

National Defence

we do in our advertising, in our thinking and in our speaking should be done by reason of our pride in our nation. It should be done to exalt our nation, the importance of our nation, as well as to set out the principles for which we stand which far outweigh the expounding of a philosophy which creates a mentality which would make us subservient to some type of international organization.

I should like to read a little passage from the speech of the minister to be found on page 1079 of *Hansard* of April 3, 1952. The minister said:

We have to come to regard the NATO peoples, not as a parcel of foreigners but as partners having a common interest in meeting a common danger in order to arrive at a common security.

It must become just as natural for any boy in Canada to take his place on our frontiers in Germany or Europe as it is for him to take a summer job on the frontier in Canada. Both mark the beginning of work in the service; both are adventures; both enlarge the horizons; both earn money to be invested in laying better foundations for a future career.

I take exception to that. There may be an element of truth in it, but that is not the reason for which we raise an army. Let us understand that.

I wish to say a few words along a little different line, that is defence expenditures. I am sure we are all happy that the defence expenditures committee is to be set up this session to examine defence expenditures and to recommend where savings can be made. However, I do not believe the terms of reference are broad enough. The committee is limited to the examination of expenditures for national defence and all commitments for expenditure for national defence since March 31, 1950. But there is another clause in the terms of reference which I think is significant. The committee is to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, and in particular what, if any, economies consistent with the execution of the policy decided by the government may be effected therein.

When you read that carefully it simply means that the committee can examine all expenditures, but must not criticize government policy. To my mind that is even more important than examining expenditures. All you have in these terms of reference are what you would have in reference to a public accounts committee. You may find here and there where a few dollars can be saved, and I am quite confident that the government does not expect the committee to find a great deal of fault with the expenditures; but when the committee begins to examine where expenditures can be saved by a reversal or readjustment of policy, where the committee decides that a different policy would save

many millions of dollars, it is going to be shut off in their examination because it will be said that it is discussing matters of government policy. To my mind that is where savings can be made or money more appropriately spent.

I do not think the government needs to be afraid that committees are going to dig up skeletons in respect to expenditures. We have the Auditor General and other supposed watchdogs on spending. What the government would be afraid of is a critical examination of its policies. I doubt very much that the committee will get far in its examination of expenditures because I fancy the government will welcome such an examination.

I was a bit surprised that the official opposition did not take up this point. I am inclined to think that it might reasonably be that there is no difference between the actual policies of our Conservative friends and the government. I am perfectly convinced that broadly speaking there are no differences. The leader of the opposition can get up and flay the government for spending too much money here, and saying they should save money there. All I wish to say is that if he were on the government side of the house, he would have to spend so much money here or save so much money there, and he would have to find the money the same way as the present government is finding it. I can see no difference in policy at all. As I have watched these two parties over the years, they do not argue one policy against another. All the official opposition says is, "Let us get over there and we will do the same job but by a different method".

Mr. Browne (St. John's West): By a better method.

Mr. Hansell: All right, by a better method. Supposing you do that, it does not alter anything. It is not the same job we want. People do not want more taxation, they want less taxation. What the opposition has to tell us if they want to replace the government is how they can do the job and meet these expenditures, while at the same time reducing taxation. If they have some different policy, of course it is up to them to announce that policy and show how that policy will do the trick.

I have been waiting to hear this for a good many years, and I have not heard it. The crux of the whole matter is to decide this. Does a certain government policy cause certain expenditures that would not otherwise be necessary if some other policy were being pursued?

Now, Mr. Speaker, so much for that. There is one other matter I should like to draw to the attention of the government, and it is