

*Supply—National Defence*

no commitments beyond that. In other words, at this moment there is no firm, hard commitment beyond the end of the year, although there are the realities of (a) requirements, (b) the equipments that we have and, (c) the deployment of those equipments and the training that has gone into them. To be more precise, this means that for this year the brigade remains in the forward position in the same role that it has had in the past few years and that the air division, including its headquarters, for this year remains in precisely the same role and precisely the same locations that it now has.

Further discussions by the council of ministers this year, which plans to meet at least two or three times because of the programs of inquiry that are necessary to consider what is best for future years, will include the question of the goals and what the Canadian contribution toward these goals will be for 1967 and for subsequent years.

**Mr. Brewin:** With all due respect I still do not understand. That is not clear.

**Mr. Lambert:** Mr. Chairman, last night the house was treated to a spectacle. It was a performance by a minister such as I have never before seen in this house. It was a cheap, tawdry affair.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Lambert:** It was quite unworthy of a minister of the crown.

**Mr. Winkler:** It was a real press show.

**Mr. Lambert:** The prepared speech, prepared in part perhaps by the minister, was, it seems to me, prepared merely to furbish the image that has been created at great effort and great expense of a boy wonder, of a sort of miracle man who is of clear eye and tight of rein at the helm of a new technique of defence.

**Mr. Hellyer:** Have you read the speech?

**Mr. Lambert:** I have only read parts of it. I have read those "flack" pieces that one sees in various publications in this country and abroad.

We heard a speech and, if it was not full of invective, full of boastfulness and little else, I do not know what it was full of. Frankly the house was expecting some hard facts and answers to very important questions. After all, the minister acknowledged that his department's estimates and his policies have not been discussed since 1964. Many important

[Mr. Hellyer.]

decisions have been taken in the interval. When we wish to examine them what do we get? We get a snide, scurrilous attack on the hon. member for Calgary North, a predecessor in office to the Minister of National Defence. I shall also refer generally to other ministers of defence almost all of whom were ministers of the Liberal party and to whose knees the present minister could not even aspire to come when one considers the decisions and contributions to this country made by those predecessors.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Lambert:** When the Minister of National Defence talks about rubberstamp ministers, does he refer to the Hon. Brooke Claxton? There has been a whole succession of ministers and surely he does not refer to them all as rubberstamps. I refer to Hon. Ralph Campney, Hon. George Pearkes—

**Mr. Hellyer:** You are misquoting.

**Mr. Lambert:** —and the hon. member for Calgary North. Were they all rubberstamps?

**Mr. Hellyer:** You are misquoting.

**Mr. Lambert:** What does the minister mean by that statement? Does he mean that the advisers to the Minister of National Defence have been so dominant that ministers have been subservient to them? That is the only interpretation I can get from the use of the word "rubberstamp". Does he mean that a minister's own advisers in the department have made recommendations and that the minister has supinely brought them before cabinet, the members of which then concurred? We are told that there was indecision, ineptitude and stupidity. Is this the way the minister thinks of those with whom he was first associated as parliamentary assistant?

I will mention some names. Was he referring to men like Air Marshal Slemon? After all, we know that Air Marshal Slemon was one of the chief advocates of the CF-104 and the Bomarc. Was this one of the stupid decisions? What about Air Marshal Campbell? Was he another one who was ineptly stupid? What about Air Marshal Dunlap who is now the Canadian representative at Colorado Springs? What about Lieutenant General Graham? What about Lieutenant General Charles Foulkes? What about Lieutenant General Walsh? What about Vice-Admiral deWolfe, and Vice-Admiral Rayner? Among these I have cited a number