

*National Defence Act Amendment*

cannot deal with all the matters that are subject to criticism in the speech the minister made, or as to the principle of the bill, but I hope to have another opportunity to do so. I am restricted to 40 minutes while the minister had about an hour and forty-five minutes. However, I will mention some items.

Before I conclude I intend to give the minister an idea, and I hope he will think about it. I hope he will put his brain trusters to work and set up a study group if he sees merit in the idea. I believe even this minister will see some merit in the proposal I intend to put before him before I sit down. Before doing that, however, I want to draw attention, with some regret, to the continuing misleading statements to which the minister subjects this house and the people of Canada. In his speech on December 7, as recorded at page 10820 of *Hansard*, the minister referred to rising costs. He was attempting to get across to us and to the public the fact he had made some substantial savings, and he used these words:

The facts are clear and incontrovertible. Either the defence budget had to be substantially increased or substantial cost reductions had to be made. Otherwise funds would simply not be available for the capital expenditures that are essential to effective military forces. These pressures will continue. The integration through unification process will generate important new cost reductions for some years to come.

● (8:10 p.m.)

The minister went on in that vein until I interrupted him to ask:

Will he relate the reduction of personnel to the cost factor?

The minister dodged that and simply replied:

Let me continue my statement.

However, Mr. Speaker, I had had it from him earlier by way of question and answer on another occasion that by reducing the personnel in the services and on the civilian side of National Defence headquarters to the number of 23,000 all told, the minister had saved on the cost of personnel and was able to divert that saving to other purposes. That is how he effected what he likes to proclaim to the public as substantial savings in national defence.

The budget of the minister for national defence is the same; he has a ceiling of \$1,500 million, or it goes a little above that now and again. The minister has made no saving to the taxpayer at all, yet this is the type of propaganda that he has spread across this country. Here and there I hear from various people, and from some who should know better, that

this minister has saved the taxpayers money. He has dismissed from the services 23,000 people, and this saving by way of salaries and upkeep has eliminated any increase in the defence budget; but in point of fact there has been no corresponding savings to the taxpayers. I regret that the minister continues to give misleading information such as that.

I want to say a word or two about the minister's statement concerning the single service concept, as he calls it. The minister wants us to believe that when he issued the white paper in 1964 this was implicit in that white paper. I am not going into all the details. The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) pointed out that this was not evident at the time. It is not evident even now from reading the white paper. There are ever so many senior officers, retired, dismissed or fired by the minister, who will be prepared to state, I expect, that this was not evident to them when they first read the white paper or when they had conversations with the minister.

Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, the minister said that this concept was introduced at that time and that we are now going to have just one single service. The hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) pointed out this afternoon, with several examples, how the minister on one page says we are going to have a single service and on the next page says that there will be a navy, an army and an air force, or that there will be sailors, soldiers, and airmen. There must be half a dozen examples in this speech of his where, on the one hand, he is saying that we are going to have one single unified service, and yet things will be unchanged.

What are people to judge from that, Mr. Speaker? The only judgment you can make is that the minister is misleading the House of Commons and the people of this country, and I do not think that this should be done.

Remarks were made the other day about the statement of the minister in his speech in connection with higher loyalty; the minister gave us some peculiar statements with regard to that matter. He said that the men in the three services, despite their respective loyalty to each individual service, will have to develop a loyalty to a single unified service, and consequently a higher loyalty to their country.

I think this is quite wrong, Mr. Speaker. I stated yesterday, or stated by way of interruption in the course of discussion going on, that this was insulting to the people now in