland and Gosselin believe that one of the real aims of the MRG was to reorder the structure of the defence department and take the decision making process out of the hands of senior military officers, specifically the CDS.[45]

The MRG report, entitled "Management of Defence in Canada" was completed in July 1972 and delivered to the new MND, Edgar Benson. The report pointed out several issues regarding the existing structure of defence management and administration in Canada. It listed inadequacies and areas for improvement in management, planning, financial services, personnel administration, research, and defence procurement.[46] The report indicated that there was a need to increase dependence on civilians experienced in management especially when dealing with complex issues like those previously mentioned. It posited that modern management techniques and greater public servant involvement in the administration and management within the department would facilitate improved outputs.

The report was not well received by the CFHQ nor the House of Commons committee on defence and consequently ended up getting buried away until it was declassified in 1984. Despite it's poor reception, the government did implement many of the MRG recommendations. The primary recommendation was a reorganization of the CAF and DND into one National Defence Headquarters (NDHQ). NDHQ would have the civilian department, headed by the deputy minister, assuming responsibility for defence administration while the CAF, headed by the CDS,

---

[45] Douglas Bland, *Chiefs of Defence* …, 96 and Daniel Gosselin, "Unelected, Unarmed Servants of the State," …, 43.

[46] Honourable Donald Macdonald, Minister of National Defence, *White Paper on Defence* …, 168.

would be focused on military operations and readiness. The MRG actually proposed that the deputy minister be incorporated into the MND's office and have the CDS as his subordinate.

The creation of NDHQ led to a realignment of responsibilities and accountabilities of both civilians and military officers. Senior civilians found themselves placed in positions of power and influence that they had not previously occupied.[47] Positions like civilian assistant deputy ministers (ADMs). The senior ADM became responsible for formulating defence policy and providing policy related advice. The other newly created ADM oversaw the management of defence procurement in addition to providing advice. As both ADMs answered directly to the deputy minister it was seen as a means to remove the military from development of defence policy by providing a focal point for DND to liaise with the central agencies and staff in other departments.[48]

The government's decision to amalgamate the CAF and DND into NDHQ was done to increase the responsibilities of the deputy minister, shift formulation of policy away from the military officers and was driven by the Trudeau government's need to exercise more effective oversight and control of the CAF.[49] Under the new arrangements at NDHQ it was believed that "operational issues withered, civil servants advanced in power and influence and command authority and responsibility in the CAF atrophied.[50]

The "civilianization" of the DND did not sit well with many in the military.
The new system enabled civilians at DND to become repositories of knowledge because many remained at DND for long periods while senior officers rotated out every couple of years.

---

[47] Daniel Gosselin, "Unelected, Unarmed Servants of the State," …, 44.
[48] Douglas Bland, *Canada's National Defence Volume 2* …, 168.
[49] Daniel Gosselin, "Unelected, Unarmed Servants of the State," …, 44.
[50] Douglas Bland, *Canada's National Defence Volume 2* …, 164.

Knowledge is power and it helped senior civilians to cement their power base. At the same time, some civilians within the department felt that military officers were poor managers will little knowledge about bureaucratic administrative requirement.

Legassé argues that the creation of NDHQ was a good thing because defence accountability was strengthened by the changes made. He believes the evolution of the deputy minister's responsibilities facilitated enhanced civilian oversight of national defence issues and management of the department, thereby taking pressure off the minister.[51] There was ambiguity in the department about who was responsible for control and administration of the CAF as there was a belief that the CDS and deputy minister shared responsibilities. This belief diminished the CDS's role in controlling and administering the CAF because senior officers and officials tried to serve both masters, "but often sided with their own leaders on the military or civilian side during internal disputes."[52]

CONCLUSION

It was a common complaint throughout the 80s that the CAF had succumbed to an unacceptable level of civilian management measures. According to Gosselin, this may have been because many had little knowledge of how NDHQ worked and the important role the senior civil servants played as the interface between the department and the central agencies.[53] The theme continued into the 90s where in addition to placing blame on the military for the events that took place in Somalia, the Somalia Commission (Inquiry) also blamed public servants. The Inquiry observed that the deputy minister's influence over defence policy had increased greatly and had

---

[51] Phillip Lagassé, "Accountability for National Defence," …, 34.

