

*Supply—National Defence*

work, albeit hard and dangerous work, one on short term and one on permanent commission, to have such dissimilar benefits payable to their survivors in the event of an unfortunate and fatal accident? These benefits are so dissimilar that it is a wonder we have any short service personnel in the services today.

I hope that during the course of this debate the minister will announce that the government is at least taking steps to remove the penalty for short service so that the problem with regard to the short term and permanent commissioned men will be resolved. It does seem unjust that two men flying together, both contributing to pension plans, should leave such dissimilar benefits for their survivors just because one is on permanent commission and the other is on short term service.

Along with the cutback and freeze at the top there is a further area which gnaws at the serviceman in marked contrast to the man in industry or business. Here I would suggest that the minister is hoist with his own petard, for in an expanding, busy economy there is room for advancement and promotion for those who wish to work and who are trained for it. Contrast this with the situation in the services where you have the freeze at the top, the freeze in the middle, the freeze at the bottom and the cutbacks which have occurred during the past two years. Where can a qualified, energetic man who wants to make the services his career find room for advancement when there are these freezes and cutbacks? I submit that the lack of advancement due to the minister's integration policy is the dry rot which eats away at morale, and this the minister has failed to acknowledge, let alone resolve.

There are some who say that the serviceman is already a political eunuch in that he can vote but not participate in political affairs. There may be sound reasons for some of the restrictions on political activity although personally I think some of those reasons are outdated. But I submit there is no justification for a moratorium on morale which, if allowed to continue, may let the forces integrate in a form which will be a faceless one without the spirit, colour and strength developed through the sadnesses and sacrifices of the past.

When he gave his detailed review and statement the minister showed a lack of concern by not mentioning the word "morale". Morale, I submit, is one of the foundations of any effective force regardless of the

methods used to train and manage it. His review was impersonal. It was cool. It was like an I.B.M. computer. We need those machines but I submit that a man in the responsible position of the minister has to bring some personality to the services instead of treating them in an impersonal way.

You can only build up the strength of the future by relying on some of the traditions and colour of the past, but when the minister comes before us with his revolutionary policy of integration and does not once mention the word morale in his review I submit this is cause for grave concern.

**Mr. Schreyer:** Mr. Chairman, I make no pretence to being well informed on matters relating to national defence or to being an expert on the subject but because I feel in good company in this respect I should like to make some remarks. I believe there are many hon. members who are in the same position as I and other new members who are confused, bewildered and perplexed as to just what is the state of Canada's defence capability in the year 1966.

There is confusion in the minds of the public across the country because on the one hand we have heard statements emanating from the minister's office to the effect that integration has been a success and that the savings to be derived from the new integration policy can be devoted to the acquisition of more, as the minister likes to put it, military hardware. On the other hand, having listened to members of the opposition such as the hon. member for Calgary North and my colleague from Vancouver East, it becomes clear that the government has not in fact succeeded in diverting any of these rumored savings into the acquisition of additional quantities of better and more modern weaponry.

If there has been such a drastic reduction in personnel, then why was there not extra money available for the acquisition of more up to date weaponry? Expenditures by the department can only be made in three directions or for three purposes. The first is to pay for the personnel who serve in the armed forces. The second is to pay for the costs of administration and the third is to pay for the acquisition of more modern weaponry.

The reduction in personnel, which apparently has taken on all the characteristics of being dangerous to the morale of the forces, must have resulted in savings. Where has this money gone? If it is true, as stated by the