

*Supply—National Defence*

[Translation]

**Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne):** I think I said clearly that, in the case of a five-year re-enlistment, a sum of \$1,000 was paid at time of re-enlistment.

**Mr. Langlois (Mégantic):** \$1,000?

**Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne):** Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I wish to conclude these remarks—I really did not intend to speak so long and I apologize—by saying that I am personally convinced that the way in which the minister is now doing the job he has undertaken is, in my view, extremely comforting and is such that we can hope to have, at least, perfectly integrated armed forces, and efficient military service, because the prime objective of integration was not necessarily saving money but ensuring a higher degree of efficiency—

**Mr. Ricard:** That is not what you said a few moments ago.

**Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne):** —and that is what we are accomplishing daily—

**Mr. Ricard:** That is not what you said a while ago.

**Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne):** —and that is what we are accomplishing daily.

**Mr. Ricard:** There are contradictions.

**Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne):** There is no contradiction. I said that efficiency came first and then economy.

**Mr. Ricard:** That is not what you said a while ago.

**Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne):** And we have accomplished both, namely greater efficiency and, at the same time, savings of more than \$100 million already.

In my opinion, we also have a much more flexible administrative formula by which we can study an over-all budget for a five-year period. This permits us to project the administration and this, I think, is the modern way to administer because an important service is involved. I remember it was one of my first reactions, 25 years ago, when I came in contact with the Department of National Defence for the first time. I met an old brigadier of my acquaintance who told me: "This is big business". When we are handling a budget of \$1½ billion and when we administer a service involving nearly 135,000 people, I think that it is logical to hope for modern administration, management and control

[Mr. Langlois (Mégantic).]

methods, and with the integration we are now trying to implement, we are getting good results. I think the whole house should rejoice that the efforts made up to now have met with such great success.

[English]

**Mr. Churchill:** Mr. Chairman, two years have elapsed since we had a debate on defence. It is high time that we examined this department and examined it thoroughly with regard to policy, and with regard to the statements and promises which have been made, to see if there has been any fulfilment of those. It is rather interesting to look back at May 8, 1964, to page 3086, when I said this:

Then, the minister did as he did in December, he praised his associate minister. The associate minister will get up and praise the Minister of National Defence. This is what was done last December. They pat each other on the back and say, "My, how hard my colleague is working." They are the gold dust twins working together.

We have that again. We have the associate minister, and he gets pulled into this Hellyer complex and pats the minister on the back and gets a return pat on his back.

**An hon. Member:** That is part of his job.

**Mr. Churchill:** I was disappointed in the associate minister. I thought he would stand up on his own feet and establish himself, as the former associate minister suggested, on an equal basis with the Minister of National Defence, and not just tag along behind this great, self-appointed commander in chief of the Canadian forces. The associate minister in his opening remarks said that he was going to tell us—and this is what I heard through the translation system—about the experience he had lived through during the last year. It has been pretty terrible living through experience with the Minister of National Defence. I have some sympathy for the associate minister—but not very much, because he has disappointed me today. He said that the armed forces are not conceived with 50 years of the past in mind, but with the future in mind. Two years ago the Minister of National Defence introducing a bill into this house did not go back 50 years. He went back 60 years to introduce a system which was discarded by the British 60 years ago.

• (3:40 p.m.)

I think the word to describe the situation today as we enter upon a discussion on national defence after a two years lapse is "disillusionment". That is the impression I