[52] Douglas Bland, "Institutionalizing Ambiguity: The Management Review Group and the Reshaping of the Defence Policy Process in Canada," *Canadian Public Administration* 30, no.4 (Winter 1987): 543.

[53] Daniel Gosselin, "Unelected, Unarmed Servants of the State," …, 45.

contributed to the fiasco involving the Canadian Airborne Regiment.[54]

The issue of civilian control and civil-military relations is still germane today. Former CDS, General Rick Hillier, indicated in a 2010 Globe and Mail article that the Harper government wanted the Clerk of the Privy Council and deputy minister to have greater powers so as to better "guide the military."[55] He felt that civilian control did not necessarily equate to civil control of the military and argued that bureaucrats should not have more power than those laid out in the National Defence Act.[56] According to Jacques Bourgault, an authority on the Canadian public service, federal deputy ministers put the interests of the government as a whole ahead of those of their department.[57] This centralization of government has the deputy minister, who serves at the pleasure of the prime minister, dealing with the central agencies. As such, this allots him / her a significant amount of sway in guiding military policy.

It is debatable whether unification of the CAF and the creation of NDHQ actually provided the economies and efficiencies that they were supposed to. What they did do was increase the roles and responsibilities of civil servants within the department and transform the civil-military dynamic. The organizational changes and departmental restructures resulted in the CAF and DND we have today. Regardless of the outcome of the current defence review, public servants will continue to play a critical and influential role within the department. They act as a conduit between the military, other government departments and most importantly, the cabinet and central agencies. The deputy minister and his team of civil servants keep the military accountable to the government and have a large impact on civil-military relations.

---

[54] Ibid., 46.

[55] Murray Brewster, "Hillier Warns Against Civil Servants Directing Military Operations," *Globe and Mail*, 11 October 2010.

[56] Ibid.

[57] Jacques Bourgault, "Federal Deputy Ministers: Serial Servers Looking For Influence" in Jacques Bourgault and Christopher Dunn, eds, *Deputy Ministers in Canada: Comparative Jurisdictional Perspectives* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 364.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allard, J.V. *Memoires du General Jean V. Allard.* Boucherville: Editions de Mortagne, 1985.

Bland, Douglas. "A Conceptual Approach to Defence Policy Planning." *Canadian Defence Quarterly* (Winter 1985): 29-32.

Canada. Departent of National Defence. *Address on the Canadian Forces Reorganization Act.* Hon. Paul Hellyer, MND, 7 December 1966.

---. *Canada's National Defence, Volume 1: Defence Policy*. Kingston: School of Policy Studies, 1997.

---. *Canada's National Defence, Volume 2: Defence Organization*. Kingston: School of Policy Studies, 1998.

---. *Chiefs of Defence: Government and the Unified Command of the Canadian Armed Forces*. Toronto: Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies, 1995.

---. "Hillier and the New Generation of Generals." *Policy Options* (March 2008): 53-58.

---. *The Administration of Defence Policy in Canada, 1947-1985.* Kingston: R.P. Frye Co., 1987.

Bishop, Scott. "Libya and the Lessons of Naval Power." *Canadian Naval Review* 8, no. 4 (Winter 2013): 14-18.

Bourgault, Jacques, and Dunn, Christopher, eds. *Deputy Ministers in Canada: Comparative and Jurisdictional Perspectives.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014.

Byers, R.B. "Canadian Civil-Military Relations and Reorganization of the Armed Forces: Whither Civilian Control?" In *The Canadian Military: A Profile*, edited by Hector J. Massey, 197-228. Toronto: Copp Clark, 1972.

Critchley, W. Harriet. "Civilianization and the Canadian Military." *Armed Forces & Society* 16, no. 1 (October 1989): 117-136.

Fetterly, Lieutenant-Colonel Ross. "The Influence of the Environment on the 1964 Defence *White Paper*." *Canadian Military Journal* 5, no. 4 (Winter 2004-2005): 47-54.

Gosselin, Daniel. "Unelected, Unarmed Servants of the State: The Changing Role of Civil Servants Inside Canada's National Defence." *Canadian Military Journal* 14, no. 3 (Summer 2014): 38-52.

Gosselin, Colonel J.P.Y.D. "A 50 Year Tug of War of Concepts at the Crossroads: Unification and the Strong-Service Idea." National Security Studies Course Paper, Canadian Forces College, 2004.

