

Supply—National Defence

Mr. Pearson: The minister knows, of course, that the exact location of this Bomarc base has appeared in reports out of Washington, in newspapers, some congressional reports and in magazines.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Chairman, I should like to bring a matter to the attention of the minister at this time which is rather different from the subject we have been discussing up till now. It concerns not only the Minister of National Defence but also the Minister of National Health and Welfare. The problem I want to bring to the minister's attention is the loss of family allowances by service people on overseas duty. Some time ago I put a question on the order paper which was answered on May 13. The answer as found on page 3638 of *Hansard* shows that a leading aircraftsman with five children loses \$1,584 during his tour of duty and against that he receives by way of income tax saving only \$16.

I think the people of Canada want the children of servicemen overseas to get the same benefits as those who remain in Canada, and this is quite a substantial loss in family income. The higher up we go the smaller is the gap. A wing commander with five children, for example, loses \$1,584 but he saves \$998 in income tax so that this regulation which prevents the payment of family allowances for the children of overseas troops falls hardest on the little man; the lower the rank the greater the loss in income. I should like the minister to bring this matter to the attention of his colleagues and have something done about it.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I would not like the minister to think that we are not interested in the observations he made about civil defence or that we do not desire to make some comments on that matter, but I take it that it will be discussed on the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare. I am in some doubt about this because there seem to be three ministers now responsible for civil defence, the Minister of National Health and Welfare, the Minister of National Defence and the Prime Minister. I assume that the discussion of this important matter will take place on the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare.

Mr. Pearkes: Other than the actual role or part which the army will play.

Mr. Benidickson: Mr. Chairman, the committee would expect me to ask a question or two about economy and extravagance, particularly because the minister will recall our discussion in December, 1957 when he first came before the house with his estimates. At

that time he was the only minister, I think, who claimed that after taking office he was able to report to the house that he had reduced expenses and had fulfilled the election promises of the government that waste and extravagance had been reversed by the new administration. As I recall it he had a certain figure which I am not going to quote at the moment, but the minister may know it better than I and that figure, as I recall very clearly, represented primarily a claimed reduction in waste and extravagance in the matter of travelling expenses. I wonder if the minister would just explain to us—I think I know the answer—but I want him to explain to the committee that this was the only item out of these millions and millions of dollars of national defence expenditures that he could put at the top of the mast as the place where he, being in charge of the department, had reversed things and found it possible to reduce expenses and first for travelling and removal expenses.

If one looks at the summary of standard objects of expenditure for this year for the minister's department and compares them with last year he will find that there is a very substantial increase in the expenses of the defence department for travel and removal. I can give the figures. Last year the amount of the estimates was \$37.2 million and this year the requirement is \$44.3 million. I know, if all the members of the public do not know, that the reason is there is a different pattern with respect to the rotation of troops going from this country over to Europe and homeward.

What I want to point out to the committee is that when the rotation was in favour of the minister he claimed this was something in favour of the new administration in achieving economy. But this year when we have this \$7 million rise in expenditures he gives the true facts and the true facts are that under the pattern of rotation of troops a greater amount of money has to be spent for moving troops back and forth between this country and Europe than in another year. This is incidental, but it is typical of the type of information we were given in December, 1957. Then we raised questions as to what evidence of waste and extravagance the minister had found and corrected. Perhaps he would have some further information on that point to give us before this item is passed tonight.

I shall pass from that item now. I was concerned to hear the minister make his reference to security and confidence with respect to defence administration in general. I think when he made a reference of that kind he was replying to what had been said