

Supply—National Defence

educational committee. At no time is the committee allowed to determine or even look at the forward policy of the government or what the forward policy of this country should be in regard to defence.

We examined the Bomarc sites but at no time did we have the chance to say that the whole thing is obsolete, that we are spending \$3.5 million a year maintaining these sites which are no longer useful to Canada. The minister said when he was in the opposition that a war involving manned bombers over this country was very unlikely. That was said some three or four years ago. It is certainly much more unlikely today. Yet we continue to maintain an obsolete fleet of missiles which at best have a range of 425 miles. Any manned bomber could fly around them without losing too many miles or wasting too much gas.

Thirteen thousand men have voluntarily retired from the forces and we are not supposed to ask why. We spent a great deal of money training these men, the amount of money spent on training them depending upon how long they were in the services, but we allowed them slowly to slip away. We the taxpayers are supposed to allow this to go on forever just because no one is apparently interested in what the Minister of National Defence is doing. This is a shameful waste of the Canadian taxpayers' money, forcing men into retirement and then paying something like \$65 million in bonuses to keep them in the services.

Some time ago we were told that the Minister of National Defence under his plan of integration of the services would make a great saving in our defence expenditures. As the hon. member for Calgary North pointed out the other day, where is this saving? For the past number of years our defence expenditures have been around \$1,500 million. In the present year they are estimated to be \$1,580 million. Where is the saving?

The minister's speech on the opening of the debate on these estimates was one of generalities. He dealt at length with the question of how he had made tremendous savings in housekeeping. He said that at national headquarters he had got rid of 1,000 men. He moved them to another building, for all we know. Now he is paying those same men to re-enlist. What kind of a hodgepodge of policy and government spending is this? Never before has the Defence Committee had

[Mr. Horner (Acadia).]

such a tremendous task ahead of it to re-examine the situation and point out the follies of the Minister of National Defence.

I hope the members of that committee will thoroughly examine defence matters not from the point of view of military experts but to see that the taxpayer has value for the dollars spent in defence. We travel across this country and see the growing alarm on the part of John Q. Citizen because of what we are doing with our money. Canadian citizens are saying: You are going to tax us in order to provide a pension; You are going to bring in medicare. Can the country afford it?

We are told that something like 40 per cent of the gross national product is paid to one government or another in taxes. Members of parliament were hoodwinked by the present Minister of National Defence when he said he would make great savings in the amalgamation of the three services. I could not see it at the time. The minister may amalgamate some services and smooth out some headquarter's expense but basically the man trained to fly a plane will still be in a separate unit from a man trained to sail a ship or serve in the army.

What has this amalgamation done to morale? A number of hon. members who have spoken previously have discussed this question. Thirteen thousand people have retired voluntarily from the forces in the past few years. This alone provides the answer to the question, what has amalgamation done to morale. They would not get out of the service if they had confidence in the minister and in the service.

This is the greatest problem the minister must face. It is all well and good for Charles Lynch to say in the *Ottawa Citizen* not long ago that the minister's self-assurance is undinted. But the minister must lie awake some night and examine the question of why so many men have left the services if they have confidence in the minister. Do they know or respect the direction in which he is taking the services? This is the ultimate question that the minister must come back to and answer. Is the minister providing the leadership necessary for these men to stay with him? I think the answer must be that he has failed in this regard and failed miserably.

• (5:30 p.m.)

There is no question about it. I am not debating the question of pay for the armed services. I appreciate the fact that they need pay increases. I was pleased to hear the minister announce the other day that a