

The Address—Mr. Drew

people. No responsible individual has suggested that we turn the clock back on the social development which has taken place in all democratic countries in closely related periods of advancement.

There is not a member of this house, however, who is not well aware of a number of places where savings could be made without reducing a single social service, or any other essential service of the dominion government.

One argument that is put forward is that the extent of our fixed obligations limits the possibility of economies. That, however, completely ignores the fact that there may be duplicating activity or costly overlapping between the dominion and provincial governments which afford the possibility of very great saving in the handling of those services without any reduction in the services themselves. We must always remember that the estimates of the cost of services include the very large sums which are required for the handling of the payments and that the amounts paid, either in the way of interest payments on debts or payments by way of social services, are far below the total figures given. It is within that field of administrative costs that great savings can be made by adjustment of responsibilities between the dominion and provincial governments and by a reorganization on a businesslike basis, which will expedite the business of the country and produce great savings.

It will be recalled that on numerous occasions we have presented a motion calling for an inquiry into the organization of the departments of government by a commission or committee made up of experts, including the highly competent civil servants who would be available for that task. It has been pointed out that a similar commission in the United States, under ex-president Hoover, made recommendations which it was estimated would have resulted in the saving of \$5 billion a year. That was not related to waste or extravagance. It was related to the efficient and businesslike organization of government. It has been pointed out that on a proportionate basis if similar recommendations were made here it would result in a saving of anywhere up to \$500 million a year. I know that this figure has been challenged, and it has been suggested that no such figure could be saved at any time. But even if \$200 million or even \$100 million could be saved, that in itself would be a tremendous saving, and it would also give evidence that the government was really trying to do the business of the country on a sound basis; and that would have a great effect on the attitude of our people to such taxation as may be necessary for defence and other purposes. In

[Mr. Drew.]

voting against that proposal the government has been voting against the kind of examination which every large business would insist upon having from time to time, if it expected to remain solvent.

When it comes to waste and extravagance I find statements made from time to time that every example of waste and extravagance is immediately dealt with. I think it would be well for us just to look at some typical examples furnished by the Department of National Defence. Since that department is now spending nearly half of the total budget approved by this parliament, it is the department of government which must be most critically examined to determine the extent to which any real attempt is being made to establish businesslike methods and prevent extravagance and waste.

Some very revealing figures have been published recently which indicated how little real effort has been made to bring defence expenditures under any clearly planned supervision. In the last few weeks articles have been appearing throughout Canada in some of the most responsible of Canadian newspapers, analysing facts and figures in regard to defence purchases, which are a challenge to every member of the house. They are the result of an examination of the reports of the government in regard to defence purchases. They are written by reporters whose high reputation is known to every member of parliament. Just let me refer to a few of the examples given.

Since these have appeared throughout the whole of Canada, they are the kind of examples which it would seem necessary for us to examine. During a single ten-month period orders for boots and shoes for the armed forces totalled \$15,292,241. Even at the very high estimate of \$15 a pair, which would indeed be a high cost for service footwear, this would mean more than one million pair of shoes for 100,000 members of the armed forces. The suggestion that orders of this kind are necessary for the reserves simply does not hold water, because plenty of shoes have been available for the reserve army for some years. Orders are still being placed, and are now well above 1,300,000.

During the last session it was found that orders have been placed for 1,150,000 neckties. Not satisfied with this incredible accumulation of neckwear, orders are still being placed for more neckties. One might well wonder what particular military service these additional ties are supposed to perform.

Then there was the remarkable order for 62,000 large serving forks, three for every five men in uniform. As a result of the