

purchased for the Canadian Armed Forces. What we needed at the time the CF-5 was purchased were about 70 high-performance aircraft. We ordered 115 CF-5s because that was the minimum number that Canadair could produce in any sort of economic manner. Thus, we purchased upward of one-third more aircraft than we needed; one-third more of an aircraft that was chosen principally because it was cheap, not because it fitted the role for which it was purchased.

In effect, we are thus paying one-third more for each aircraft than the purchase price of \$2 million, and indeed since less than one-half of the initial purchase order is now in service we have in fact paid double for each aircraft. For double the price per copy of a CF-5 in 1965, when the order was placed, we could have purchased, for example, the F-4 Phantom and would have had the number of multipurpose, high-performance aircraft we required, and no more; aircraft that are capable of fulfilling the role assigned to them, which the CF-5 is not.

Beyond that, we now have in service 66 CF-101 Voodoo aircraft and are replacing them with newer models. An aircraft like the F-4, with slight modifications, could have fulfilled an air defence role as well as a tactical support role and other roles assigned to the CF-5. Thus, had we purchased such an aircraft to fulfil all fighter aircraft roles, we probably would have been able to place an order sufficiently large to warrant production of that kind of aircraft in Canada. Such a decision would have had the additional advantage of lowering supply and maintenance costs because we would have only one aircraft instead of two aircraft types in service.

It is about time we stopped making major equipment purchases for the Canadian armed services on an ad hoc basis. We will shortly need to decide upon a replacement aircraft for the CF-104s and CF-101s which are in service. The answer that I received to question No. 1210 on the order paper informed me that these aircraft will need to be replaced "about 1980." Unhappily, the same answer informed me that "no specific evaluation study of possible

#### *Adjournment Debate*

replacement aircraft for the CF-101 and CF-104 is currently under way". Well, let us get one under way and avoid the purchase of another disaster like the CF-5 or the *Bonaventure* refit. When we talk about equipment for the Canadian Armed Forces, we are talking about millions of dollars. For heaven's sake, let us quit fooling around.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has expired.

**Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, the original question we are debating tonight, dealing with an additional 20 CF-5s being purchased, appears in *Hansard* at page 3433 of April 18, 1973. As the hon. members knows, the Canadian forces' inventory of CF-5 aircraft, now standing at 68 single-seaters and 23 duals and due to be increased by 18 more duals, is calculated to be just right for the programmed 15-year life of the aircraft. With an advanced training role soon to be added to the CF-5s close support tactical air assignment in mobile command, it is expected that aircraft held in unit establishments and in reserve will be adequate for the total program.

Beginning in December, 19 dual and 12 single CF-5s will begin to replace the T-33 aircraft currently used by 1 Canadian forces flying training school at CFB Cold Lake, Alberta. The change will give the forces the capability of training student jet pilots on a modern aircraft at the advanced level. It is estimated that the CF-5 phasing-in will be completed at 1 CFFTS by November, 1974.

Twenty aircraft were sold to Venezuela in 1972. Of these, 18 are being replaced as dual-seaters for the expanded training role. Six aircraft have been written off due to accidents since the CF-5 came into service in 1968. While some CF-5s are currently on inactive reserve, all the aircraft are programmed for various roles during the aircraft's service life. These aircraft will be brought back into service as required to fill commitments. Mr. Speaker, this situation has no relationship whatsoever to the refitting of the *Bonaventure*, as this is a constructive program.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.