

National Security Measures

have two squadrons of CF-5 tactical fighter bombers and we have taken delivery of the first of 50 utility, 14-passenger helicopters. We have 16 large 28-passenger helicopters and we are getting 74 new observation helicopters. We have 15 Buffalo aircraft and 23 Hercules as well as five 707 jet transports.

The hon. member, in saying that the forces are less effective and not equipped to carry out their role, is not being at all factual. Our forces are very well equipped. It is precisely because of the advanced and carefully planned nature of this equipment that we have been able in the last several years to perform so superlatively the tasks we have undertaken.

Mr. Nowlan: Were the F-5 and the *Bonaventure* planned operations?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I would agree with the hon. member in respect of the *Bonaventure*, but he and his colleagues think we should still retain an aircraft carrier in service.

Mr. Nowlan: Were they planned?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It was a bad plan. The difference is, we have learned from that bad plan and the hon. member apparently has not. Whether you are talking about the United States or the United Kingdom, the fact of the matter is that it is recognized that the day of the aircraft carrier has passed. This is recognized by other states, but apparently not by the hon. gentleman and his colleagues.

Mr. Nowlan: Was the F-5 well planned, or is that another white elephant?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Let me point out to the hon. member that he is not correct. In other states, for example in the Netherlands, which have bought the F-5 aircraft, the NF-5, which is constructed in this country, it has been decided that this close-tactical aircraft is eminently suited for the task for which it was acquired.

• (3:20 p.m.)

In summary, I appreciate the opportunity to set out in a general way the response to some of the points which have been made in this debate. What the hon. member pointed out is hardly significant at this time unless the hon. member who moved the motion is prepared to crystallize some of the issues in the debate, which he did not. I hope to be able to deal with some of the issues again when we bring forth the white paper.

Mr. Brewin: Before the minister resumes his seat, would he be willing to answer a question?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes, go ahead.

Mr. Brewin: Is there intention to raise in the white paper the subject which I raised that of the continuance of Canada in NORAD and the possibility of saving up to \$200 million a year if we are able to get out of what we think is an obsolete commitment?

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The white paper does intend to deal with that matter. However, I think I have to correct the figures mentioned by the hon. member. As I recall, the expenditure for Air Defence Command is somewhere in the nature of \$105 million. I acknowledge that this is a lot of money and I do not regard it as insignificant, as does, apparently, the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East. We intend to deal with that question. How we will deal with it, I cannot say to the hon. member, but this is really one of the central questions in Canadian defence policy to which we will have to address ourselves at this time.

I would like to thank the House again for the opportunity to exchange views on some of these points. I will follow with interest comments which other hon. members make so that we may perhaps be able to continue this debate at a future time when we have before us the forthcoming statement on defence policy.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. May I point out that the minister has one minute left of the time permitted him. If the hon. member's question goes beyond that time the consent of the House will have to be obtained.

Mr. Forrestall: I am sure we will give consent to the minister if he will answer this question. Would he indicate to us briefly, since most of us anticipated that he would, when we might expect the white paper? While I am on my feet may I remind him that I never said the amount was insignificant. I said that it reflected the insignificant thought and attention paid to it by the government.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): May I say, on the latter point, that I noted very carefully what the hon. gentleman said. We will see what appears in *Hansard*. With regard to the timing of the white paper, as I indicated it is now before cabinet. I hope that before the House rises for the summer it will be available, but of course it depends on the dispatch of other business, in particular the preparation for the constitutional conference and the taxation bill. But I hope we might have it available prior to the summer recess.

Mr. Nowlan: May I ask the minister a question?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I will recognize the hon. member but first of all, as I have indicated, may I point out that the minister's time has just expired. Is there consent of the House to allow the minister extended time for the purpose of receiving a question?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Nowlan: I thank members of the House. My question is on the point which I tried to raise during the minister's interesting remarks. He said the government had learned from past errors and mistakes, and he admitted that the *Bonaventure* was a mistake. I would ask the minister directly if the present plan for the implementation of the DDH program involving several hundred million dollars—I have heard an estimate of around \$280