

Supply—National Defence

pay increase would be forthcoming, retroactive to October of last year. He forces retirements and then he pays men to stay in the service. This very fact must convince the people of Canada that the defence policy of this government is the worst we have ever had. These are the questions that are uppermost in the minds of the people of this country. You force men to retire after spending \$175,000 on their training and then you introduce an item of \$65 million in the estimates in order to pay men to stay in the service.

The minister has announced that he will give men \$200 a year for each year for which they re-enlist. I talked the other day to a person in the air force who said he was going to re-enlist for five more years. It meant \$1,000 to him and he had intended to get out. I asked him why. He gave me a whole host of reasons which I found very interesting but when you summed up all his reasons they amounted to the fact he did not know where he was going and he was more or less fed up with the leadership shown by the department. We in the opposition have a duty to point out to the government that the Canadian citizen is not getting value for his money in this department. The minister has failed and failed miserably in trying to make savings and cut out wasteful expenditures.

The minister could make an immediate saving of \$215 million by cancelling the contract for the F-5. Charles Lynch put it very well in an article in the *Ottawa Citizen* from which I should like to quote:

There is more than a suspicion that the CF-5 was ordered more to keep Canadian workmen busy than for any qualities it may possess as a fighting machine.

I ask you, is that the duty of the defence department? If the government wants to keep Canadian workmen busy the government should spend money on the development of our resources because there you have a multiplying force. As the resources are developed many more people are employed. If the sole purpose of the government is to spend money to employ people, then it should spend money not in making an aircraft which is obsolete before it is off the drawing board but in developing our resources. I think the minister must wrestle with that question and decide just what he is doing, employing men or purchasing equipment that will enable us to defend this country better and keep peace throughout the world.

Further along in this same article Mr. Lynch says:

The result has been that there has been no informed critical appraisal of the Hellyer revolu-

tion except by the men who are conducting it under his guidance and inspiration. Not surprisingly, they find it good.

This is what I said a while ago. The only people who have really examined the minister's record have been his own advisers, press agents and public relations people. They have all agreed it has been tremendous. We look for results, we look for savings, and we have seen none.

In addition to all these mistakes, the morale of the forces has been eroded. Mr. Lynch has a word to say about morale too:

Mr. Hellyer admits that he is having trouble keeping the armed forces up to strength.

I like this:

Having cut away the fat, he now finds he's losing some of the meat.

This is exactly the case in the armed forces today. Having cut away the fat he is losing some of the meat. Morale has gone and the forces are completely dejected.

What did the minister say in his remarks in this regard? He first gave us some idea of what he thinks the Canadian forces should do and what has been done. I should like to quote from the minister's opening remarks as found on page 1416 of *Hansard*:

—that notwithstanding the reduction in expenditures we will have achieved, within two years, a significant qualitative improvement and operational capability of our armed forces.

Let us examine that statement. First he says, "notwithstanding the reduction in expenditures". We have not seen any reduction in expenditures. The minister may say that this tri-service business has saved us a lot of money. The estimate book shows that there has been \$15,800 million budgeted for the armed services. We do not see these savings. The minister goes on to say that within two years we will have achieved a significant qualitative improvement. How can you have a significant qualitative improvement when you force 500 of your top officers to retire? You cannot. The minister also said there would be an improvement in operational capability of our armed forces. How can you have that improvement when you order an airplane for them that is obsolete before you start production of it?

The news last night really prompted me to make this speech on defence. It was stated then that 107 CF-5 planes had been ordered by West Germany and 21 of them had crashed because of faulty mechanism, faulty construction or faulty design. About one-fifth of the planes with which they were supplied