Gosselin, Daniel P. "The Storm over Unification of the Armed Forces: A Crisis of the Canadian Civilian-Military Relations." in *The Insubordinate and the Noncompliant: Case Studies of Canadian Mutiny and Disobedience, 1920 to present*, edited by Howard G. Coombs, 309-343. Toronto: The Dundurn Group, 2007.

Gosselin, Major-General Daniel. "Hellyer's Ghosts: Unification of the Canadian Forces is 40 Years Old – Part One." *Canadian Military Journal* 9, no. 2 (2008): 6-15.

---. "Hellyer's Ghosts: Unification of the Canadian Forces is 40 Years Old – Part Two." *Canadian Military Journal* 9, no. 3 (2008): 6-16.

Government of Canada. "Minister Sajjan Launches Public Consultations on Defence Policy Review." last accessed 20 April 2016. http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?nid=1047049.

Granaststein, J.L. *Canada 1957-1967: The Years of Uncertainty and Innovation*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1985.

---. *Who Killed the Canadian Military?* Toronto: Phyllis Bruce Books, 2004.

Hanson, Jim, and Susan McNish, eds. *The Canadian Strategic Forecast 1996: The Military in Modern Democratic Society*. Toronto: The Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies, 1996.

Hayden, Peter T. *The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis: Canadian Involvement Reconsidered.* Toronto: The Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies, 1993.

Hellyer, Paul. "Canadian Defence Policy." *Air University Review* 19, no. 1 (November-December 1967): 2-7.

---. *Damn the Torpedoes: My Fight to Unify Canada's Armed Forces*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1990.

Dale, R. Herspring, *Civil-Military Relations and Shared Responsibility: A Four Nation Study*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2014.

Hunt, B.D, and R.G. Haycock, eds. *Canada's Defence: Perspectives on Policy I the 20th Century*. Mississauga: Copp Clark Pitman, 1993.

Kronenberg, Vernon J. *All Together Now: the organization of the Department of National Defence in Canada 1964-1972.* Toronto: Canadian Institute of International Affairs, 1973.

Legassé, Philippe. "Accountability for National Defence: Ministerial Responsibility, Military Command and Parliamentary Oversight," *IRPP Study* 4 (March 2010), http://search.proquest.com/docview/1095558054?accountid=9867.

Leslie, Brigadier-General E.M.D. (CF ret.). "Too Much Management, Too Little Command." *Canadian Defence Quarterly* 2, no. 3 (Winter 1972/73): 30-32.

McLin, J.B. *Canada's Changing Defence Policy 1957-1963: The Problems of a Middle Power Alliance.* Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1967.

Middlemiss, Danford William, and Joel J. Sokolsky. *Canadian Defence: Decisions and Determinants.* Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jvanovich, 1989.

Morton, Desmond. *Canada and War: A Military and Political History.* Toronto: Butterworth and Co., 1981.

---. *A Military History of Canada. 5th Edition.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Inc., 2007.

---. *Understanding Canadian Defence.* Toronto: Penguin, 2003.

Prime Minister of Canada Justin Trudeau. "Minister of National Defence Mandate Letter." last accessed 22 April 2016. http://pm.gc.ca/eng/minister-national-defence-mandate-letter.

Robinson, H. Basil. *Diefenbaker's World: A Populist in Foreign Affairs*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.

Shaw, Geoffery, D.T. "The Canadian Armed Forces and Unification." *Defense Analysis* 17, no. 2 (2001): 159-174.

Sherman, Michael E. "A Single Service for Canada?" *The Adelphi Papers* 7, no. 39 (July 1967): 1-14.

Stone, Craig, and Brigadier-General Daniel Gosselin. "From Minister Hellyer to General Hillier: Understanding the Fundamental Differences Between the Unification of the Canadian Armed Forces and its Present Transformation." *Canadian Military Journal* 6, no. 4 (Winter 2005/2006): 5-15.

The Royal Commission on Government Organization. "Volume 4, Special Areas of Administration." Ottawa: Queens Printer, 1963. Last accessed 29 April 2016. http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2014/bcp-pco/Z1-1960-4-4-1-eng.pdf.

Thériault, General G.C.E. "Reflections of Canadian Defence Policy and its Underlying Structural Problems." *Canadian Defence Quarterly* 22, no. 6 (July 1993): 3-10.