

*Supply—National Defence*

both the Minister of National Defence and the Minister of Defence Production had no knowledge that the simulator had been purchased in connection with the CF-5 program. I think that this might be quite true. I presume the reason for the specific lack of knowledge concerning the simulator arises from the fact that in the major purchase of any aircraft of this kind, the simulator automatically goes with the whole procedure. I presume that the reason why the simulator program was cancelled is because the United States armed forces are not going to buy the CF-5, and therefore it is not considered financially feasible for the Canadian armed forces to proceed with the simulator.

On the other hand the Associate Minister of National Defence has indicated that several other countries are going to purchase the CF-5. It seems to me that if we are to make the best possible job of what appears to be less than the best aircraft, we have to have the basis for sound training, and you cannot have sound training without the simulator or without a ground training device of some kind. Before any final decisions are made about this, and that is why I bring it up at the moment, Mr. Chairman, I think the minister would be well advised to review this decision. Obviously \$50,000 has been invested in the simulator program already. It seems to me that we are not going to have adequate training unless we proceed with this ground trainer.

**Mr. Hellyer:** Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is correct when he says that normally a simulator is required. On this basis the technical branch of the forces sent notice to the Department of Defence Production that a simulator would probably be required, for information only. The Department of Defence Production on the basis of this probability decided that they might invest some money from their revolving fund in the development of a simulator, in order to gain some months lead in the development of it, with the hope that the department would be able to make sales probably to other countries, as well as making it available for the R.C.A.F. In December, and I am speaking from memory, the operators advised the technical branch that the simulator would not be required. This advice was sent immediately to the Department of Defence Production and the project was cancelled at once. It had no relationship whatsoever to any inclination or otherwise of the United States air force to acquire this aircraft.

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

• (7:50 p.m.)

**Mr. Dinsdale:** Is the minister saying that the CF-5 does not require this sort of device to assist in the training program? It would appear to me that this represents an extreme departure from the training procedures which have always been carried out in the R.C.A.F.

**Mr. Hellyer:** That is exactly what I am saying. According to the best advice available in the department the simulator is not required. We have a number of planes with dual controls and to the extent that training of this type is required it will be done in these aircraft. But it is felt that simulator time in addition to dual time is not necessary.

**Mr. Hales:** One brief observation before leaving this vote. I should like to direct the attention of the minister and of the committee to the observations made by the Auditor General when he called attention to the case of nine naval officers who left Halifax to go to Victoria on a course. They went in separate cars—nine men, nine cars. They travelled all the way to Victoria and back in connection with a course which lasted from January to May. Allowing for ferry services, meals and other travelling expenses it is estimated that this cost some \$5,282, whereas had they travelled by a service aircraft their journey would have cost approximately \$600.

We have heard today examples of every kind of extravagance in the minister's department. I realize the example I have just given may relate to an item in the former estimates but I am asking the minister whether he has re-evaluated the system of travel arrangements in his department in an effort to reduce this continual waste of the taxpayers' money—waste which is going on all the time. Every day, as has been pointed out, cars are running around on errands unconnected with official business. I trust the minister will be able to give us a good reason for all such journeys in future.

**Mr. Hellyer:** The regulations provide that the commanding officer may decide what means of travel is used by his personnel on official business. He is allowed to take into consideration a number of factors, including morale, the need to have a car at the other end of the journey, and so on. I think it is right that there should be a certain amount of delegation of authority. If there is any one thing which we tend to do in large organizations it is to centralize too much authority and require more decisions to be made at higher levels than is really justified.